

The British Invasion: Finding Traction in America

by

Piacentino Vona

A thesis

presented to the University Of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2018

© Piacentino Vona 2018

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

As a period of American History, the 1960s has provided historians and academics with a wealth of material for research and scholarship. Presidents John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Nixon, the Vietnam War, the hippie era, and the Civil Rights Movement, among other topics have received thorough historical discussion and debate. Music was another key aspect in understanding the social history of the 1960s. But unlike the people and events mentioned above, historians have devoted less attention to music in the historical landscape. The British Invasion was one such key event that impacted America in the 1960s. Bands such as the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who found their way into the United States and majorly impacted American society. Using secondary sources, newspaper articles, interviews and documentaries on these bands, this thesis explores the British Invasion and its influence in the context of 1960s America.

This thesis explores multiple bands that came in the initial wave. It follows these bands from 1964-1969, and argues that the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who shared common multiple factors that allowed them to attain the traction to succeed and to maintain that success in the United States. Referred to as the Big Three throughout the thesis, these three bands managed to enjoy success on a level previously unprecedented for British bands or singers through influential managers, era-defining hits, use of television and film, master songwriters, evolution of their music, and their staying power. All these factors, combined, allowed the them to succeed in America. In contrast, not every British Invasion band was as fortunate, as Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, and the Dave Clark Five failed to maintain success in America after their initial hit songs. Regardless, the British Invasion had a lasting impact on music in the United States and helped usher in the era of Classic Rock.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Andrew Hunt, whose assistance in this project was invaluable, Jane Forgay who was immeasurably helpful with tracking down sources and materials, and my friends and family, who put up with my endless rants about how awesome this music is.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1
Chapter 1: Gerry and the pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, and the DC5 ..11
Chapter 2: The Beatles.....38
Chapter 3: The Rolling Stones.....63
Chapter 4: The Who.....86
Conclusion102
Bibliography105
Appendix: Newspaper Articles.....112

INTRODUCTION

In the February 8, 1964 issue of *The New York Times*, a photo caption announcing the Beatles' arrival read "The Beatles Invade, Complete with Long Hair and Screaming Fans."¹ From the moment the Beatles touched down at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport, the British Invasion had begun in the United States. It commenced not with guns, but music. The mid-1960s saw multiple bands from Britain arrive in America in unprecedented numbers. While many bands would also come in a second wave in the 1970s, such as Pink Floyd, Led Zeppelin, and Queen, it was the first wave of groups from 1964-1969 that opened the doors to future British arrivals, and set the general tone of a new genre of music, Classic Rock, in America.

Many groups comprised the first wave of the British Invasion. The most obvious, and potentially most popular was the Beatles, but many others left impacts of varying depths, such as the Rolling Stones, the Who, the Animals, Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Dave Clark Five, the Yardbirds, and the Zombies, to name a few. All these bands took advantage of the Beatles blowing the doors open to America. But not all of them experienced the same level of success. The Beatles were arguably the most successful British Invasion band of the era, and one of the most influential rock groups of all time. But the Rolling Stones and the Who managed to also leave a lasting impression on American popular culture and contributed significantly to ushering in the era of Classic Rock on both sides of the Atlantic. These bands will be referred to as the

¹ Paul Gardner, "3,000 Fans Greet The Beatles," *New York Times*, Feb 8, 1964; ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Big Three throughout this thesis. All three groups managed to succeed and thrive in America, where other bands lacked comparable staying power and influence.

This thesis will discuss the story of multiple bands that came in the initial wave of the British Invasion. It will explore Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, the Dave Clark Five, the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who from 1964-1969. It will discuss two different stories: those that failed to maintain traction after their first hit and those that managed to succeed, thrive, and most importantly, last in the collective American memory. When exploring the story of each band, there are common factors shared by each of the Big Three that allowed them to succeed and find traction in America. To start, each had an era-defining album of the period that put them on the radar of American rock music fans. Next, each band adapted to the changing times and sounds, but also grew and evolved as a band, and contributed to the very changes to which they adapted. Also, each group thrived as a result of having master songwriters. Shrewd managers working behind the scenes gave each of the three bands the ability to flourish on a large scale. Additionally, the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who effectively used film and television to promote their image and music. Lastly, out of all the bands that will be discussed in this thesis, these three have enjoyed the most staying power, allowing them to assume a central place in the collective American popular imagination. Collectively, all these shared reasons allowed the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who to become incredibly successful in the United States.

The context of the United States and Britain contributed to the bands succeeding the way they did. Great Britain after World War II and leading into the 1960s was where British Invasion musicians grew up. On the other side of the Atlantic, transformations in America during the 1960s created preconditions that allowed the bands to enter and find mass success with American

audiences. As the sixties progressed, changing social and cultural conditions impacted the bands in complex ways, and through multiple bands these changes can be seen. Great Britain, too, was going through a period of transformation in the 1960s, and experienced many parallel events to the United States, but with some key differences. For example, Britain experienced student rebellions in the late 1960s, not unlike those in the United States. Like Washington, D.C., the British government introduced major pieces of legislation. But whereas the United States had a game-changing Civil Rights Movement influencing sweeping legislation, Great Britain saw major reforms to abortion and homosexuality that subsequently led to greater openness. A key similarity between the United States and Britain in the 1960s was the influence of The Beatles and, more broadly speaking, the aptly named British Invasion. The Beatles had just as much of an impact in Britain as in the United States, greatly impacting the popular music scene.

Another part of the social transformation in Great Britain in the 1960s was the emergence of the mod subculture that engulfed large segments of the nation's youth. Starting from an elitist clique, the mod subculture in Britain eventually evolved into a full subculture and had established its own fashion and music. According to Keith Gildart, "Mod was an identity, subculture, and movement that seemingly aimed to transcend class but in many ways was an expression of resilience."² The mod subculture also saw its impact in the Who, as the album *Quadrophenia* released in 1973 was based on events at a concert where they performed in March 1964.³

Similarly, the United States underwent profound social changes in the 1960s, and while some bore resemblance to those in Great Britain, America experienced its own unique turmoil

² Keith, Gildart. *Images of England Through Popular Music: Class, Youth, and Rock 'n' Roll, 1955-1976* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 90.

³ Gildart, 90.

and transformation. An event whose significance cannot be overstated was the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on 22 November 1963. The death of the president that America loved sent shockwaves throughout the nation, with people struggling to come to grips with the tragedy.⁴ After Kennedy's assassination and the onset of Beatlemania and the British Invasion, America saw a massive groundswell of the counterculture, which coincided with a sexual revolution. Rock 'n' roll, along with sex and drugs became synonymous with this youth movement.⁵

Another major sea change shift in the United States was the Civil Rights Movement. Led by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., renowned for his famous "I Have a Dream" speech from August 23, 1963, the African American population of the southern United States fought a nonviolent struggle for equal rights against what were known as "Jim Crow" laws that enforced rigid segregation.⁶ After all their hard work, in 1964 the federal government passed the Civil Rights Act, thus prohibiting discrimination based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. The following year, the Voting Rights Act did away with all state and local laws interfering with the right to vote, thus fully enfranchising African Americans.⁷

Events in America came to a head in the late sixties. The United States escalated the war in Vietnam, and in response, there was growing dissent at home. The traumas and tragedies of 1968, most notably the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in Memphis in April, and presidential nominee Robert F. Kennedy in Los Angeles in June, shook the nation to its core. A massive demonstration at the Democratic convention in 1968 was subdued by a large amount of

⁴ Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* (3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 103.

⁵ Isserman and Kazin, 155.

⁶ Isserman and Kazin, 24.

⁷ Troy D. Paino, *Social History of the United States: The 1960s* (Santa Barbara, California: ABC Clio, 2009), 26.

police and military forces but failed to curtail the momentum of the thriving antiwar movement.⁸

The changing social context of America in the sixties was reflected through bands like the Beatles and other Classic Rock bands that provided an increasingly forceful soundtrack to a chaotic era.

Historians have explored this larger backdrop of the United States during the 1960s at great length, and the literature on the topic is well developed. Surprisingly, they have devoted less attention to the music of the era. Before delving into each band explored in this thesis, a topic this expansive deserves a look at the current literature on the British Invasion, and on each band. This historiography will consist of two main parts. The first will discuss literature that provides a broad overview of the British Invasion. The second will be briefly spotlight more specific works on specific bands.

Key works on the British Invasion include Barry Miles' *The British Invasion* (2009), in which he discusses the story of the invasion from an insider's perspective as Miles not only lived through the sixties but also was close friends with a few groups and provided multiple interviews from the period. He does well at providing a general history and is a great start for anyone looking to delve into literature on the British Invasion. Another key work is James E. Perone's *Mods, Rockers, and the Music of the British Invasion* (2004). His work explores the British Invasion from multiple different bands, but also does well in setting up the Mods vs. Rockers in Britain, as well as the 1950s in Britain with skiffle.

Two other authors whose works deserve consideration when reading on the British Invasion are Nicholas Schaffner's *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave*

⁸ Isserman and Kazin, 244-5. For further reading on the sixties in The United States, see Terry H. Anderson, *The Movement and The Sixties* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

(1982) and Simon Philo's *British Invasion: The Crosscurrents of Musical Influence* (2015). Schaffner's work does not stop with the first wave but explores subsequent bands that arrived after the 1960s, and has chapters dedicated to some of the bigger bands of the era. Philo in his work discusses the British Invasion but shows how much of an impact this event had on popular culture.

On more specific bands, the less important British Invasion bands have inspired decidedly fewer works. In the case of the Animals, for example, outside of a few mentions in general works, and despite a few stories on Eric Burdon's life, there is only one key work that thoroughly discusses them in their various manifestations. Sean Egan's work *Animal Tracks-Updated and Expanded: The Story of The Animals, Newcastle's Rising Sons*, provides a long, but comprehensive look at the band and an annotated bibliography, should the reader choose to try to track down further materials on the group.

One group that has, unfortunately, attracted few chroniclers has been the Dave Clark Five. In his recent 2017 work *My British Invasion: The Inside Story on The Yardbirds, The Dave Clark Five, Manfred Mann, Herman's Hermits, The Hollies, The Troggs, The Kinks, The Zombies, and More*, Harold Bronson includes a chapter on them, and there was a documentary that aired in 2014 on PBS entitled *The Dave Clark Five and Beyond: Glad All Over*. Otherwise, there is no one band biography or monograph has been written about the group. This is odd considering the Dave Clark Five, before The Rolling Stones, were considered the main rival to the Beatles, so the dearth of materials on the band remains puzzling.

By contrast, the Yardbirds have generated a few band histories. The first is Greg Russo's *Yardbirds: The Ultimate Rave-up* (1998). The second is Alan Clayson's *The Yardbirds: The Band That Launched Eric Clapton, Jeff Beck, Jimmy Page* (2002). Russo's work in his words is

“all the information on the Yardbirds presented with a much greater level of detail than before.”⁹

His book tracks the group from their inception in 1963 through to The New Yardbirds, and subsequently, Led Zeppelin. With Clapton, Beck, and Page being part of the band at different times (with Beck and Page briefly playing together near the group’s end), interviews with them also can provide valuable insight on a band that otherwise, does not have a solid bibliographical foundation. Clayson traces the band through its history, studying their successes and failures, but ultimately, makes sure to note that the band was known for launching the careers of their three virtuoso guitarists: Eric Clapton, Jeff Beck, and Jimmy Page.

When it comes to the Big Three, there are a multitude of resources to draw from. Starting with the Beatles, key works include Jonathan Gould’s masterful *Can’t Buy Me Love: The Beatles, Britain, and America*. In his work, Gould goes in-depth in tracing the complete history of the group, how and why they succeeded and failed, and how they were impacted by the social setting around them and how they, in turn, impacted it. Steve Turner’s *Beatles ’66: The Revolutionary Year* focuses on the group through the pivotal year 1966, furnishing context before and after that point. Turner identifies 1966 as a key year for the growth and evolution of the Beatles. Also, June Skinner Sawyer’s collection of primary sources *Read The Beatles: Classic and New Writings on The Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter* (2006) gives lots of documents and discussions from throughout the Beatles history. A must have for a varied collection of Beatles’ sources. Lastly, André Millard’s *Beatlemania: Technology, Business, and Teen Culture in Cold War America* (2012) discusses the technological side, in part, of the

⁹ Greg Russo, *Yardbirds: The Ultimate Rave-up* (Floral Park, NY: Crossfire Publications, 1998), 4.

Beatles' success, and argues that the evolution of music technology was a key component in their success.

In addition, there are two documentaries on the group that provide valuable insight. The first, released in 2016 is *The Beatles: Eight Days a Week- The Touring Years* directed by Ron Howard. It explores the group through their touring years up until their final concert at Candlestick Park in San Francisco in 1966, utilizing archival footage from their tours, as well as interviews with Paul McCartney and Ringo Starr, and archival interviews of Brian Epstein, John Lennon, and George Harrison. The second, released in 2017 is *How The Beatles Changed the World* directed by Tom O'Dell. It is a thorough documentary on how the emergence of the Beatles impacted and helped transform the world through their music and their rapid rise to the top of the recording industry.

The Rolling Stones have a similar abundant quantity of sources. For example, David Dalton's edited collection entitled *The Rolling Stones: The First Twenty Years* (1981) delves into the early years of the group, with contributions from other authors. It provides useful primary source materials and in general is a good read for those looking to study the Rolling Stones in their earlier years. Released for their fiftieth anniversary Christopher Sandford's *The Rolling Stones: Fifty Years* (2012) looks back at this iconic British Invasion group and explores their lively history from the time they met to their fiftieth anniversary, also providing a look into The Stones' more recent years. One other key work on the group is John McMillian's *Beatles vs. Stones* (2013), provides an insightful analysis of The Beatles as well the Stones, and a valuable overview on both groups, with a primary focus on their growing rivalry, which flourished despite band members' claims to the contrary. Lastly, the 2012 documentary *Rolling Stones: Crossfire Hurricane*, directed by Brett Morgan, wove together archive footage and scenes of the group

reminiscing about their times together, with the interviews only having an audio recording, as cameras were not allowed.

The Who, while not having as developed a historiography as the Beatles or the Rolling Stones, have still managed to provide inspiration for a growing source base. A key work on the group is Dave Marsh's *Before I Get Old: The Story of The Who*. This book is a pivotal piece in the historiography. As Marsh discusses, he wishes this to be a product of history that talks not just of the band, but of the concerns and changes felt by both the group and the society that listened to them.¹⁰ Another important contribution is John Atkins' 2000 book, *The Who On Record: A Critical History, 1963-1998*. Atkins' account provides a good chronology on The Who, while at the same time bringing a more critical approach to the study of their history.

Another essential source is Andy Neill's and Matt Kent's *Anyway, Anyhow, Anywhere: The Complete Chronicle of The Who, 1958-1978*. The book's chapters are broken down in years, with each discussing a year of the group's development. One last key work is done by none other than lead guitarist and songwriter for the group Pete Townshend. In 2012, he released *Who I Am: A Memoir*.¹¹ He delves into every aspect of his life and provides invaluable insight into what he was thinking and experiencing, both before and during his time with the group. There are more works that can be considered, but these four are a good place to start.

This thesis will be divided into four chapters. The first will be a conglomeration of some of the less influential bands that came in the first wave of the British Invasion from 1964-1969. It will trace the story of each one, but at the same time, identify key factors that help us understand

¹⁰ Dave Marsh, *Before I Get Old: The Story of The Who* (London: Plexus, 2015), 13.

¹¹ In Fall 2018, Lead Singer Roger Daltrey will be releasing his memoirs, which should add another interesting book to the Who's historiography.

why these less influential acts lacked the social-cultural impact of the Big Three. Such brief case studies will bring clarity to our understanding of the varied impacts of the British Invasion itself. The following three chapters will focus on each of three most influential bands of the British Invasion: the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who, with an eye to understanding the social, cultural and musical dynamics that contributed to the success of each. Without a doubt, the story of the British Invasion does not end well for everyone involved, but the stories of the groups that follow, both positive and negative, help explain why this musical soundtrack to this eventful period of American history has managed to remain a source of historical fascination to this day and continues to shape the music of our times.

CHAPTER 1

GERRY AND THE PACEMAKERS, THE YARDBIRDS, THE ANIMALS, THE ZOMBIES, AND THE DAVE CLARK FIVE

A great number of bands saw their way into the United States at the beginning of the so-called British Invasion. These bands, spearheaded by the arrival of the Beatles at the beginning of 1964, included groups such as Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, and the Dave Clark Five. Yet, with the passage of decades, many seem to have been either forgotten or pushed to the periphery of the British sixties music scene in America. Despite this, these groups initially enjoyed great success in the United States, but unlike the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and eventually the Who, they were unable to maintain that momentum for a variety of reasons. Some, like the Yardbirds, broke up before the 60s ended, others, like the Dave Clark Five, achieved massive success, so much so they rivalled the Beatles, but ultimately lost the rivalry and faded away in popular memory. The goal of this chapter is to explore the stories of some of these lesser groups of the British Invasion from 1964 to 1969 and explore the reasons why they went from star status to flickering out in a matter of years.

Gerry and the Pacemakers were one of the first groups to come over in the British Invasion, following closely on the heels of the Beatles in their arrival to the United States. Guitarist and lead vocalist Gerry Marsden, drummer Freddie Marsden, pianist Leslie Maguire, and bassist Les Chadwick had a similar sound to the Beatles, known as the Mersey Beat. They,

like the Beatles, were from Liverpool and even had the same manager in Brian Epstein.¹² Yet unlike the Beatles, they did not have the staying power and popularity later into their careers, causing them to fizzle away after a year or so. Regardless, they deserve some discussion in this chapter, as they show that incredible similarities with the Beatles does not guarantee success.

Their first hit was “Don’t Let the Sun Catch You Crying,” released in the spring of 1964, topped at number four on *Billboard*. Their second hit, “How Do You Do It?” was originally meant for the Beatles, but they refused to record it, so Gerry and the Pacemakers took it. It reached number nine and was the first song to knock The Beatles out of the top spot on the charts.¹³ They even had a movie like the Beatles. *Ferry Cross The Mersey* was released in January 1965, months after *A Hard Day’s Night*. Following the Beatles’ movie hurt them however. As one *New York Times* review mentioned, it paled in comparison to *A Hard Day’s Night*, noting that drummer Freddie Marsden tried to be an “Ingratiating solo personality, but he is no Ringo Starr.”¹⁴ They fell even farther behind when they failed to adapt to the changing times. While the Beatles evolved with the drug-oriented late sixties, Gerry and the Pacemakers continued on with their Merseybeat sound.¹⁵ Thus, despite some outward similarities with the Beatles, Gerry and the Pacemakers failed to change with the times, and therefore languished in the shadow of the Beatles, and ultimately the shadows of the British Invasion.

The Yardbirds have become known as the band that, at various points, featured three virtuoso guitarists, Eric Clapton, Jeff Beck, and Jimmy Page, before they launched their

¹² Nicholas Schaffner, *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 225.

¹³ Schaffner, 225.

¹⁴ Eugene Archer, “The Screen: ‘Ferry Cross the Mersey’: New Film Stars Gerry and the Pacemakers,” *New York Times*, Feb 20, 1965.

¹⁵ Schaffner, 225.

illustrious careers. However, in the early British Invasion, they were relatively unknown. The Yardbirds started between two friends, Anthony (Top) Topham and Chris Dreja, both on guitar. The original lineup was rounded out by Paul Samwell-Smith on bass, Keith Relf on vocals and harmonica, and Jim McCarty on drums.¹⁶ These three were recruited to the group after Topham and Dreja saw them at the Railway Tavern and Hotel as part of the Metropolis Blues Quartet (MBQ). By the end of 1963, the MBQ was made of Dreja, Topham, McCarty, Relf, and Samwell-Smith.¹⁷

The MBQ had a heavy blues influence in their music, brought by their three newest members McCarty, Relf, and Samwell-Smith.¹⁸ It quickly became clear though, that as they were becoming more well known in the venues of London, that The MBQ needed a new, less cumbersome name. Keith Relf was heavily influenced by beat literature and read a lot of Jack Kerouac. He came across “the Yardbirds,” which is a hobo who hung around railroad yards, in Kerouac’s writings.¹⁹ They became known as the Yardbirds and started to find more and more success the more they played, so much so that Relf, McCarty, and Samwell-Smith quit their other jobs, and Dreja was willing to drop out of school to go full-time as musicians.²⁰

The band was growing, but they needed that next step, and they found those next couple steps in one spot. Later in 1963 the Crawdaddy Club run by Giorgio Gomelsky, was looking for a replacement for the Rolling Stones who had moved on to bigger and better things. Gomelsky was looking for the Stones’ successor, and he wanted to make sure the band that followed the

¹⁶ Greg Russo, *Yardbirds: The Ultimate Rave-Up* (Floral Park, NY: Crossfire Publications, 1998), 5-6.

¹⁷ Russo, 8.

¹⁸ Russo, 7.

¹⁹ Harold Bronson, *My British Invasion: The Inside Story on The Yardbirds, The Dave Clark Five, Manfred Mann, Herman’s Hermits, The Hollies, The Troggs, The Kinks, The Zombies, and More* (Los Angeles: Rare Bird Books, 2017), chap. The Yardbirds, Kindle.

²⁰ Russo, 8-9.

Stones was not only blues-based, but original and experimental.²¹ The Yardbirds fit the bill. They were blues musicians, and their originality and experimentation were derived from what became known as “rave-ups.” A rave-up, as described by Greg Russo, involved “rapidly speeding up the song’s tempo within a free-form instrumental passage before expertly returning to the original time.”²² In a 1966 article in *The Los Angeles Times*, Keith Relf described their style: “We started with the usual sort of folk blues stuff. Then the numbers started to take on their own feelings. The solos got longer, became more abstract. They lost their original format. Now we even change it night to night... The numbers were just copies of somebody else; now they are us.”²³ Gomelsky was impressed with this style and not only signed them on to The Crawdaddy Club to replace the Rolling Stones, but also became the Yardbirds’ manager.²⁴ The ability to make a big splash were starting to take shape for the Yardbirds.

The band’s first personnel change happened shortly thereafter. Top Topham could not make a consistent commitment due to pressure from his parents to go to art school. He quit the band, and they needed a replacement. Enter the first of the three virtuoso guitarists, Eric Clapton. Only eighteen, he was getting nowhere with his previous groups the Roosters and Casey Jones And the Engineers, so on October 13, 1963 he saw them play and joined them that night, officially making him Topham’s replacement.²⁵

With Clapton a part of the group, the Yardbirds sought to record hit records.²⁶ Their first hit single was “For Your Love,” written by Manchester songwriter Graham Gouldman. They

²¹ Russo, 9.

²² Russo, 9.

²³ Marilyn Caldwell, “Yardbirds Find Own Style in the Far Out,” *Los Angeles Times*, Feb 26, 1966.

²⁴ Russo, 9.

²⁵ Russo, 11.

²⁶ Bronson, chap. The Yardbirds, Kindle.

needed a hit to break into the charts. In addition to the revenue this hit would provide, Chris Dreja pointed out that this would allow them “to increase their popularity so we could draw a crowd beyond the fifty-mile radius of London.”²⁷ The song was recorded early 1965 and when it released in The UK in March 1965 and the United States in April 1965, it reached number three and number six, respectively.²⁸

Despite this top hit, another personnel change occurred. Clapton was getting fed up and did not like “For Your Love,” with its minimal reliance on guitar, and in February 1965, he announced that he was leaving the group.²⁹ The Yardbirds had to find another replacement, and their first choice was session guitarist Jimmy Page. He declined, opting instead to continue working as a session musician. Page, however suggested Jeff Beck, who was highly into guitar experimentation with feedback and distortion.³⁰ Alan Clayson also aptly points out that Beck was a visual asset, as his actions on the stage with his guitar added a certain flair, such as “leaving the guitar squealing on the speaker as he prowled the stage.”³¹ Beck joined the Yardbirds shortly after Clapton’s departure, and once again the lineup of five was complete.

With the British Invasion underway, the band set its sights on the United States, where Giorgio Gomelsky was investigating the possibility of a Yardbirds tour.³² Gomelsky had trouble obtaining visas for the band members. Even once they received visas on August 23, 1965 the group still could not play in the United States due to a rule put in by The Royal Musicians’ Union. This rule restricted foreign musicians from performing in the United States unless an

²⁷ Bronson, chap. The Yardbirds, Kindle.

²⁸ Russo, 19-20.

²⁹ Russo, 19.

³⁰ Russo, 20.

³¹ Alan Clayson, *The Yardbirds: The Band That Launched Eric Clapton, Jeff Beck, Jimmy Page* (San Francisco: Backbeat Books, 2002), 77.

³² Russo, 20.

American group in return went on tour in Britain, meaning if the Yardbirds, a five-piece rock band wanted to play in America, five American musicians would have to be guaranteed employment in Britain.³³ Dreja described the band's first experience in the United States: "We had trouble with our work permits, so we didn't actually play any proper venues... So, we did promo things, because we couldn't legitimately play... but in a way, it was the best thing we could have done. It was a pre-promo tour to playing, 'cause what it did, it introduced us to all the right 'faces,' if you know what I mean."³⁴ Despite the challenges of their first American tour, the group, especially Dreja, viewed the experience in a very positive light.

The Yardbirds' second single, "Heart Full of Soul," was also written by Graham Gouldman, and attempted to introduce the sitar, an instrument from India into the song. Unfortunately, the instrument did not have the power they wanted, so Beck managed to recreate the sound they wanted on his guitar. It released in June 1965 in Britain and July 1965 in the United States and reached number two and number nine on the British and American charts respectively.³⁵ Also, the Yardbirds were attempting to explore lyrics beyond the typical boy-meets-girl fare of the early British Invasion, as their single that followed "Evil Hearted You," in the UK and "I'm a Man" in the United States (both were released in 1965), "Shapes of Things," released in 1966, could be heard as an indictment of society.³⁶ Overall, "Evil You" (paired with "Still I'm Sad") went as high as number three in Britain, while "I'm a Man" topped out at number seventeen in America, and "Shapes of Things" topped at number three and eleven in Britain and the United States, respectively.³⁷

³³ Bronson, chap. The Yardbirds, Kindle.

³⁴ Russo, 29.

³⁵ Russo, 22.

³⁶ Clayson, 93-4.

³⁷ Schaffner, 288.

Once again however, personnel changes occurred, and not just with the artists. As the Yardbirds continued to grow and develop as musicians, Gomelsky was unable to meet their needs, both in production and management, with the final straw breaking with San Remo festival debacle, where money due to the band went missing.³⁸ The Yardbirds hired Simon Napier-Bell as their new manager, but unfortunately, he was no better for the group. Part of Gomelsky's release contract gave him the right to retain the rights and royalties of all Yardbirds material up to and including "Shapes of Things." Also, Napier-Bell was managing other bands, and while he obtained recording advances for the Yardbirds, he never had a hands-on interest with them.³⁹

On top of Gomelsky's firing and other mismanagement, Paul Samwell-Smith was tired of constantly touring. Psychologically, Samwell-Smith feared the law of averages would catch up with him and he would lose his life in a horrific accident. He also witnessed schisms in other bands, such as Paul Jones leaving Manfred Mann and on 18 June 1966, he finally decided to leave when at an Oxford college ball Relf appeared drunk at the microphone. He quit the band, forcing them to find yet another replacement. Within a week of Samwell-Smith quitting, Jimmy Page became the new Yardbird.⁴⁰

In spite of mixed feelings within the band over Samwell-Smith's departure, losing him, in the words of Dreja, "freed us to explore other areas – music with more muscle."⁴¹ This allowed the group to try different types of music, such as psychedelic. As Beck recalls, "We were on the threshold of this new thing. the Yardbirds were the first psychedelic band."⁴² This song was

³⁸ Russo, 34.

³⁹ Russo, 35.

⁴⁰ Clayson, 97-9.

⁴¹ Clayson, 103.

⁴² Clayson, 104.

“Happenings Ten Years Time Ago,” but unfortunately for the group, it only charted number 43 in Britain and 30 in America.⁴³

The group’s next tour of America was fraught with problems. Page found it to be “the worst tour I’d ever been on, as far as fatigue is concerned. We didn’t know where we were or what we were doing.”⁴⁴ The Yardbirds were still drawing crowds with many enthusiastic fans, as one *Chicago Tribune* account noted: “One girl... brought along a plaster kit to get a mold of Jeff Beck’s leg forever!”⁴⁵ Despite zealous fandom, the American tour uncovered a troubling realization within the group, as Dreja recalls noticing, “Having two guitarists was no longer a great idea... Jeff felt – justifiably – that his space was being invaded.”⁴⁶ Originally starting on bass, Page switched to guitar and co-led with Beck. This led to another personnel casualty, as Beck would end up being sacked *in absentia* after his colleagues realized that instead of being sick and receiving treatment, as he claimed, he was partying at Los Angeles night spots.⁴⁷

Instead of replacing Beck, the group decided to continue as a foursome, but once again, they encountered managerial problems. The combination of Beck’s firing and poor tours caused the group to rid themselves of Simon Napier-Bell. His replacement, Peter Grant, immediately secured tour dates for a few weeks in the United States starting Christmas Day 1966.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, this was the beginning of the end, despite Grant’s positive impact. Relf and McCarty were absorbing psychedelia in all forms, and it started to negatively impact the band.⁴⁹ In addition, at home in Britain, other bands were overshadowing them, such as the super-group

⁴³ Clayson, 104.

⁴⁴ Clayson, 107-8.

⁴⁵ Pamela Bassett, “Young Fans Dig English Yardbirds,” *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 12, 1966.

⁴⁶ Clayson, 108.

⁴⁷ Clayson, 108-9.

⁴⁸ Russo, 48.

⁴⁹ Russo, 52.

Cream, of which Eric Clapton was a part, and the Jimi Hendrix Experience. The stiff competition left the band bewildered and directionless. Grant did help them make money on the road, but once again, road weariness reared its ugly head and started to impact members. Also, musically, their contrasting tastes caused fissures, as Relf and McCarty wanted to go softer, but Page wanted to go heavier. Ultimately, the band took part in one last tour of the United States from March to June 1968, at which point Relf and McCarty announced they were quitting.⁵⁰

The Yardbirds ground to an unceremonious halt. Page would try to revive them and formed a group called the New Yardbirds, which consisted of Page on guitar, singer Robert Plant, John Paul Jones on keyboard, and drummer John Bonham. Ultimately, they changed their name to Led Zeppelin after a comment Who bassist John Entwistle made to his drummer Keith Moon that these four would “go down like a lead zeppelin.” The name stuck, with only a minor change from “lead” to “led” so it would not be mispronounced.⁵¹ Led Zeppelin would enjoy massive amounts of success in the 1970s, but the group they evolved from, the Yardbirds, while having a couple hits, never gained the traction in the sixties that the Big Three did. Decades later, when they are remembered, it is mainly because of the three guitarists that got their starts with them. Once a group with two big hits, the Yardbirds faded to the status of a lesser act in the British Invasion.

The Animals had a similar experience to the Yardbirds. Today, the band is remembered as having the best rendition of “House of The Rising Sun,” ranking number 123 on *Rolling Stone’s* 500 Greatest Songs of All Time.⁵² Despite this song’s lasting popularity, the band itself

⁵⁰ Russo, 58.

⁵¹ Russo, 61.

⁵² Rolling Stone, “500 Greatest Songs of All Time,” *Rolling Stone*, <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/lists/the-500-greatest-songs-of-all-time-20110407/the-animals-the-house-of-the-rising-sun-20110526> (accessed June 25, 2018).

did not enjoy the same staying power as other British Invasion groups and has faded away in the history of the British Invasion. Regardless, they are a prime example of a band that had a massive hit that is still remembered and played today, and a few lesser but still impressive successes (“We Gotta Get Out of This Place,” “It’s My Life,” “Don’t Let me Be Misunderstood”), but never achieved the level of success of the Big Three.

Like the Yardbirds, the Animals consisted of five members: vocalist Eric Burdon, guitarist Hilton Valentine, bassist Chas Chandler, drummer John Steel, and Alan Price on Keyboards. When Burdon went to art school at age fifteen, he met fellow musician John Steel. Originally, Burdon played trombone and Steel played trumpet in jam sessions with two other college students, known as the Pagan Jazzmen, but then suddenly Burdon decided he wanted to sing, and Steel, influenced by skiffle, switched to drums.⁵³ They reconstituted as an R&B group and changed their name to the Pagans. Alan Price, a young pianist who impressed them, subsequently joined the group.

As they continued to grow, they morphed into the Kansas City Seven, then the Kansas City Five after their trumpeters left. Early on, they would play at a club that reportedly had no license. This is where they met their manager, Mike Jeffery, who, sadly, proved far more inept than Gorgio Gomelsky, or any of the Yardbirds’ managers. Burdon’s father even warned him to be suspicious of Jeffery.⁵⁴ After receiving a regular Friday night gig at Jeffery’s new club, Price abruptly left to join another group, the Kon-tors. The Kansas City Five fell apart, and for a while, went their separate ways. The Kon-tors splintered however, and one of the offshoots was The Alan Price Rhythm and Blues Combo, of whom Eric Burdon would permanently join. They

⁵³ Sean Egan, *Animal Tracks – Updated and Expanded: The Story of The Animals: Newcastle’s Rising Sons* (n.p.: Askill Publishing, 2012), chap. 1, Kindle.

⁵⁴ Egan, chap. 1, Kindle.

would find regular gigs at Jeffery's new club, the Club A'Go-Go. John Steel joined the group after Chas Chandler decided their drummer had to go because of a bad attitude.⁵⁵ As Steel recalled:

One day I'm walking down the street and Chas stops and says, 'You know Eric's playing with us now?' I'd heard this. Chas said, 'Do you fancy playing with us?' By this time I'd turn professional. I'd quit my job selling wallpaper and I was making fifteen quid a week playing this nightclub. I said, 'Chas, I'd love to but I can't afford it. It's me living now, I'm making fifteen quid a week.' And Chas says, 'Well, hell, we're playing seven sets a week and we're picking up fourteen, fifteen quid a week as well.' And I thought, 'Well, fuck me.'⁵⁶

Steel joined the group, and to round out the original group, they snagged guitarist Hilton Valentine from another group. This completed the original Animals line-up.

With the group now complete, the Alan Price Rhythm and Blues Combo (they were not yet known as the Animals) went into the recording studio. On September 15, 1963 they recorded a four-track EP titled *I Just Wanna Make Love To You*, which Valentine notes: "It certainly captured what the Animals were about."⁵⁷ The hope was that their loyal fans from their hometown of Newcastle would purchase the EP. Their hopes were fulfilled, with over 500 copies sold.⁵⁸ All of a sudden, the group started to take off. "In between September and December of '63, we just became the hottest thing in Newcastle," recalled Steel. "Everywhere we played it was absolutely jammed."⁵⁹ Events continued to snowball and eventually the band signed a contract with Jeffery to become their new manager.

Jeffery's first act was trying to get them some gigs in London. As Steel recounted:

⁵⁵ Egan, chap. 1, Kindle.

⁵⁶ Egan, chap. 1, Kindle.

⁵⁷ Egan, chap. 2, Kindle.

⁵⁸ Egan, chap. 2, Kindle.

⁵⁹ Egan, chap. 2, Kindle.

He said, 'Right, we've got a thing set up. There's a band called The Yardbirds who've taken over from The Rolling Stones doing a lot of gigs... I've been talking to this guy called Giorgio Gomelsky and also this guy Ronan O'Rahilly. Ronan O'Rahilly's got a club called the Scene Club which is just off Piccadilly and that's where we're gonna be playing late night and we're gonna be doing all these Rolling Stones gigs. The Yardbird gigs early in the evening.' He set it all up. The deal was he'd take The Yardbirds and put them in all our gigs. So right up to practically the day before Christmas, we had these ten or so days lined up where we'd play these small clubs, pubby-type gigs in the early part of the night, eight o'clock to ten, ten-thirty, and we'd zoom into London down to the Scene Club and start there about midnight 'til two in the morning. And he said, 'Oh, and by the way, the name's been changed. You're now The Animals.' And everybody went, 'What!'⁶⁰

Suddenly, they had gigs in London and a new name, the Animals. After getting over the initial shock of the name change however, Steel remembers Chas saying, "Well right, fair enough: the Beatles, the Animals, whatever," with Burdon and Steel quite liking it themselves.⁶¹ With a new name and some gigs in London, the Animals were slowly rising within the ranks of British musicians.

After their ten-day visit to London in January 1964, the Animals relocated there permanently. But the group already started to splinter. On a tour of Scotland, the band almost dismissed Chandler because of his disinterest in R&B and short temper. The Animals experienced a change of heart, and Chandler stayed in the group. However, thereafter, Steel noted that there were two factions within the Animals: Valentine, Burdon, and himself, and Price and Chandler.⁶² Regardless of these tensions, the group still enjoyed successes, and by the end of January 1964, they had signed on with the Don Arden agency for live work, and independent record producer Mickie Most, who was intent on trying to land them a recording contract. Most,

⁶⁰ Egan, chap. 2, Kindle.

⁶¹ Egan, chap. 2, Kindle.

⁶² Egan, chap. 3, Kindle.

however convinced Jeffery that the Animals needed to record a demo and obtain a contract by selling its distribution rights.⁶³

The next logical step was the recording studio. There has been some confusion about this first recording session, but Steel's journals suggest (and Valentine remembers it similarly) it was February 12, 1964, instead of January, with the band recording "Baby Let Me Take You Home" and "Gonna Send You Back To Walker."⁶⁴ After laying the demo, Most approached EMI, because of their association with the Beatles. The deal Most landed was not desirable, with six percent of profit being split between Most, Jeffery, and the Animals. But a deal was a deal, and at the time, the band was ecstatic.⁶⁵

A deal now in hand, the next song they record would turn into an American classic. "House of the Rising Sun" would become the Animals' biggest hit. Burdon heard the song when he was seventeen, and the Animals heard other versions at Newcastle spots like the Downbeat and the Club A-Go-Go. Burdon was also impacted by Josh White's version of the song, and Bob Dylan's version when his record found its way to Newcastle in 1962.⁶⁶ It is unclear however which version had a bigger impact on the Animals' version. Burdon remembers it as his idea, with both Dylan and White's versions shaping their version. Steele however believes it was only Dylan's version that had any influence.⁶⁷ Regardless, the Animals version of "House of the

⁶³ Egan, chap. 3, Kindle.

⁶⁴ Egan, chap. 3, Kindle.

⁶⁵ Egan, chap. 3, Kindle.

⁶⁶ Ted Anthony, *Chasing the Rising Son: The Journey of an American Song* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007), 144-5.

⁶⁷ Anthony, 145.

Rising Sun” in the eyes of Ted Anthony, would become the definitive version.⁶⁸ It became the first number one hit by a British band after the Beatles.⁶⁹

When preparing to publish the song, an issue was the length of the recording, as it came in at four minutes and twenty-seven seconds. The rule of thumb was that you could not have a song longer than three minutes. This is where Most showed his guts urged the band to go with the longer running time.⁷⁰ This was the decision that allowed “House of the Rising Sun” to flourish and put the Animals at the top of the charts when it was released in June. It sold a quarter of a million units in the first three days, and by July 11, 1964, it topped the charts in Britain. The song was not released in America until August, but the version that was released was shortened. Regardless, it hit number one in the United States.⁷¹ But “House” was not an original song. It was a traditional folk and blues standard, with a mysterious history. Like so many other bands that relied heavily on cover songs, recording work by others impacted the Animals, and restricted their ability to push their careers forward.

That is not to say that the Animals did not try to write original material. They decided that to follow up a single that did as well as “House of the Rising Sun,” that single needed to be an original. Steel recalls that Alan was the obvious choice because he played the piano and could put together baselines and guitar chords. Burdon would pitch in with lyrics, but the song-writing process never evolved much farther than that.⁷² Regardless, at this point the Animals were riding high, and because of topping the charts in America, it was almost a given that they would tour the States. Their arrival in America was greeted with massive hype as the *New York Times*

⁶⁸ Anthony, 15.

⁶⁹ Schaffner, 192.

⁷⁰ Egan, chap. 3, Kindle.

⁷¹ Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

⁷² Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

reported: “Three hundred teen-agers, most of them girls, gave a squealing welcome at the Paramount Theater yesterday to five British singers who call themselves the Animals.”⁷³

Howard Thompson gives a similar, yet more in-depth account of their show at the Paramount: “They came, they blasted and they conquered the youngsters at the Paramount yesterday. Who? The Animals, that’s who... Making their American debut in the churning wake of the Beatles, the Animals spared neither the horses nor the muses. Talk about loud! Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah! The kids ate it up.”⁷⁴ With the release of one song, the Animals were receiving American press coverage, and even had teenagers screaming for them *a la* the Beatles. Outside of discovering the changes that were made for the American release of “House of the Rising Sun,” the tour went well, and they even were able to meet their hero Bob Dylan.⁷⁵

Continuing, their next single “I’m Crying”/“Take It Easy” reached number 19 in America when it released in October. “I’m Crying” was an original composition by the group, and it did reasonably well, but unfortunately, as Sean Egan points out, they would never write another A-side.⁷⁶ As he also points out, the group had similarities with the Rolling Stones, starting out as rhythm and blues fanatics who covered songs and did not have a lot of confidence writing their own material. The difference was, however, that the Rolling Stones were buttressed by the song-writing talents of Mick Jagger and Keith Richards, which eventually rivaled the writing duo of John Lennon and Paul McCartney. In addition, Egan astutely notes that the manager for the Animals lacked the vision and savvy of Rolling Stones’ manager, Andrew Loog Oldham. It was

⁷³ New York Times, “300 Teen-Agers Welcome The Animals, Singing Group,” *New York Times*, Sep 3, 1964.

⁷⁴ Howard Thompson, “Teen-agers Howl for the Animals: 5 Beatlelike Britons Come to the Paramount,” *New York Times*, Sep 5, 1964.

⁷⁵ Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

⁷⁶ Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

Oldham that pressed Jagger and Richards to write their own material.⁷⁷ Guitarist Hilton Valentine also recalls that the bickering in the band probably stunted the song-writing growth of Burdon and Price: “I guess people just didn’t really want to get together when they weren’t working.”⁷⁸

Unfortunately, a weak manager, and a lack of original song-writing talent, would stunt the growth and evolution of a group that may have otherwise had the potential to turn into a giant of the British Invasion. As will later be discussed with the Big Three, these two components were pivotal to the success of the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who.

The Animals found their way back to America, however, for a tour in late September, and to appear on the *Ed Sullivan Show* on October 18, 1964. In November, their single “Boom Boom” was released in the United States, but only reached 43 on the charts. Their next big hit came in 1965, but once again, it was not an original composition. “Don’t Let Me Be Misunderstood” was written by Bennie Benjamin, Sol Marcus, and Gloria Caldwell, and at the time the most well known version was performed by Nina Simone version. The single, along with the B-side “A-Go-Go” (which was written by Price and Burdon), reached number fifteen in America.⁷⁹ Suddenly, without warning, on April 28, 1964, keyboardist Alan Price went AWOL and announced that he was quitting the group, and was replaced by Dave Rowberry. After that, keyboards assumed a less important role in Animals’ songs.⁸⁰ In mid-May 1965, the Animals went on another American tour, this time in the Deep South.

⁷⁷ Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

⁷⁸ Egan, chap. 4, Kindle.

⁷⁹ Egan, chap. 5, Kindle.

⁸⁰ Egan, chap. 5, Kindle.

The year 1965 also saw the changing of record labels, with the group switching to Decca, and ditching producer Mickie Most. But the Animals' next single "Inside-Looking Out" only reached number 34 in America, and John Steel had had enough. He gave his notice in February 1966. He was not enjoying being part of the band and felt that the band was falling apart. He also felt that "we were being ripped off and fucked around... Where was the money?"⁸¹ His replacement was Barry Jenkins, playing his first gig on March 15, 1966.⁸²

That same year, the Animals went on vacation to the Bahamas, feeling the pressure to write their own material. This effort was all for naught. As Rowberry recalled: "We actually sat there in this room. The five of us just couldn't come up with anything. The mind was on the golf course outside and the beach and the birds. It was so gorgeous there. We didn't want to be in there."⁸³ A film titled *Animals Around the World*, released in June, exemplified the turmoil the band was experiencing internally. It showed the group fragmenting, like the Beatles' *Let It Be*. July of that same year, the group went on another tour of the United States, supporting Herman's Hermits.⁸⁴

Lysergic Acid Diethylamide, also known as LSD, had become very prevalent in the growing American counterculture of the sixties. Unfortunately for the Animals, it was not the high they were hoping for, as it split the group between those who took LSD, and those who preferred alcohol. "There was a short period of time when we were all pulling together and we all thought we could make it," recalled Burdon. "It was a very short time from the inception of the band. That quickly digressed into two camps: those who took LSD and those who kept on

⁸¹ Egan, chap. 6, Kindle.

⁸² Egan, chap. 6, Kindle.

⁸³ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

⁸⁴ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

drinking booze. Each side hated each other for what each other was doing.”⁸⁵ Mutual hatreds flared. Band members were pitted against each other. Burdon later acknowledged that manager Mike Jeffery had manipulated the band.⁸⁶

The band’s end came abruptly. “There was never any sitting down, the band together, saying ‘What shall we do?’ It just happened,” recalled Dave Rowberry. “I think it was Eric’s decision, basically.”⁸⁷ According to Burdon, the band’s breakup “only happened when it became extreme pressure and it became way obvious to me that we couldn’t live together, we couldn’t go any further.” The *Los Angeles Times* also reported on their breakup. Pete Johnson reported: “The Animals, whose rhythm and blues treatment of popular music propelled them to fame as a top British group, are splitting up following their current American tour.”⁸⁸ The Animals officially disbanded on September 5, 1966.⁸⁹

The original Animals were dead and buried, but Burdon tried to revive the group, retaining Berry Jenkins, and bringing on guitarists John Weider and Vic Briggs, and bassist Danny McCulloch, with Mike Jeffery back as manager. Once again, Burdon wanted to try to make the renamed New Animals self-sufficient when it came to original song material, but their live acts started out as all covers.⁹⁰ It was their first recording session that allowed the group to transition to writing their own material.⁹¹ Their first tour of the United States as the New Animals started in February 1967, but it did not go the way they had hoped, as Briggs recalls:

⁸⁵ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

⁸⁶ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

⁸⁷ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

⁸⁸ Pete Johnson, “Popular Records: Animals Calling It Quits After U.S. Tour,” *Los Angeles Times*, Sep 4, 1966.

⁸⁹ Egan, chap. 7, Kindle.

⁹⁰ The New Animals was their name although sometimes according to Briggs it varied between the New Animals and the Animals

⁹¹ Egan, chap. 8, Kindle.

In the aftermath of the Herman's Hermits tour, which I understand was an artistic disaster, [Burdon] wanted the band to be taken a lot more seriously. We rehearsed a lot of songs from varying degrees of obscurity. In fact, that tour was supposed to be a college tour. The idea being that more mature audiences would appreciate more mature music... In fact the tour turned out to only have a few college dates. So we found that often we were going over the audiences' heads and we had to do more of the 'pop'-type material.⁹²

The tour's problems were offset by a more successful recording career for Eric Burdon and the New Animals, thanks to their new single, "When I was Young," which fared well in Britain and the United States.

In June 1967, Eric Burdon and the Animals performed at the Monterey International Pop Music Festival. They were booked as the opening night replacement for The Beach Boys.⁹³ "We were well received," recalled Briggs. "After us was Simon and Garfunkel, basically two guys and one guitar. They did pretty good but I have a review somewhere that says, 'Friday night belonged to the Animals.' We had no competition on Friday."⁹⁴ The massive outdoor concert proved a springboard to stardom for Jimi Hendrix, Janis Joplin, and the Who. By contrast, the Animals, in spite of their success Friday night, did not reap the same rewards as those three classic rock giants at Monterey Pop. Promoting their album *Winds of Change*, Eric Burdon and the Animals would once again run into money issues. Out of a \$100,000-dollar net profit, Burdon would get \$45,000 dollars and the rest of the group would get \$55,000 dollars out of a \$100,000-dollar net profit. Briggs would end up being scammed out of losing the signed contracts, costing him the opportunity to sue.⁹⁵

⁹² Egan, chap. 8, Kindle.

⁹³ Egan, chap. 9, Kindle.

⁹⁴ Egan, chap. 9, Kindle.

⁹⁵ Egan, chap. 9, Kindle.

The New Animals would head back to Britain to see that *Winds of Change* did not chart in Britain, and only reached number 42 in the United States. In January 1968, they would leave Britain once again, and not return in any meaningful way. Their return to the States also revealed how much it had changed in a year, with the brotherly love of the hippie era quickly fading away. This was also the case with the New Animals. Burdon was unhappy with the way the band was going musically, and it was clear there was something very wrong with the money.

They finally decided to split from Jeffery, replacing him with manager Kevin Deverich.⁹⁶ Tensions boiled over on February 9, 1968. The New Animals were doing a pair of shows with the Jimi Hendrix Experience where the New Animals would headline one show and Hendrix the other. Burdon had told Hendrix that he was so much better than them, and McCulloch and Briggs lost their tempers. Following internal tensions, the New Animals finally disbanded at the end of the year after a dreadful tour of Japan that started in November of 1968.⁹⁷ The Animals in all their incarnations, had potential to become a big-hit band that rose to the top of the ranks of The British Invasion.

Unfortunately, the story of the Animals is one with a corrupt manager, a lack of top hits, and the inability to sustain themselves with their own material. While they did have a top hit with “House of the Rising Sun,” and some impressive lesser hits, this was not enough to sustain their success. The band failed to live up to fan and record company expectations, and unlike the Big Three of the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who, they were not able to deliver. Burdon, looking back on the New Animals, summarizes that they “fell in between the cracks.”⁹⁸ Nor could they compete with their rising contemporaries. Their financial situation did not help, and

⁹⁶ Egan, chap. 11, Kindle.

⁹⁷ Egan, chap. 12, Kindle.

⁹⁸ Egan, chap. 13, Kindle.

Jeffrey's mismanagement hurt their ability to progress. Overall, the Animals became another casualty of the British Invasion as they lacked many key components that allowed the Big Three to flourish.

The Zombies were another one of the countless rock groups that came out of Britain because of the success of the Beatles. The group consisted of Colin Blunstone on vocals, Rod Argent on vocals and keyboard, Paul Atkinson on guitar, Chris White on vocals and bass, and Hugh Grundy on drums. In contrast to the Beatles, the band veered towards the edgier side of R&B, like the Rolling Stones, but as one American observer noted: "They are clean-cut, quiet, well-mannered, intelligent, and all very good-looking... They behave like gentlemen, and shy away from boisterous and out-of-hand affairs."⁹⁹ They were way closer to the Beatles than the Rolling Stones in terms of looks and personality. And like the Beatles, they did score hits in the United States. But unlike the Beatles, they had only three hits in America and one in Britain.¹⁰⁰ The Zombies were interesting because their hits were at the beginning of the British Invasion and at the end of the sixties, with the group struggling to find success in between. Their story may not be as long or in-depth as some of the bands in this chapter, but they were another example of how a band that enjoyed initial success fell through the cracks of the British Invasion.

Originally, the Zombies may not have even made it past 1964. Band members were eyeing college and about to break up, but they were encouraged to enter a battle of the bands contest and subsequently, they won. They received 250 British Pounds as well as a recording contract with Decca Records.¹⁰¹ The Zombies could boast two talented songwriters in Chris

⁹⁹ Schaffner, 289.

¹⁰⁰ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

¹⁰¹ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

White and Rod Argent, who wrote about themes of adolescent angst.¹⁰² In their initial recording session, producer Ken Jones suggested a song called “She’s Not There,” written by Argent. The song did incredibly well as a debut single when it released in July 1964, charting even better in the United States at number two than in their home Britain, at number twelve. Already, unlike the Animals, the group were cashing in on original material.¹⁰³

This instant hit for the group had the Zombies hastily added to Murray the K’s Christmas show, a show the Who would eventually appear on, and this provided the group some more airtime in the United States. They got even more TV time when they appeared on *Hullabaloo* and *Shindig!* where they played their new single “Tell Her No,” and consequently, their new single hit number six on the American charts. They took these two hits, and along with other songs they recorded, released their LP *The Zombies* in February 1965, eventually reaching number 39.¹⁰⁴ The promotion for this LP came in April when they went back to The United States for a thirty-three-date tour, but like the Animals, it seemed as if those managing their career were not the best.¹⁰⁵

In 1967, the summer that saw the release of the Beatles landmark era-defining album *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*, the Zombies recorded an album at EMI’s Abbey Road that would later be recognized as a reflection of the era.¹⁰⁶ At the time of release, *Odyssey and Oracle*, flopped, only reaching number 95 on Billboard in America. The one song that became a hit off of it, “Time of the Season,” became a hit nearly a year after the release of it on *Odyssey*

¹⁰² Schaffner, 290.

¹⁰³ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

¹⁰⁴ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

¹⁰⁵ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

¹⁰⁶ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

and Oracle, reaching number three and selling over two million copies. When people and promoters went looking for them, they had discovered the band had broken up.¹⁰⁷

The Zombies were a band that received their accolades well after their break-up at the end of the sixties. *Rolling Stone Magazine* ranked *Odyssey and Oracle* number 100 on their 500 Greatest Albums of All Time, citing its “psychedelic pop-arrangements” and its “the adventure of *Sgt. Pepper* with the concision of British Invasion pop.”¹⁰⁸ Ultimately, while their album in many ways embodied the spirit of the psychedelic times in which it was recorded, it did not take its place among the acclaimed albums of the period until well after the Summer of Love was over.

The Zombies had potential: they had gifted songwriters and landed massive hits in the United States, but they never reached the point of the Big Three. Argent went his own way, forming a band that took its name from him. In an interview discussing the Zombies, he recalled: “We were always dissatisfied with the production of our records. It [*Odyssey and Oracle*] would come out a lot differently than the sound we had in our heads. So, as an experiment, we wanted to produce an album before we broke up to satisfy ourselves. So we recorded it and then split. It was the first thing we ever produced ourselves and that knocked us out. We were very pleased with it.”¹⁰⁹ While not necessarily a casualty of the rigors of the British Invasion, the Zombies failed to find the steady stream of success that the Big Three eventually did.

Of all the bands that enjoyed promising starts yet failed to maintain the momentum of the British Invasion’s most successful acts, the Dave Clark Five, who also went by the DC5, were

¹⁰⁷ Schaffner, 289.

¹⁰⁸ Rolling Stone, “500 Greatest Albums of All Time,” (accessed July 2, 2018).

¹⁰⁹ Bronson, chap. The Zombies Resurrected, Kindle.

arguably the biggest. In the words of Elton John, these five musicians were one of the major acts that came out of Britain in the sixties.¹¹⁰ Consisting of Dave Clark on drums and vocals, Mike Smith on vocals and keyboard, Lenny Davidson on guitar, Rick Huxley on bass, and David Payton on saxophone, these five chaps that represented the Tottenham sound were at one point the biggest rivals to the Beatles. They rivalled the Beatles going toe-to-toe in America, but ultimately, vanished almost without a trace, allowing the Beatles to win the rivalry, and the Rolling Stones to emerge as the Fab Four's main rivals. For a group that had so much potential, but disappeared so abruptly, they were the perfect example of a British Invasion band that rode so high but could not keep up with the Beatles.

Early on, the Dave Clark Five were not aiming to be a success. They formed the band to help pay for Dave Clark's youth club soccer team's trip to Holland.¹¹¹ They penned a lot of their own music as well as Dave Clark handling the producing and managing.¹¹² They started to grow in popularity, around the time the Beatles shocked the south of England with their success. London needed to hit back, and the first group to do so was the Dave Clark Five.¹¹³ "Glad All Over," recorded in the fall of 1963, was the song that knocked The Beatles off the top of the British charts the following year.¹¹⁴ The Dave Clark Five, like the Beatles, made an appearance on the *Ed Sullivan Show*. But originally, when the show reached out to Clark, he turned them down, as he had no interest in going to America.¹¹⁵ The DC5 went on to make a record twelve

¹¹⁰ *The Dave Clark Five and Beyond: Glad All Over* (2014), TV Movie, directed by Dave Clark (2014). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfOlijx0tZU&t=34s> (accessed May 12, 2018).

¹¹¹ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

¹¹² MC Strong, "The Dave Clark Five Biography," *The Great Rock Bible*, <http://thegreatrockbible.com/portfolio-item/the-dave-clark-five-biography/> (accessed June 28, 2018).

¹¹³ Bill Harry, *The British Invasion: How The Beatles and Other UK Bands Conquered America* (Surrey, UK: Chrome Dreams, 2004), 61.

¹¹⁴ Harry, 62.

¹¹⁵ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

appearance on the *Ed Sullivan Show*.¹¹⁶ Like the Beatles (*The Chicago Tribune* called them a “Beatle-Like Group”), the DC5 were greeted by thousands of screaming teenage girls and needed 35 policemen to get them past.¹¹⁷

With the Dave Clark Five knocking the Beatles out of top spot in Britain, the rivalry between the DC5 and the Beatles escalated in the United States. A *Boston Globe* article title got straight to the point, calling the Dave Clark Five the “Beatles Toppers.”¹¹⁸ Yet Dave Clark, when talking about this supposed rivalry, suggested that there was none: “The American press pitted us against the Beatles, but there was no rivalry between us... the magazines made it up. The magazines in America made a war out of it.”¹¹⁹ Regardless if there was a rivalry or not, the DC5 were giving the Beatles a run for their money on both sides of the Atlantic.

Like the Beatles, the Dave Clark Five starred in a movie. Shortly after the Fab Four’s success in *A Hard Day’s Night*, the DC5 appeared in *Catch Us If You Can*, which was known as *Having A Wild Weekend* in the United States. Unlike *A Hard Day’s Night*, *Catch Us If You Can* did poorly at the box office. It received some good press, with Bosley Crowther of the *New York Times* calling it “Another fresh and fetching British film.”¹²⁰ But not all the reviews were so glowing. Harold Bronson found it pessimistic in tone, overly ambitious in its satire of consumerism and boring. In addition, he believes that it suffered from a lack of memorable songs unlike those of Lennon and McCartney.¹²¹ Margaret Harford of The *Los Angeles Times* suggested it was “Oddly dreary, too, for a teen-age romp.”¹²² Even Dave Clark thought that they

¹¹⁶ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

¹¹⁷ Chicago Tribune, “Visitors from British Isles: Beatle-Like Group Is Mobbed by Girls Chicago Tribune,” *Chicago Tribune*, Jun 7, 1964.

¹¹⁸ The Boston Globe, “Dave Clark Five, Beatles Toppers, Coming in June,” *Boston Globe*, May 16, 1964.

¹¹⁹ Barry Miles, *The British Invasion*, (New York: Sterling, 2009), 80.

¹²⁰ Bosley Crowther, “Neighborhood Houses Show ‘Wild Weekend.’” *New York Times*, Aug 19, 1965.

¹²¹ Bronson, The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

¹²² Margaret Harford, “A Tame ‘Wild Weekend,’” *Los Angeles Times*, Oct 22, 1965.

could do better. In a *Los Angeles Times Article*, Marilyn Caldwell noted that “The boys agreed there’s room for improvement. ‘We’ll do better in the next film,’ Dave commented.”¹²³

While incredibly popular, the group failed to evolve for a couple of reasons. To begin with, the saxophone, a prominent part of the Dave Clark Five, was mainly identified with the pre-Beatles era.¹²⁴ This suggests that even while they were having hit after hit, the failure to eventually change their style undermined them. More importantly, the Dave Clark Five failed to evolve as a group. They did not transition, like the Beatles did, into the age of psychedelia, and eventually, because they failed to change with the times, they were left behind, and their hits dried up in the age of psychedelia. This caused them to retreat home to Britain by 1967.¹²⁵ Also, while starting off strong with original compositions, they reverted to doing covers, where other bands, like the Beatles and the Rolling Stones, went the opposite direction. This impacted their record sales, as fans became aware that the Dave Clark Five were not putting out any original material.¹²⁶ The group officially disbanded August 1970.¹²⁷

The Dave Clark Five, as previously mentioned, had retreated to Britain in the latter half of the sixties, and thus, by the 1980s, their hits were unavailable in America for ten years.¹²⁸ Dave Clark refused to release the master copies of the songs, even with the transition to Compact Disc (CD) because he felt that keeping them off the market would raise demand for the songs.

¹²³ Marilyn Caldwell, “DC5 Keep on Rolling Along,” *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 29, 1965.

¹²⁴ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

¹²⁵ MC Strong, “The Dave Clark Five Biography,” (accessed June 28, 2018).

¹²⁶ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

¹²⁷ Harry, 63.

¹²⁸ The lack of playtime also extended into my childhood (late 90s early 2000s) as well. I honestly cannot say I remember the Dave Clark Five. I grew up on the British Invasion, hearing all these fantastic songs from so many different groups. Yet I do not recall The Dave Clark Five. After hearing their hits again, a part of me feels like I may have heard them on the radio at one point, but by no means did they receive a lot of airtime on the local radio station, despite “Glad All Over” being the hit that knocked The Beatles off their pedestal. I think I can honestly say that The Hollies’ “Bus Stop” received more play than “Glad All Over.”

Bronson, as the owner of Rhino Records, wrote Clark for five years expressing interest in releasing the catalogue of songs, only to eventually receive a letter from Clark saying he was not interested. This backfired, the hits lost their value, and since they were not available, more and more oldies radio stations did not play them. They also received no play in other forms of media.¹²⁹ This caused the Dave Clark Five to fade from popular memory, causing them to only be remembered in the twenty-minute class discussion on the Beatles' first rivals. Thankfully, with today's music streaming services such as Spotify, their music is available again, but with being out of memory for so long, unless their parents have fond memories of the Dave Clark Five, the chances of them being heard by today's youth through normal means is almost zero.

In conclusion, each band discussed in this chapter had their moment in the sun. Each of these groups enjoyed a top hit and, in some instances, even several hits, on the billboard charts; and, in the case of Gerry and the Pacemakers and the Dave Clark Five, these less successful acts of the British Invasion had their own movies. Despite these triumphs, when delving into the histories of these bands in-depth, it becomes clear that a few hits on the charts is not enough to sustain success. Whether it be because they did not write original material, or had lackluster managers and lots of personnel turnover, or did not evolve with the times, they all fell behind the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and eventually the Who. That said, these bands experienced their own difficulties and while the Beatles arrived in America with fans waiting, they still needed to continually achieve and maintain success to be remembered in the United States.

¹²⁹ Bronson, chap. The History of The Dave Clark Five, Kindle.

CHAPTER 2

THE BEATLES

When watching footage of the Beatles performing live during their tours, or in the opening scene of their hit 1964 movie *A Hard Day's Night*, the one thing that is consistent is the sheer number of teenage fans, of whom many were girls, surrounding them and screaming. At an after-show party in Washington DC on February 11, 1964, John Lennon told an interviewer that the American public are “The wildest” and that their show that night was “Marvellous, ridiculous. Almost eight thousand people all shouting at once and we tried to shout louder than them with microphones and we still couldn’t beat them.”¹³⁰ The footage of young women screaming, cheering and fainting, and the countless stories of fans ending up in the hospital is unprecedented and all of this was caused by four mop-top individuals from Liverpool: the Beatles.

Consisting of John Lennon on guitar, Paul McCartney on bass, George Harrison on guitar, and Ringo Starr on drums, with all four on vocal duties at various points, the Beatles were the pinnacle of the first wave British Invasion in terms of success in America, but this did not come about by magic. Throughout the sixties, specifically when Beatlemania started in early 1964 until the end of the decade, there were several contributing factors that allowed them to not only find traction in the United States, but also maintain their popularity throughout their entire existence, and beyond. Such factors included the development of Lennon and McCartney as songwriters, their use of television and film, their evolution and musical adaptation as the decade

¹³⁰ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years* (2016), online video, directed by Ron Howard (2016). <https://www.watchonline.red/the-beatles-eight-days-a-week-the-touring-years-2016-watch-online/>.

progressed, their influential manager Brian Epstein, numerous era-defining hits, and their staying power both during and after their existence as a group. This chapter will aim to tell the story of the Beatles, all while highlighting these key points and how they contributed to the band's remarkable ability to strike a cord with the American public.

The birth of The Beatles dated back to 1957.¹³¹ On 6 July 1957, the group started to form with Paul McCartney meeting John Lennon at the St. Peter's Parish Church garden fête.¹³² McCartney would join Lennon's band, the Quarrymen. Guitarist George Harrison, the youngest of the three, would be the next to join the Quarrymen early in 1958. Lennon would talk his friend Stu Sutcliffe into joining in 1960 after the other members of The Quarrymen left. Pete Best would join the group the same year as the drummer, and the group was complete. Eventually, after several name changes, they started billing themselves as the Beatles, inspired by Buddy Holly and the Crickets. The next stop in the Beatles' development and formation was Hamburg, Germany.¹³³

Hamburg, in the eyes of many who have written on the Beatles, was key in their development as a group, but since these events fall outside of the focus and time frame of this thesis, they will only be briefly mentioned. On their multiple excursions to Hamburg from 1960-1962, the Beatles began to grow as a band because they were subjected to long days, and the necessity to create new material. As McCartney recalled, "We used to play eight hours a night,

¹³¹ As with all the events discussed before the time frame of this chapter, Jonathan Gould's *Can't Buy Me Love: The Beatles, Britain, and America* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2007) provides an excellent, in-depth look at all these events from the very beginning, through the Hamburg years, and throughout the Beatles' whole career.

¹³² Jim O'Donnell, "'The Afternoon Hours' from *The Day John Met Paul*," in *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, ed. June Skinner Sawyers (New York: Penguin, 2006), 5.

¹³³ Nicholas Schaffner, *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 14-5.

and as you didn't like to repeat tunes, you had to [come up with] eight hours of material."¹³⁴ In July 1961, they lost Stu Sutcliffe, who decided to stay in Hamburg with Astrid Kirchherr to focus on his painting. He unfortunately would pass away in April 1962. In Hamburg, the Beatles would eventually adapt the "Beatle cut," an iconic haircut that would prove a massive marketing tool later.¹³⁵ Hamburg was incredibly crucial for the Beatles, but equally vital was when they met Brian Epstein.

The Beatles would eventually need a manager, and Brian Epstein would fill that void. He first heard of the group through the magazine *Mersey Beat*, and went to see them at one of their lunch gigs at the Cavern in November 1961. He recalled that he "had never seen anything like the Beatles on *any* stage."¹³⁶ Epstein went to see the Beatles a couple more times and eventually expressed interest in becoming their manager. In a show of good faith, he offered to help the group attain their goal get a record contract in Britain.¹³⁷ Using his connections as operator of North End Music Stores (NEMS), he reached out to the two major British record companies, Decca and Electrical & Musical Industries (EMI) and passed on the Beatles' materials to their recording managers. EMI showed no interest, but Decca sent someone to see the Beatles and offered them a recording test on 1 January 1962. It did not go well, and Decca passed on them. Epstein impressed the Beatles with his ability to obtain an audition, so he became their manager that same month.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ Schaffner, 15.

¹³⁵ Schaffner, 16.

¹³⁶ Jonathan Gould, *Can't Buy Me Love: The Beatles, Britain, and America* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2007), 115.

¹³⁷ Gould, 115.

¹³⁸ Gould, 117-8.

Epstein was integral in creating the image of the Beatles in their early years. When he discovered the Beatles at the Cavern Club, they were dressed in leather, smoking on stage, and generally looked unkempt. Epstein wanted to clean them up, and the Beatles went along with it. Epstein slowly transitioned them into the group that became instantly recognizable. He started by eliminating the leather jackets, then the jeans, and then eventually putting the Beatles into their trademark suits. Epstein even created a list of what the Beatles must not do, such as swearing on stage and joking with the girls.¹³⁹ Despite the growing professionalism, Epstein and the Beatles needed a recording contract, and they were running out of options.

The Beatles' saving grace was Parlophone Records and its head, George Martin. After meeting with many other recording managers with no luck, Epstein met with Martin, who himself was not overly impressed, but he heard "an unusual quality of sound," and offered the Beatles a recording test."¹⁴⁰ Martin saw enough to offer the group a contract, but he insisted that they use a session drummer, as he was not impressed with Pete Best. When a contract was officially offered, it was a typical deal that favored the record company, but Epstein and the Beatles were turned down everywhere else, so they jumped at the chance. Reminded that Martin wanted to use a session drummer, Harrison, McCartney, and Lennon brought in an old acquaintance, Ringo Starr to replace Pete Best.¹⁴¹

McCartney recalled the time Starr first played with the group: "I still remember that moment; the first time Ringo played with us... and it was an 'oh my god' moment and we were looking and we're all looking at each other like 'yeah this is it.'"¹⁴² Harrison also remembered

¹³⁹ John McMillian, *Beatles vs. Stones* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2013), 29.

¹⁴⁰ Gould, 120.

¹⁴¹ Gould, 122-4.

¹⁴² *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

when Starr joined the group, and how the band started to improve and have a more professional sound: “Once we got Ringo, we started to do better, and sort of do it professionally.”¹⁴³ Starr had a profound impact on the group, and like the Who finding Keith Moon (discussed in the Who chapter) Ringo was that final integral piece of the band that rounded out the Beatles.

From that point on, the Beatles started to grow momentum and look forward. Their first single “Love Me Do” released in October 1962 appeared on the charts near the end of the month.¹⁴⁴ Their next single “Please Please Me” fared just as well upon its release in January 1963, climbing the charts faster than “Love Me Do.”¹⁴⁵ They continued to gain popularity not just in their hometown of Liverpool, but throughout Britain, starting to be heard more frequently on the British Broadcasting Corporation’s (BBC) radio waves.¹⁴⁶ Their third single, “From Me to You,” topped the charts even though it was released two weeks after the Beatles’ first album, which also topped the charts.¹⁴⁷ In July 1963, the Beatles went back to the studio to record their fourth single, “She Loves You.” Released in late August of 1963, it quickly became the fastest selling record in Britain.¹⁴⁸

The Beatles triggered Beatlemania in Britain, and while the word was mainly associated with America’s obsession with them, it was the British media that coined it in 1963.¹⁴⁹ First used by the *Daily Mail* on 21 October 1963, Beatlemania became commonplace shortly afterwards. By the end of the year, the American press had taken notice of Beatlemania.¹⁵⁰ One of the first

¹⁴³ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁴⁴ Gould, 136-7.

¹⁴⁵ Gould, 142.

¹⁴⁶ Gould, 151.

¹⁴⁷ Gould, 150.

¹⁴⁸ Gould, 157-9.

¹⁴⁹ André Millard, *Beatlemania: Technology, Business, and Teen Culture in Cold War America* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012), 29.

¹⁵⁰ Millard, 32.

American articles referencing the phenomenon appeared in *Newsweek*. Entitled “Beatlemania,” it offered a brief, yet memorable, description of the Beatles: “They wear sheep-dog bangs, collarless jackets, and drainpipe trousers. One plays left-handed guitar, two have falsetto voices, one wishes he were a businessman, and all four sing... and sing... and sing.”¹⁵¹ Beatlemania was slowly making its way to the United States. In the United States, D.J. Dick Biondi played their music for the first time on the radio in Chicago in early February 1963. By the start of the following year, in the weeks prior to their arrival in America, Murray the K, a D.J. in New York played the Beatles on his radio show as well.¹⁵² Martin Goldsmith pinpointed the time when most Americans would have started to pay attention to the Beatles, first hearing them in December 1963 and into January 1964.¹⁵³ With this anticipation and publicity building, Beatlemania exploded on 7 February 1964, when the group landed at John F. Kennedy (JFK) Airport in New York, officially marking the “invasion” of the Beatles in America.

Landing at JFK, Epstein understood the significance of this event as a turning point: “We knew that America would make us or break us as world stars... In fact, she made us.”¹⁵⁴ Conquering the United States was a massive step for the Beatles; they had managed to succeed in Britain, and America was the next step. It also opened the doors for other British bands to follow, and as discussed in the previous chapter, and the chapters to follow, many did. Their landing in JFK was covered in-depth by the American media. The *Boston Globe* article published on 8

¹⁵¹ *Newsweek*, “Beatlemania,” November 18, 1963 in *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, ed. June Skinner Sawyers (New York: Penguin, 2006), 43.

¹⁵² Barry Miles, *The British Invasion* (New York: Sterling, 2009), 55-6.

¹⁵³ Martin Goldsmith, “The Beatles come to America,” in *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, ed. June Skinner Sawyers (New York: Penguin, 2006), 48.

¹⁵⁴ Brian Epstein, *A Cellar Full of Noise* (New York: Pocket Books, 1967), 60. As cited in André Millard, *Beatlemania: Technology, Business, and Teen Culture in Cold War America* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2012), 21.

February 1964, entitled “Beatles Conquer New York” recounts the day they landed in the United States, from early in the morning to after they landed:

By 6:30 a.m. Friday, half the kids in the Metropolitan area were already up with their transistors plugged in their skulls... Actually, two girls from Brooklyn, Helen Kay, 14, and her sister Regina, 15, were already out at Kennedy Airport’s International terminal at 4:30 a.m. Because they couldn’t sleep for thinking about the Beatles’ coming... By 11 a.m., about 2500 kids had finished school and were in the terminal lobby screaming inside the little corrals the police managed to edge them into... By 1 P.M., there were about 4000 kids at Idlewild, most of them out on the observation deck above Gate 29. At 1:20 P.M. the Beatles’ jet arrived from London, and B-Day was to prove one thing:... as long as there is a disk jockey or a press agent alive, the United States need rank second to no country in teen-age manias.

The Beatles had now officially invaded, and B-Day, or Beatles’ Day, signified the “invasion” aspect, playing off the allied D-Day invasion of Normandy in World War II. Their landing in America was well covered, but it would be their next major public appearance that would televise them across the United States to approximately 74 million people who tuned in.¹⁵⁵

“Ladies and gentlemen, the Beatles!” As soon as Ed Sullivan finished introducing them on their first appearance on the 9 February 1964 episode of his variety show, the screams from the mainly female teenage crowd permeated the studio. Cheering remained loud and consistent through “I Want to Hold Your Hand,” and at times, made the song difficult to hear.¹⁵⁶ In *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*, Malcolm Gladwell noted, “The society is dominated by teenagers.”¹⁵⁷ This statement bordered on the obvious, but it is still an important observation. In the early days of the Beatles’ success, it was teenagers who liked the group the

¹⁵⁵ Gould, 3.

¹⁵⁶ The Beatles, “The Beatles on the Ed Sullivan Show, 9th February 1964, performing ‘I Want To Hold Your Hand,’” Filmed February 1964. YouTube video, 0:56. Posted February 2014.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=It3Cctk6BRs>.

¹⁵⁷ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

most; which is seen in their arrival at JFK and first appearance on the *Ed Sullivan Show*.¹⁵⁸ It seemed Beatlemania was here to stay; for how long, no one knew but Larry Kane, a reporter who travelled with the Beatles, asked the biggest question of Beatlemania in 1964: “when is the bubble gonna burst?”¹⁵⁹

Throughout the remainder of 1964, the bubble held firm. Before the first live taping of *The Ed Sullivan Show* on 9 February 1964, the Beatles recorded a taped appearance that would air two weeks later on the 23 February 1964.¹⁶⁰ The rest of the Beatles’ first tour in America consisted of their first live concert in America in Washington, D.C., two concerts at New York’s Carnegie Hall, another live appearance on *The Ed Sullivan Show*, this time from Miami, Florida, then several days of relaxation in Miami before they returned to Britain.¹⁶¹

The Beatles would return for their first American tour from August to September 1964, and America was still as much in love with them as before. Their landing in San Francisco on 18 August 1964 had outdone their arrival in New York. Nine thousand screaming fans were there to greet them.¹⁶² Their first live concert in San Francisco attracted 17,130 people, and the screaming was so loud that the Beatles could not hear themselves play.¹⁶³ This became a common occurrence throughout all the Beatles concerts. *The San Francisco Chronicle* reported on the concert, echoing similar sentiments: “Although it was publicized as music, all that was

¹⁵⁸ Any number of Google searches will show the reader the sheer number of screaming teenage fans the Beatles had. To give the reader a taste, here is some footage of their arrival in America on 7 February 1964: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aeswlOJEdQg>.

¹⁵⁹ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁶⁰ Miles, 74.

¹⁶¹ Gould, 4-6.

¹⁶² Miles, 102.

¹⁶³ Miles, 105.

heard and seen of the Mersey Sound was something like a jet engine shrieking through a summer lightning storm because of the yelling fans.”¹⁶⁴

The scenes wherever the Beatles played were chaotic. The Beatles needed to be protected to avoid being mobbed by thousands of screaming teenagers. This tour was a steep learning curve: they dealt with hysterical fans in Britain, but the sheer craziness that the thousands of American teenagers brought to each concert overwhelmed the police forces protecting the Beatles. So much so that the police in Las Vegas had to wield billy clubs to subdue the crowds. Other places had to adopt on-the-fly tactics, such as in Seattle where the police recruited navy volunteers to help form a line to protect the Beatles. No matter where they were, speed was of the essence for the Beatles to escape.¹⁶⁵ In Cleveland, the audience pushed the police line too close to the stage the show had to be stopped after only 10 minutes, something the Beatles had never had to do before.¹⁶⁶ From the early tours, it was clear America loved the Beatles.

Another important thread running through the 1964 tour was the Beatles and politics. As was briefly mentioned in the intro, The United States had reached the height of the Civil Rights movement in 1964, where African-Americans waging nonviolent protests for equal rights. There was heavy resistance in the south, and Larry Kane was informed that the concert at the Gator Bowl in Jacksonville, Florida, was segregated. In a press conference a few days before the Friday concert, Kane raised the question to them if they would play to a segregated crowd.¹⁶⁷ In response, Paul said: “We don’t like it if there’s any segregation or anything because it just seems mad to me... There was never any segregation in concerts in England and in fact if there was we

¹⁶⁴ Miles, 105.

¹⁶⁵ Miles, 106.

¹⁶⁶ Miles, 112.

¹⁶⁷ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

wouldn't play 'em you know."¹⁶⁸ Kane echoed the Beatles' sentiments, recalling that "All of them, by the way, were very emphatic about Jacksonville. They said if there was going to be segregation of any kind, we're not going."¹⁶⁹ Consequentially, when the Beatles took the stage at the Gator Bowl concert on 11 September 1964, there was no segregation.¹⁷⁰ The Beatles did not speak on political issues that much prior to this, but their outspokenness on social and political issues in the United States would become more prevalent as the sixties progress.

On top of their American tour in August, the first part of the month saw the American release of the first Beatles' first feature film *A Hard Day's Night*. The movie was an exaggerated "day in the life," a fictionalized documentary of the group's rise to fame.¹⁷¹ The reviews for the movie were incredibly positive, creating massive acclaim. Mae Tinee of the *Chicago Tribune* enjoyed the film, noting how the Beatles seemed "completely natural and unactorish" and that the "action is chaos from start to finish and really pretty good fun."¹⁷² Bill Rice of *The Washington Post, Times Herald* thought it was a "fine, funny film" and that "The most important achievement of 'A Hard Days' Night is that popular entertainers, in this case the Beatles, wisely playing themselves, have been brought to the screen in a manner satisfying to their fans yet in a format that allowed a talented technical crew to make a film of real merit."¹⁷³ The film did so well that a profit was ensured while filming was still ongoing, due to the album accompanying the film, also entitled *A Hard Days' Night*, having enough sales to surpass the 200,000 pound budget the film had. This played into demand for the film, as America demanding 700 prints to

¹⁶⁸ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁶⁹ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁷⁰ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁷¹ Stephen Glynn, *The British Pop Music Film: The Beatles and Beyond* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 83.

¹⁷² Mae Tinee, "Beatle Film Chaotic, but Is Good Fun: 'A Hard Day's Night,'" *Chicago Tribune*, Sep 3, 1964.

¹⁷³ Bill Rice, "The Beatles Pull a Fast One; It's a Fine, Funny Film," *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Aug 14, 1964.

show in theatres.¹⁷⁴ Needless to say, Beatlemania was still rampant in the United States, and *A Hard Day's Night* pushed it further along.

Musically, the band was riding the pop high, and not just with *A Hard Day's Night*. Capitol Records, the American counterpart to EMI and Parlophone, finally started releasing Beatles' LPs in the United States with *Meet the Beatles!* early in 1964. It reached number one on *Billboard* in just three weeks and stayed there for eleven weeks.¹⁷⁵ Before Capitol, Vee Jay Records, an independent Chicago-based record company released the first Beatles' albums in the United States.¹⁷⁶ In April, the Beatles held the top five spots on *Billboard* with (in order of ranking) "Can't Buy Me Love," "Twist and Shout," "She Loves You," "I Want to Hold Your Hand," and "Please Please Me."¹⁷⁷ With the Beatles' music, Terence O'Grady points out that while musically superior to their contemporaries, the lyrics were only slightly better.¹⁷⁸ This is an important note, as all the music up to this point the Beatles composed is pop music. The Beatles were a pop band in their early years of success, and as they continue through the years, their music starts to evolve. 1965 would still see the Beatles ride the successful pop wave.

The Beatles continued to ride their success into 1965 as the hit pop sensation, and they also tried to jump on the success of their first movie by making a second one, *Help!*. In the movie, three members of a religious cult are trying to get their sacred ring back from Ringo, sending the Beatles on a wacky adventure.¹⁷⁹ Unlike the across the board acclaim of *A Hard Day's Night*, reviews for *Help!* were much more divided. Leonard Stone of *The Hartford*

¹⁷⁴ Glynn, 84-5.

¹⁷⁵ Terence J. O'Grady, *The Beatles: A Musical Evolution* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983), 44.

¹⁷⁶ Gould, 195.

¹⁷⁷ O'Grady, 46-7.

¹⁷⁸ O'Grady, 66.

¹⁷⁹ Bosley Crowther, "Screen: Beatles Star in 'Help!', Film of the Absurd," *New York Times*, Aug 24, 1965.

Courant said that *Help!* was “not the good visual comedy that ‘A Hard Day’s Night’ was, thus it was not nearly as funny.”¹⁸⁰ Crowther calls it “utterly absurd” in comparison to the Beatles’ previous film, and says that there is “... no evident line of theme and substance,” concluding that the Beatles “just become awfully redundant and—dare I say it?—dull.”¹⁸¹ Still, *Help!* fared well at the box office in America, and helped to further promote The Beatles and boost record sales.

They had another tour of the United States, which was just as chaotic as their 1964 tour. This included the first ever stadium tour by a pop group, as Epstein and the Beatles needed to play in stadiums due to the sheer number of people that wanted to see them. The numbers at all these concerts were enormous for the time: Portland- 20 000, San Francisco- 29,000, Minneapolis- 25,000, Chicago- 31,000, Atlanta- 34,000, and combined two shows at the Hollywood Bowl- 35 000. Yet all these numbers would be usurped by the most well-known concert of the Beatles 1965 tour; their concert at Shea Stadium on 15 August.

This concert was so big that a video documenting it was released the following year. *The Beatles at Shea Stadium* captures the lead-up to the concert, the concert itself, and the sheer amount of people there; 56,500. In the first three minutes, one gets a sense of the atmosphere in the stadium. The shrieks of the teenage girls are ear-piercingly consistent throughout the concert scenes, but when Ed Sullivan introduced the Beatles, the audience screamed even louder.¹⁸² The music is heard on the video, and Vox made special speakers for the venue, but Harrison noted, “it wasn’t enough.”¹⁸³ Ringo agreed, and when looking back at the concert, he simply could not hear themselves play: “I could not hear anything. I’d be watching John’s ass, Paul’s ass, his

¹⁸⁰ Leonard W. Stone, “Beatles Need ‘Help,’” *The Hartford Courant*, Aug 29, 1965.

¹⁸¹ Crowther, “Screen: Beatles Star in ‘Help!’, Film of the Absurd.”

¹⁸² *The Beatles at Shea Stadium* (1966), Online Video, directed by Bob Precht (1966). <https://vimeo.com/67634284>.

¹⁸³ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

foot's tapping, his head's nodding, to see where we were in the song."¹⁸⁴ The sheer number alone is impressive enough, as it was the biggest audience at a Beatles concert to that point. To get to the venue the Beatles had to be helicoptered in.¹⁸⁵ The exhausting pace of touring was starting to take a toll, and it was after the 1965 tour, Harrison was starting to be fed up with touring. Neil Aspinall, the Beatles' tour manager, recalls Harrison asking Epstein if touring like this was going to be an annual event.¹⁸⁶

Progressing into the later months of 1965, the Beatles started to change. The change was subtle, but the group was starting to evolve into not just a pop group who sang about romance, but into musicians creating art with more complex tones and themes. This change started on their last LP of the year, *Rubber Soul*. Jonathan Gould outlines the themes of the album perfectly: the cover suggests that the Beatles' lives and souls had been "bent out of shape by the stresses and strains of success," and is well illustrated by the rubbery feeling the cover artwork suggests.¹⁸⁷ Also, their hair is long, not the typical Beatle-style haircut they had worn through their early years. The music also reflected the idea that the Beatles were growing, and once again Gould words it perfectly: "It is the Beatles as before, but twisted on their axis, looking in different directions, arrayed against a background of darker, more somber hues."¹⁸⁸

With *Rubber Soul*, it is important to note that there were song differences between the American and British releases, which led to a difference in sound and thus suggested a different musical direction for the Beatles.¹⁸⁹ The American version had "I've Just Seen a Face" leading

¹⁸⁴ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁸⁵ *The Beatles at Shea Stadium*.

¹⁸⁶ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

¹⁸⁷ Gould, 295.

¹⁸⁸ Gould, 295.

¹⁸⁹ Gould, 296.

off side A, and side B started with “It’s Only Love,” two songs not on the British version. The British release started with “Drive My Car” on side A and “What Goes On” starts side B.¹⁹⁰ Yet the album still sold well in the United States, selling one million copies in its first week and having an impact on the folk scene, encouraging many to go pop.¹⁹¹ McCartney hoped as well that *Rubber Soul* would be a way to gradually introduce fans to more challenging work rather than releasing an album that was a radical departure compared to their previous work: “If we did a whole album of way out things we’d be doing what the people who do electronic music do, which is to go too far out, too suddenly, and no-one stays with them... What we try to do is—*Rubber Soul* was a bit more towards that, the next album will be a bit more, and the one after that should be a bit more. If people stay with us, it’s great.”¹⁹² The Beatles were on a different path, and 1966 cleared that path for them with what became their final tour as a group.

The year 1966 proved important transitionally for the Beatles, and Beatles’ historian Steve Turner does a fantastic in-depth exploration on this pivotal year for the group in his work *Beatles ’66: The Revolutionary Year*.¹⁹³ The year started off quietly for the Beatles, as they finally had some vacation time, but already one could see significant changes in the group: they were engaged in their own individual interests, partaking in their own hobbies, not spending every waking moment together. Harrison had taken an interest in Indian music, McCartney became interested in art, and in general everyone but Paul were starting to settle down and have families.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁰ Gould, 296-7; 302.

¹⁹¹ Gould, 296.

¹⁹² Steve Turner, *Beatles ’66: The Revolutionary Year* (n.p.: Ecco publishing, 2016), chap. February. Kindle.

¹⁹³ Turner will play a key part in helping describe 1966 in this part of the chapter, but if the reader wants a much more in-depth look, they should certainly read Turner’s marvelous work.

¹⁹⁴ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years*.

During the early weeks of 1966, the Beatles were interviewed by journalist and close newspaper ally Maureen Cleave. Feeling that each Beatle had gone through massive changes, the goal of these interviews was to show who the Beatles were becoming. The series was called “How a Beatle Lives,” and would present them as four individuals (not as the “four-headed monster as Rolling Stones singer Mick Jagger had called them) developing their own interests.¹⁹⁵ While each Beatle had interesting discussions with Cleave, it was Lennon’s interview that would spark major backlash in the United States. In the interview, Lennon discusses the topic of religion, and makes a comparison (a very apt one) to the Beatles’ popularity. Cleave wrote:

Experience has sown few seeds of doubt in him: not that his mind is closed, but it’s closed round whatever he believes at the time. ‘Christianity will go,’ he said, ‘It will vanish and shrink. I needn’t argue about that; I’m right and I will be proved right. We’re more popular than Jesus now; I don’t know which will go first—rock ‘n’ roll or Christianity. Jesus was all right but his disciples were thick and ordinary. It’s them twisting that ruins it for me.’ He is reading extensively about religion.¹⁹⁶

Taken out of context, it angered Americans, especially in the southern United States, where Christianity was strong. It threatened their record sales in America as well as their lives and contributed to the end of their touring career.¹⁹⁷

All the records suggest, and Lennon later expressed similar sentiments, the he was discussing religion in the context of Britain, rather than America, as there is no evidence to suggest he attended church anywhere else other than Woolton, specifically the Church of England.¹⁹⁸ Also, as Turner points out, Lennon may have been suggesting that rock ‘n’ roll was

¹⁹⁵ Turner, chap. February. Kindle.

¹⁹⁶ Maureen Cleave, “‘How Does a Beatle Live?’ John Lennon Lives Like This,” *London Evening Standard*, March 4, 1966, in *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, ed. June Skinner Sawyers (New York: Penguin, 2006), 88.

¹⁹⁷ Turner, chap. February. Kindle.

¹⁹⁸ Turner, chap. February. Kindle.

fulfilling a religious role in people's lives.¹⁹⁹ Whatever Lennon may have meant by what he said, Americans saw it as a shot against religion, and the backlash was incredibly prevalent. As one *Los Angeles Times* article reported: "Dozens of rock 'n' roll disc jockeys across the country have banned the Beatles from their turntables because of Beatle John Lennon's comment in a teen-age magazine that the foursome is now 'more popular than Jesus.' The Beatle boycott was begun last week in Birmingham, Ala., by two-disc jockeys angered by quotes attributed to Lennon in a *Datebook* magazine article."²⁰⁰

The pressure was so bad on Lennon that he apologized twice: once at an 11 August interview and once the day after. In response to a reporter saying teens were echoing Lennon's remarks about religion, he said "Well, originally I was pointing out that fact in reference to England—that we meant more to kids than Jesus did, or religion, at that time. I wasn't knocking it or putting it down, I was just saying it as a fact... I just said what I said and it was wrong, or was taken wrong." When asked if he was sorry he said it, Lennon said "I am. Yes, you know, even though I never meant what people think I meant by it. I'm still sorry I opened my mouth."²⁰¹

With their American tour coming up, Lennon asked if it would be cancelled due to his comment. "No, not at this stage," he replied.²⁰² Yet in addition to Beatles' music being banned on some radio stations, the group also received death threats, and there were reports of record burnings.²⁰³ The tour would proceed as planned, but no one at the time knew this would be their last. The American leg of the 1966 tour was hectic to say the least. In Cleveland, the audience

¹⁹⁹ Turner, chap. February. Kindle.

²⁰⁰ United Press International, "Beatle Quote Brings a Hard Day's Night," *Los Angeles Times*, Aug 5, 1966.

²⁰¹ June Skinner Sawyers, ed., *Read The Beatles: Classic and New Writings on The Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 85-6.

²⁰² United Press International, "Beatle Quote Brings a Hard Day's Night," *Los Angeles Times*, Aug 5, 1966.

²⁰³ Sawyers, ed., 86.

rushed the stage because the sound quality was terrible. In Memphis, there was a bomb scare that delayed the concert. The concert in St. Louis was outdoors, and the weather was atrocious forcing the Beatles to perform in pouring rain. The group, especially Harrison, had become fed up with touring.²⁰⁴

Unbeknownst to the audience at Candlestick Park on 29 August 1966, they would be the last to witness the Beatles live in concert. The park's capacity was 42,500, but only 25,000 tickets were sold, leaving sections glaringly open.²⁰⁵ The Beatles knew this was their last concert, as Ringo noted: "There was a big talk at Candlestick Park that this had got to end. At that San Francisco gig it seemed that this could possibly be the last time, but I never felt 100% certain till we got back to London. John wanted to give up more than the others. He said that he'd had enough." Also, McCartney and Lennon brought a camera with them on stage to record the crowd and themselves at arm's length to capture the moment.²⁰⁶ When the concert was finished, the Beatles left in an armored car straight to the airport. They left for Los Angeles, and on the plane, Harrison exclaimed "That's it, then. I'm not a Beatle anymore."²⁰⁷

During the tour, The Beatles started to take a stand on matters of American foreign policy, thrusting them even more into the spotlight. In regards to Vietnam: "The usually light-hearted Beatles press conference took a serious tone yesterday as the mop-haired singers fielded questions on the war in Vietnam, bigotry in the United States and the comments by one member of their quartet on Christianity... 'We don't like war, war is wrong,' each said several times in a

²⁰⁴ *The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years.*

²⁰⁵ The Beatles Bible, "Live: Candlestick Park, San Francisco: The Beatles' final concert," *The Beatles Bible*, <https://www.beatlesbible.com/1966/08/29/candlestick-park-san-francisco-final-concert/> (accessed August 3, 2018), page 1 of 2.

²⁰⁶ The Beatles Bible, "Live: Candlestick Park, San Francisco: The Beatles' final concert." Page 1 of 2.

²⁰⁷ The Beatles Bible, "Live: Candlestick Park, San Francisco: The Beatles' final concert." Page 2 of 2.

low, nearly inaudible voice when asked to comment on any aspect of the Vietnamese conflict.”²⁰⁸ The willingness of band members to discuss and criticize American policy, albeit mildly, put them on the side of protesters.²⁰⁹ This also shows another step in the evolution of the group, as they were becoming more vocal about social issues; it started with the segregation at the Gator bowl, and the next step was Vietnam.

The bubble of Beatlemania burst at the end of 1966, and the newspapers made note of it. One *Los Angeles Times* article noted that “The fabulous foursome—John Lennon, Paul McCartney, George Harrison and Ringo Starr—have simply let it be known that they are evolving in different directions. They will reunite for the occasional recording and there may even be a third film, but the grinding personal appearance tours which are the basis of pop image-building are out. Beatlemania is at an end.”²¹⁰ Another article from *The Chicago Defender* cited rumors the band was breaking up: “Beat music is on its way out and the mop-topped foursome who made it internationally ‘in’ are leading the retreat. The Beatles are believed to be breaking up as a pop group, though their spokesmen denies it.”²¹¹ Certainly, the Beatles did not break up, but the initial pop boom and subsequently Beatlemania was dying. The article notes that Eric Burdon had split with the Animals, The Rolling Stones’ new single only reached as high as number four, beaten out by American groups like the Four Tops and the Beach Boys.²¹² The early feel-good style British beat of the British Invasion was dying out in the United States, but the Beatles

²⁰⁸ Robert E. Dallos, “Beatles Strike Serious Note in Press Talk: Group Opposes the War in Vietnam as Being ‘Wrong,’” *New York Times*, Aug 23, 1966.

²⁰⁹ Turner, chap. February. Kindle.

²¹⁰ Los Angeles Times, “Too Potent To Forget: Beatlemania Ending; Echo Lingers On,” *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 19, 1966.

²¹¹ Joan Deppa, “The Rise And Fall Of The Beatles: The Pop Boom Poops Slowly,” *The Chicago Defender (National edition)*, Nov 26, 1966.

²¹² Deppa, “The Rise And Fall Of The Beatles.”

would be one of the groups to keep the British Invasion alive, making pop music art, and creating the most iconic album ever.

The Beatles continued to mature even more as a band with the August release of their innovative album, *Revolver*, an even more experimental and psychedelic follow-up to *Rubber Soul*. With *Revolver*, the Beatles showed further growth and experimentation in their music. Since they stopped touring, they were able to essentially lock themselves in the studio for six months to create music and experiment.²¹³ Their creativeness and evolution would reach new heights in 1967 with their release of *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band*. *Rolling Stone* Magazine voted it number one on their 500 greatest albums of all time.²¹⁴ Yet when the album released in June 1967, the reviews were mixed, mostly positive, but not unanimous. Richard Goldstein of *The New York Times* had the most scathing review calling the album “an undistinguished collection of work.”²¹⁵ There was an immense backlash on the poor reviews the album received. *The Village Voice* called *Sgt. Pepper* “the most ambitious and most successful record album ever issued.”²¹⁶ Writer Langdon Winner said it was the most amazing album he has ever heard.²¹⁷

Despite Goldstein’s harsh take on *Sgt. Pepper*, this album is the pinnacle of the Beatles’ evolution as a group and them leaving their pop roots behind, literally. The album is a concept album and from the cover to the music, every bit of the album signifies the pinnacle of the Beatles’ growth. The cover best represents this concept, as the Beatles adopted alternate personas

²¹³ George Martin with William Pearson, *With a Little Help From My Friends: The Making of Sgt. Pepper* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1994), 2.

²¹⁴ Rolling Stone, “500 Greatest Albums of All Time,” *Rolling Stone* (May 31, 2012) <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-lists/500-greatest-albums-of-all-time-156826/the-zombies-odessey-and-oracle-172848/>.

²¹⁵ Richard Goldstein, “Recordings: We Still Need the Beatles, but...,” *New York Times*, Jun 18, 1967.

²¹⁶ Sawyers, ed., 97.

²¹⁷ Martin, 154.

as the titular band. Looking at the cover, the Beatles are dressed in colorful outfits, all differing from one another, which is in stark contrast to the traditional look of uniformity. At the bottom of their feet, “the Beatles” are written in flowers. All around them are wax statues of famous people, including their original looking selves, further suggesting that the Beatles were a separate entity to their alter egos.²¹⁸

The album is also unique as it could not at the time be reproduced live, and when it released in 1967, there was nothing that compared with it.²¹⁹ Also, the American counterculture grew in 1967, and the summer of 1967 became known as the “summer of love.” The Beatles left their mark on the counterculture as the counterculture praised the Beatles. Post-*Rubber Soul*, they were credited with helping establish the emerging youth culture.²²⁰ As George Martin, producer of *Sgt. Pepper*, points out, the album captured the sixties in music: psychedelia, peace and love, and the anti-war movement among others.²²¹

Unfortunately, tragedy would strike the Beatles, as *The Washington Post*, *Times Herald* noted at the time: “Brian Epstein... has died... The 32-year-old millionaire was found dead in bed today [27 August 1967] at his home.”²²² Producer George Martin did not feel his death was a purposeful suicide, because while Epstein attempted suicide before, he had always made sure it failed.²²³ The death of Epstein signified the end of an era for the Beatles, as it was Epstein that helped them go from unknowns to one of the most well-known bands across the world.²²⁴ Also, this signified the beginning of the end for the Beatles as a group, as Lennon recalled: “After

²¹⁸ Martin, 115.

²¹⁹ Martin, 157.

²²⁰ McMillian, 154.

²²¹ Martin, 157.

²²² The Washington Post, Times Herald, “Beatles Manager Dies After 5 Years of Fame,” *The Washington Post*, *Times Herald*, August 28, 1967.

²²³ Martin, 164.

²²⁴ Martin, 164.

Brian died we all collapsed... That was the disintegration.”²²⁵ From this point onwards, the Beatles would increasingly grow apart from one another. The group needed to forge ahead after Epstein’s death however, and had Clive Epstein, Brian’s brother, running the finances. By 1969, they would replace him with Allen Klein, who at the time was also working with the Rolling Stones.²²⁶

The year rounded out with another movie and album from the Beatles: *Magical Mystery Tour*. This was the album that followed *Sgt. Pepper*, and after the praise that album received, the Beatles wanted it marketed as a film soundtrack.²²⁷ In Britain, EMI agreed, and released it as a double EP, which is somewhere in between a single and a full vinyl record. In the United States however, EPs were rare, so Capitol received permission to package it as a typical LP with music from the movie on one side and recent Beatles singles on the other.²²⁸ As for the television movie premiere, it premiered in color in Britain on 26 December 1967, but since color television was rare at that time, many people saw what was supposed to be a vividly colorful movie in black and white.²²⁹ Reviews for the movie were not good, as British critics ripped it apart. John Rowland of the *Express* fumed that he “cannot ever remember seeing such blatant rubbish.”²³⁰

After the massive success of *Sgt. Pepper*, the year could not have had a worse ending. In 1968, the next major Beatles album released. Simply called *The Beatles*, it became more commonly known as the *White Album* because of its plain white cover. In his review of the double LP album, which contained thirty songs on two records, Mike Jahn of *The New York*

²²⁵ Martin, 162.

²²⁶ Dave Lifton, “The Day the Beatles Hired Allen Klein as Their Manager,” *Ultimate Classic Rock*, <http://ultimateclassicrock.com/beatles-hire-allen-klein-as-manager/> (accessed August 4, 2018).

²²⁷ Gould, 452.

²²⁸ Gould, 452.

²²⁹ Gould, 454-5.

²³⁰ Gould, 455.

Times called many of the songs “corny” and “Not nearly as good as ‘Sgt. Pepper’s.’”²³¹ Another review in the Catholic monthly *Commonweal* by Michael Wood, an English professor at Columbia gave the album a much more cogent review, describing the *White Album* as “a survey of styles... It’s music by very talented people having a ball, and I’m not sure what else we have a right to ask for. Originality? We’re entitled to a rest from that.”²³² The album received uneven reviews, but it still was a huge commercial success reaching number one on the American music charts.²³³

In addition, the album signified that the group was continuing to splinter the song-writing powerhouse of Lennon-McCartney. Coming off a complete group effort with *Sgt. Pepper*, there was little collaboration between the members on the *White Album*. This had started well before in 1966, as most of the songs they collaborated on was because McCartney initiated the song and asked for Lennon’s involvement. The arrival of Yoko Ono contributed to their dissolution as a duo, as Lennon and Ono spent every waking moment together, making it impossible for McCartney to continue writing with John in the intense manner they were accustomed to.²³⁴

The deterioration of the Beatles continued into 1969, along with the release of their newest album *Abbey Road*. Robert Hilburn in his review of the album said, “Despite some weak selections, ‘Abbey Road’ is easily the best Beatles album since ‘Sgt. Pepper.’” In addition, he adds that “It looks like the Beatles, after a brief album drought, are back at the top of their form.”²³⁵ Mike Jahn of the *New York Times* was not so complimentary. He called the album

²³¹ Mike Jahn, “First Beatles Album in a Year Is Here,” *New York Times*, Nov 21, 1968; ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²³² Gould, 529.

²³³ Schaffner, 52

²³⁴ Gould, 512-3.

²³⁵ Robert Hilburn, “Beatles Are Back in Top Form,” *Los Angeles Times*, Oct 26, 1969.

“dull,” but “hiding in the comparatively sobriety of ‘Abbey Road’ is the feeling of surefootedness that the Beatles have needed in the last few years.”²³⁶ While this may have been their best album since *Sgt. Pepper*, the Beatles knew intuitively that they could not best that album because they were no longer working as a cohesive unit. Also, McCartney held out hope that if they could try to outdo themselves, they would find that musical cohesion and camaraderie that made them who they were.²³⁷ Unfortunately the end was drawing ever closer for the Beatles, and McCartney’s hopes of them lasting were fading away.

The album *Let it Be* (known at the time as *Get Back*) was supposed to release before *Abbey Road*, technically making *Abbey Road* the last album the Beatles ever recorded. However, *Let it Be* was pushed back, meaning *Abbey Road* released first.²³⁸ The corresponding documentary filming the creation of the album definitely showed some more of the tensions within the group. For example around the sixteen minute mark, Harrison and McCartney are discussing what Paul wants from George, and Harrison while not snapping at McCartney, simply says “I’ll play whatever you want me to play.”²³⁹ The reviewers also noted the disillusion within the group. Writer Penelope Gilliat, who wrote so fondly about *A Hard Day’s Night* said *Let It Be* was a “very bad film and a touching one... about the breaking apart of this reassuring, geometrically perfect, once apparently ageless family of siblings.”²⁴⁰ The documentary also showcased the Rooftop Concert the Beatles played on top of Apple Studios, the company they created after Brian Epstein’s death.²⁴¹

²³⁶ Mike Jahn, “‘Abbey Road’ by Beatles Marked by Moderation,” *New York Times*, Oct 4, 1969.

²³⁷ Gould, 588-9.

²³⁸ Hilburn, “Beatles Are Back in Top Form.”

²³⁹ *Let it Be* (1970), Online Video, directed by Michael Lindsey Hogg (1970)

https://archive.org/details/LetItBe_724.

²⁴⁰ Gould, 600.

²⁴¹ Gould, 600.

As for the album *Let it Be*, reviewers seemed to prefer some of the movie version songs to the album versions, particularly McCartney's rendition of "The Long and Winding Road."²⁴² New manager Allen Klein brought in American producer Mark Spector to work on it, and he remixed that song, along with others, thus essentially meddling with the Beatles music, as most producers tended to do. Producers would decide how to best represent the music without consulting the band.²⁴³ The breakup of the band officially occurred 10 April 1970 when McCartney announced he was leaving.²⁴⁴ The Beatles all went their separate ways, each pursuing a solo career. The biggest band in the world ceased to exist.

Despite their breakup, the Beatles are still considered one of the greatest and most important bands of all time, and their music and records are still just as potent today. Their staying power is incredible. As one *Los Angeles Times* article pointed out: "They have also produced music with some staying power. 'When people ask to re-create the mood of the 60s,' observed Aaron Copeland, one of America's top serious composers, 'they will play Beatle music.'"²⁴⁵ With *Rolling Stone* voting *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band* the greatest album on their Top 500 Albums list in 2012, it guarantees the Beatles will remain at or near the top a little while longer.

Yet this chapter's purpose was not about showing how great the Beatles were. Rather, this chapter has demonstrated that the Beatles' success was not instantaneous. They had to work hard from their early days to the very end to become successful, and to maintain that success.

²⁴² Gould, 601.

²⁴³ Gould, 601.

²⁴⁴ Mark Hertsgaard, "'The Breakup Heard 'Round the World': from *A Day in the Life: The Music and Artistry of the Beatles*," in *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, ed. June Skinner Sawyers (New York: Penguin, 2006), 158.

²⁴⁵ Los Angeles Times, "Too Potent to Forget."

Lennon and McCartney developed into phenomenal songwriters. They not only grew with the times and adapted their music accordingly, they led the charge, especially in 1967. They continued to evolve and master their craft to maintain success in America. They had a number of era-defining hits, and countless songs and albums on the top of the charts. Yes, when they landed in America, at JFK Airport with thousands of screaming teenage fans, they had to maintain that success and survive a major backlash triggered by Lennon's "More popular than Jesus" comment. They used television and film to their advantage through *The Ed Sullivan Show* and *A Hard Day's Night* to further progress their popularity, and they had a highly effective manager in Brian Epstein that worked tirelessly for them, securing them a recording contract and helping lead them to fame. Another band that was around the time of the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, faced their own challenges, but much like the Beatles and for the exact same reasons, they managed to find fame.

It is now time for their story.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROLLING STONES

“Would You Let Your Sister Go with a Rolling Stone?”²⁴⁶ While having nothing to do with the article that followed it, which was a fairly straightforward profile of the band, this question is one that stands out. The Rolling Stones were the rough looking, devil-may-care, rock group consisting of Mick Jagger as lead vocals, Keith Richards on guitar and backup vocals, Brian Jones on guitar and harmonica, Bill Wyman on bass, and Charlie Watts on drums. Taking the 1960s by storm, the Rolling Stones and the Beatles were the two top bands of the first wave British Invasion. After the Dave Clark Five started to lose traction in America, it was the Rolling Stones that took their place as the Beatles’ main rival. In the early days of the Invasion, they were the complete opposites in every sense of the word. While the Beatles were clean-cut and dressed the same, the Stones look shaggy, rough and unkempt. The Beatles sang about love while the Rolling Stones sang about “how they can't get no satisfaction.” Yet there was certain appeal about the Rolling Stones, and in the later years, when the Beatles were starting to splinter, it was the Rolling Stones who stepped to the forefront and became one of the premier British Invasion artists in the United States.

The Rolling Stones had to work, just like the Beatles, to get to the top. However, the factors that allowed the Rolling Stones to reach rock and roll superstardom were very similar to the Beatles. The Stones had era-defining hits, and an influential manager in their formative years

²⁴⁶ Ray Coleman, “Would You Let Your Sister Go with a Rolling Stone?” *Melody Maker*, March 14, 1964, 8, as cited in David Brackett, *The Pop, Rock, and Soul Reader: Histories and Debates*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 221.

in Andrew Loog Oldham. Moreover, Mick Jagger and Keith Richards had developed into excellent songwriters. Like the Fab Four, they grew and adapted with the changing times, and tried to effectively use the mediums of film and television. As a band that still performs and records successful albums, their staying power is some of the strongest of the British Invasion. The main purpose of this chapter will track the Rolling Stones through the years of 1964-1969, walking the reader through their rise to prominence in the United States and highlighting the key reasons, mentioned above, that allowed the Stones to succeed. However, since the Rolling Stones were already established as the complete band in 1964, a small discussion on the formation and the early years of the group will help set the scene.

The band's formation, whether Keith Richards and Mick Jagger realized it, came after years of run-ins with each other. Richards and Jagger were the original two founding members, enjoying a bond that came from being raised near another in their early years. But the one interaction that started the band's story occurred in October 1961, when Jagger and Richards crossed paths at Dartford Railway Station, after being separated by family moves years earlier. Both were on their way to Sidcup Art College, where they were enrolled, and Richards eventually joined Jagger and his mates in the recently formed Little Boy Blue and the Blue Boys, which included guitarist Dick Taylor.²⁴⁷

Jagger, Richards, and their mates soon discovered there was a small demand for R&B groups. At this point in their careers, they insisted they were an R&B group, not a rock 'n' roll band.²⁴⁸ They also discovered that there was an R&B venue in the Ealing Club in West London, and eventually musicians such as Eric Burdon (the Animals), and Paul Jones (singer for Manfred

²⁴⁷ Sean Egan, *The Rough Guide to The Rolling Stones* (New York: Rough Guides, 2006), 5-6.

²⁴⁸ Egan, 7.

Mann) would play there.²⁴⁹ Bryan Jones also got his start at Ealing, and upon seeing Jones play, Jagger and Richards would recruit him on April 1962. According to Richards, it was the arrival of Jones that led to them creating a “real band,” and their first billing as the Rolling Stones came on July 12, 1962.²⁵⁰ They borrowed their name from Muddy Waters’ song “Rolling Stone.”²⁵¹ Slowly, they were coming together.

The early months were not without their challenges. Bassist Dick Taylor decided to leave in September 1962 to focus on school, thus leaving only Jagger, Richards, Jones, and pianist Ian Stewart, with bassists and drummers rotating in and out. Jones started to emerge as the leader of the group, and he especially saw it this way because as previously mentioned, Richards noted it was Jones’ arrival that lent credence to forming a serious band.²⁵² Eventually, drummer Tony Chapman joined the group, and in October 1962, they entered a recording studio for the first time, performing Bo Diddley, Muddy Waters, and Jimmy Reed songs. It came to a point where the Rolling Stones started to look for a more permanent bass player. Their drummer at the time, Tony Chapman, knew a bassist named Bill Perks, who would change his surname to Wyman. He would become the next permanent member of the band.²⁵³

Band members nudged Chapman out of the group in early 1963 to recruit Charlie Watts, believing his musicianship inferior. Sean Egan likened the firing of Chapman and the hiring of Watts to the Beatles firing Pete Best and bringing Ringo Starr: this was the final piece of the puzzle that created the original line-up of The Rolling Stones.²⁵⁴ Richards echoed similar

²⁴⁹ Egan, 8.

²⁵⁰ Egan, 8-9.

²⁵¹ Philip Norman, *The Stones* (Oxford: Pan Books, 2002), 62.

²⁵² Egan, 12.

²⁵³ Egan, 13.

²⁵⁴ Egan, 13-4.

sentiments to Egan. “The desire to get Charlie was one of the driving forces that nailed this band together, because we knew he had to be the drummer,” Richards explained.²⁵⁵

Their big break came in 1963 with Giorgio Gomelsky and his Crawdaddy club, originally known as the Station Hotel. The Stones’ fan base expanded with each passing gig, and Gomelsky began acting as their manager, based only a verbal agreement.²⁵⁶ This was an important point in the Rolling Stones’ career. Jones begged Gomelsky to get them gigs, and his decision to intervene quite possibly, in the words of Christopher Sandford, saved the career of the Stones, as it provided them with relatively steady pay.²⁵⁷ Even though Gomelsky gave the Rolling Stones a chance, his verbal agreement to be their manager would not hold up and eventually, the final managerial piece of the Rolling Stones would be added with Andrew Loog Oldham.

Oldham originally worked as a press aide for Brian Epstein, who managed the Beatles. Yet when Oldham saw The Stones, he just knew he had to be their manager: “When I heard them play I realized that this is what my life was all about and what all the preparation was for. These people needed me and I needed them and we could finally go somewhere together.”²⁵⁸ Three days later, his determination to become the Rolling Stones manager paid off, and this contract, unlike Gomelsky’s, was on paper. Andrew Loog Oldham was now the manager of the Rolling Stones.

The group now needed a record deal, and who better to secure them one than the man who turned down the Beatles, A&R man Dick Rowe of Decca Records. John McMillian recounts an interesting occurrence with Dick Rowe and the Rolling Stones. As the story goes, Rowe was

²⁵⁵ The Rolling Stones, Jools Holland, and Dora Loewenstein, *The Rolling Stones: A Life on the Road* (New York: Penguin Studio, 1998), 13.

²⁵⁶ Egan, 14-6.

²⁵⁷ Christopher Sandford, *The Rolling Stones: Fifty Years* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2012), 46-7.

²⁵⁸ Egan, 18.

judging a talent show when the Beatles' George Harrison suggested to him that he should sign the Rolling Stones. He was so excited (or desperate) to see them that he rushed to the Crawdaddy Club that same night to see them. While it is true that Rowe was a judge for the talent show and Harrison did suggest he see the Rolling Stones, McMillian eloquently shows that Rowe seeing the Stones on the same night as the talent show – which has become a widely accepted myth in rock and roll lore – was, in fact, impossible.²⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the logic that Decca would panic after passing on The Beatles was common among Oldham, Rowe, and Sir Edward Lewis, Decca's major shareholder. On May 14, 1963 two days after Rowe saw the Stones, they were signed to Decca Records.²⁶⁰

The Stones had their record deal, but before the line-up became the way history knows it to be, one last major personnel change occurred. Oldham decided that pianist Ian Stewart had to go. Six members were too many and Oldham decided that Stewart's jutting chin was not pop star material. Eventually Stewart became their road manager, with some keyboard credits here and there, but officially, the band was now down to five.²⁶¹ In July 1963, the group appeared on the British television show *Thank Your Lucky Stars*, appearing in matching stage outfits. Letters were sent exclaiming their disgust of the Stones' looks, and shortly after, they decided that stage suits were not for them, and dressed down for their shows.²⁶²

September 1963 saw the group go on a package tour, as well as being gifted a song by John Lennon and Paul McCartney, "I Wanna Be Your Man." They also appeared on *Thank Your Lucky Stars* again on November 17, 1963.²⁶³ Oldham soon became adamant that the Stones

²⁵⁹ John McMillian, *Beatles vs. Stones* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2013), 61-3.

²⁶⁰ McMillian, 63.

²⁶¹ Egan, 21.

²⁶² Egan, 23.

²⁶³ Egan, 23-4.

should write their own material because they would make more money. Oldham did not want Jones to be the songwriter because as Oldham explains: “Jones wanted both the fame and the adulation but he wanted to be authentic. The end result is that he basically looked down at the pop process and you cannot write down to the public. They will not accept it.”²⁶⁴ Thus, Oldham focused in on Jagger and Richards to be the next great song-writing duo. The story goes that Oldham locked Jagger and Richards in a room and would not let them come out until they wrote a song.²⁶⁵ While not necessarily true, it seemed to have worked. The result was the song “Tell Me,” a 1964 single that ended up on their first album. As a result of the successful collaboration, “Mick and I got hung up about writing songs,” Richards later recalled.²⁶⁶

The music of the Stones was unique, in their eyes, from the other groups out there. In discussion with Ed Rudy in 1964, Brian Jones noted: “The essential difference between ourselves and the British groups that are well known in the United States at the moment is that we’re the first to have a really strong Negro rhythm & blues influence. We haven’t adapted our music from a watered-down music like white American rock ‘n’ roll. We’ve adapted our music from the early blues forms...”²⁶⁷

Once again, in the early days of the group, the Rolling Stones insisted that they played rhythm and blues, not pop, or beat music, or rock ‘n’ roll.²⁶⁸ Eventually, like the other members of The Big Three, they saw their music evolve throughout the sixties, especially because as

²⁶⁴ Egan, 26.

²⁶⁵ Egan, 26.

²⁶⁶ Egan, 26.

²⁶⁷ Nicholas Schaffner, *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 56.

²⁶⁸ Schaffner, 57; Egan, 7.

Nicholas Schaffner points out British rhythm and blues died out.²⁶⁹ Yet early on, they insisted they were rhythm and blues, and nothing more.

The foundations were now starting established, and when 1964 came around, the group began enjoying greater success in Britain, with their single “Not Fade Away” reaching number three in the UK charts in February 1964. They would also release their first album in March, and the self-titled *The Rolling Stones* would reach number one within a week, knocking the Beatles out of the top spot.²⁷⁰ It was now time to see if they could follow in the Beatles’ footsteps and find fame in America. But while they would eventually do so, it would take the Rolling Stones a little longer than the Beatles to break through in America.

The Stones’ first shot at the United States came in June 1964. But where the Beatles had thousands of screaming teenagers waiting for them, the Stones did not have that much fandom on their first trip. They were virtual unknowns in America despite being stars in Britain.²⁷¹ When they landed at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York, a crowd of five hundred, mostly teenage girls, showed up to greet them. But Oldham and his associate Eric Easton paid to have those teenagers bussed in.²⁷² Even so, it was nowhere near the greeting The Beatles received upon their arrival. Despite the questionable reception at the airport, the Stones went on to enjoy a good start. The American counterpart to Decca, London Records, produced a massive marketing campaign akin to The Beatles months earlier, and the Rolling Stones’ faces were plastered on everything imaginable. When they played their first live concert on June 5, 1964 in San

²⁶⁹ Schaffner, 57.

²⁷⁰ Sandford, 59-61.

²⁷¹ Rob Bowman, “Into the Pressure Cooker,” in *According to The Rolling Stones*, ed. Dora Loewenstein and Philip Dood (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2003), 106.

²⁷² Sandford, 62-3.

Bernardino, California, it was generally well received, especially with their opening song, “Route 66,” referencing the town.²⁷³

Other parts of the tour did not go so well. Their first major television appearance in the United States would come on the *Hollywood Palace Show*, hosted by Dean Martin. During their short performance on the show, Jones seemed to frequently flip off the host, and when the Stones finished, Martin gave his monologue about them having “low foreheads and high eyebrows.” The act that followed, a trampolinist, was introduced as “the father of the band – he’s been trying to kill himself ever since.”²⁷⁴ In addition to the short set, it was clear that Dean Martin did not think highly of the Rolling Stones.

The first show in San Bernardino went well, but the following four in Texas were not as well received.²⁷⁵ Their first tour ended in New York with two shows at Carnegie Hall, along with forty-seven arrests and 120 cases of fainting. The group was not entirely pleased with their first American tour, and Jagger was particularly displeased when a 14,000-seat theatre in Detroit only had 371 people there.²⁷⁶ While the tour fell somewhat short of a success in terms of growing the group’s popularity in the United States, musicologist and historian Rob Bowman points out that what this first tour did was it expanded the groups’ musical repertoire by being exposed to soul along with what they already played which was mainly post-war blues and black rock ‘n’ roll.²⁷⁷ It still was not all bad for The Rolling Stones, as this first tour started to establish their brand. The memorable refrain that opened the chapter – “Would You Let Your Sister Go with a Rolling Stone?” – and many different variations of it, came out of this tour, after Oldham had seen what

²⁷³ Sandford, 63-4.

²⁷⁴ Sandford, 63.

²⁷⁵ Sandford, 64.

²⁷⁶ Sandford, 65-6.

²⁷⁷ Bowman, 107.

some of the press had to say about them.²⁷⁸ While their brand was developing however, they still were lacking that big hit in America.

The band returned to the United States on October 23, 1964 to find their cover of Irma Thomas' "Time Is on My Side" doing well in the American charts. The reception for the Stones had improved by this time, with much more pandemonium awaiting the groups' arrival. As Richards remarked to Wyman, it was a "Bit different this time, isn't it?"²⁷⁹ Two days later, they made their first appearance on *The Ed Sullivan Show*, and their brand that started to grow on their first tour continued to expand. When the show aired, it was clear that this group of British Invasion artists was nothing like the Beatles. After the Stones performed two sets, complaints by parents flooded the phone lines. Ed Sullivan the next day promised, "They'll [The Rolling Stones] never be on again. Never. Never. We won't book any more rock and roll groups and we'll ban teenagers from the theatre."²⁸⁰ Despite Sullivan's vow, they would appear multiple other times on his show. The Stones were certainly living up to their brand of being rough and very "anti-Beatles."

This image and brand continued into 1965. Parents were not happy with the group, and the stories that came out about The Rolling Stones piled on to their distrust.²⁸¹ Their third American tour started on April 29, 1965 and it was not a standard "everything went smoothly" tour. Their sound system broke on their first show, they received death threats from the Ku Klux Klan, the brakes on the plane failed on their flight to Atlanta, and on their May 6 show, they only made it through four numbers before two thousand fans rushed the stage.²⁸² Yet out of this tour

²⁷⁸ Sandford, 66.

²⁷⁹ Sandford, 74-5.

²⁸⁰ Sandford, 75.

²⁸¹ Sandford, 80.

²⁸² Sandford, 83-4.

came the song that would propel the Rolling Stones to number one in America, thanks to a riff developed by Richards for “(I Can’t Get No) Satisfaction.” It took two days to put it together in the studio, and when it was released in June 1965, it topped both the American and British charts, and became a generational anthem for the working-class men.²⁸³ Also, Oldham started to grow tired of the day-to-day mechanics of management, so he hired on “the toughest wheeler-dealer in the pop jungle” Allen Klein to be a part of the management. Klein’s aggressive techniques immediately scored the Stones more money from Decca.²⁸⁴

With the successful release of “(I Can’t Get No) Satisfaction,” the Rolling Stones were drawing comparisons to the Beatles and their success. In a *Los Angeles Times* article from December 10, 1965 writer Charles Champlin suggested that the group was already on its way to the massive success of The Beatles: “Now that the Beatles have achieved their lofty orbit as at least semi-immortals, the group now enjoying the Beatle-like-lift-off toward the same orbit is the Rolling Stones.”²⁸⁵ A rivalry brewing between The Stones and The Beatles took hold, but both groups maintained that it was a media creation. In fact, the groups planned the releases of their albums, so that one would not overlap the other, and there was a healthy amount of friendly competition between the two growing juggernauts of the British Invasion.²⁸⁶

By January 1966, a writer for *Melody Maker* magazine in Britain observed that at this point, everything was going well for The Stones “But despite their height of appeal,” he wrote, “they haven’t got the staying power of the Beatles. Because of changes in taste in popular music, the Stones cannot hope for lasting popularity. The very nature of their music precludes drastic

²⁸³ Sandford, 84-5.

²⁸⁴ Sandford, 92.

²⁸⁵ Charles Champlin, “Rolling Stones Ready to Go Into Orbit: Rolling Stones Ready to Go Into Own Orbit,” *Los Angeles Times*, Dec 10, 1965.

²⁸⁶ McMillian, 142.

change.... It is difficult to see or discover which direction they are travelling in. Where do they go from here?"²⁸⁷

This statement spoke to one of the key reasons why many bands did not find further traction in the United States during the British Invasion: staying power. The Stones had their number one hit, and followed it up with another hit "Get Off of My Cloud" but the question posed in the pages of *Melody Maker* was important: Where do the Rolling Stones go from here? That question was answered with their first album fully compromised of original material: *Aftermath*, released on both sides of the Atlantic in April 1966. Closely compared to the Beatles album *Rubber Soul*, *Aftermath* showed two things: The Stones could put out quality original material, and they could grow and adapt to the changing times.

By this point, the Rolling Stones were transitioning to more of a rock 'n' roll pop group, despite their earlier assertions of being an R&B group and nothing more. What *Aftermath* did however was take them a more mature level with their most adventurous and lyrically sophisticated work to date, like what *Rubber Soul* did for the Beatles.²⁸⁸ While most pop songs focused on melancholy and lovelorn characters, the opening songs on the British and American versions differ, but both spoke to the maturity and adventurous themes they tackled. The British opening song, "Mother's Little Helper" explored middle-class drug dependency, and the American opening song "Paint It, Black" suggested a clinically depressed and suicidal narrator.²⁸⁹ With *Aftermath* reaching number two on the American charts, it further cemented the group's success in the United States.

²⁸⁷ McMillian, 140.

²⁸⁸ McMillian, 140.

²⁸⁹ McMillian, 141.

Unfortunately, as a *Los Angeles Times* article pointed out after the fact, success did not necessarily follow the Stones: “In 1967 the Stones ran into crisis after crisis. Drug conviction. Lawsuits. Marital splits. Bans. Brawls on and off stage.”²⁹⁰ Matters worsened over the course of the year when the band fired Oldham, and Jones’ drug problems continued to deepen, along with his growing detachment from the group. This was to be the most trying year for the Stones in their career to date.

Drug busts in February 1967 made the Rolling Stones front-page news.²⁹¹ The highly publicized raids occurred on February 12, 1967 after someone tipped off the newspaper *The News of the World* that there were illegal proceedings occurring at Redlands, Richard’s country home. *The News of the World* subsequently tipped off the police. Richards recalled the night of the bust: “There was a knock on the door. Eight o’clock. Everybody is just sort of gliding down slowly from the whole day of sort of freaking about... ‘Bang, bang, bang,’ this big knock at the door and I go answer it. ‘Oh look, there’s lots of little ladies and gentlemen outside.’”²⁹² The men and women outside were police, and they proceeded to raid the house. Jagger was charged for having methamphetamines (also known as lepers or purple hearts) without a prescription and Richards was charged for permitting his house to be used for the smoking of hashish. Jagger was prosecuted on a technicality and Richards on incredibly circumstantial evidence.²⁹³

The trials of Jagger and Richards took place from July 27-29. The juries for both only took five minutes to deliver a guilty verdict. Keith received one year and Jagger six months in

²⁹⁰ Charles W. Bell, “Stones in Crises, Keep Rolling Along,” *Los Angeles Times*, Jan 2, 1968.

²⁹¹ David Dalton, *The Rolling Stones: The First Twenty Years*, ed. David Dalton (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981), 97.

²⁹² Dalton, *The First Twenty Years*, 98. This is just a minor clip of the story Richards tells.

²⁹³ Dalton, *First Twenty Years*, 97-8.

prison.²⁹⁴ Support came out in favor of Jagger and Richards, with the Who backing them after the drug conviction.²⁹⁵ Public opinion was divided however, but turned in favor of Jagger and Richards when the London Times published an article by William Rees-Mogg headlined, “Who Breaks A Butterfly On A Wheel?” On appeal in late July, Richards’ conviction was quashed while Jagger’s was commuted to a conditional discharge.²⁹⁶ Brian Jones was also brought up on drug charges while Jagger and Richards were fighting theirs. On October 30, 1967 he pled guilty to cannabis-possession and was sentenced to a concurrent nine months and three months in prison.²⁹⁷ His sentence was appealed and eventually overturned. He was instead fined 1000 pounds and put on probation for three years, with an order to continue psychiatric treatment.²⁹⁸

On top of the drug charges, the Stones were also tired of Oldham, who seemed to mysteriously disappear for a while then reappear at Olympic Studios ready to work.²⁹⁹ This did not sit well with the band members, and as Oldham recalled, for seven weeks the Stones either kept him waiting for hours, sometimes days on end, or went into the studio for no other purpose than to play old blues numbers. Eventually, Oldham was fed up, saying to them “From here on you can deal with everything directly through Allen (Klein).”³⁰⁰ Thus, Klein became the new manager of the Rolling Stones.

The band faced musical challenges as well. The Rolling Stones played their last live concert for the next two and a half years on April 17, 1967.³⁰¹ Their first album of the year

²⁹⁴ Dalton, *First Twenty Years*, 98-100.

²⁹⁵ McMillian, 166.

²⁹⁶ Dalton, *First Twenty Years*, 101. If the reader wishes to read this article, Dalton has the important points in his book.

²⁹⁷ Norman, 290-1.

²⁹⁸ Norman, 294.

²⁹⁹ Philip Norman, *Sympathy For The Devil: The Rolling Stones Story* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984), 249.

³⁰⁰ Norman, *Sympathy*, 249.

³⁰¹ Sandford, 135.

Between the Buttons was released in February in the United States, one month after coming out in Britain. It received a good review from Pete Johnson of the *Los Angeles Times*, calling it “their best effort so far, a blending of fairly typical group numbers, all of them good for dancing, and some far out tunes, some funny and others deep.”³⁰² Their second album of the year *Flowers* had already been released in Britain two years prior, but hit American record stores in June of 1967. It was a collection of singles and tracks left off their previous two albums.³⁰³ Their last album of the year *Their Satanic Majesties Request* was the most polarizing for the Stones. It made them more money but received the worst reviews of any album to date.³⁰⁴

In a discussion with music journalist Roy Carr, Jagger talked about the album: “*Satanic Majesties* was the mood of the times. You can’t play or write outside the mood of the times.”³⁰⁵ Indeed psychedelic was the mood of the times, and the band members figured they had to adapt their music to keep up with changing times. The theme of 1967 was the “Summer of Love” and psychedelic experimentation was all the rage. Despite its mixed reviews, the album was an attempt at psychedelic experimentation, hoping to compete both with the changing times in the United States as well as the monumental success of the Beatles’ newest album *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*. In fact, many considered *Their Satanic Majesties Request* an inferior imitation to *Sgt. Pepper*.³⁰⁶ The Stones themselves were not happy with their album either and regarded it as the “lowest of low points in their career.”³⁰⁷

³⁰² Pete Johnson, “Latest Stones Album Best Yet,” *Los Angeles Times*, Feb 26, 1967.

³⁰³ David Fricke and Robert Christgau, “50 Essential Albums of 1967,” *Rolling Stone* (September 19, 2017) <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-lists/50-essential-albums-of-1967-198515/the-rolling-stones-flowers-198807/> (accessed July 20, 2018).

³⁰⁴ Sandford, 156.

³⁰⁵ David Dalton, “Pictures of Us Through The Steamy Haze,” in *The Rolling Stones: The First Twenty Years*, ed. David Dalton (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981), 105.

³⁰⁶ McMillian, 175.

³⁰⁷ Norman, 287.

The Rolling Stones survived the trials of 1967, and the following year, they went back to what they knew best. First, they released “Street Fighting Man” in June 1968 right after the Beatles’ “Revolution,” breaking the unwritten code that their singles would not compete.³⁰⁸ Then in December, they released their newest album *Beggars’ Banquet*, a critical and commercial success. In a 1968 *New York Times* article, journalist Nik Cohn discussed the Stones’ newest album, comparing it with their previous *Their Satanic Majesties*, making it clear which album he enjoyed more. “‘Their Satanic Majesties Request’ was disastrous – pretentious, drab, full of ninth-hand innovations.” Yet when it came to their new release, “*Beggars Banquet*... brought it all back home. Simply, ‘*Beggars Banquet*’ is terrific and on it the Stones have managed something I thought they’d never do: They’ve reached real sophistication without losing any of their basic fierceness, without toning down the violence or sexuality or deep-down evil at all.”³⁰⁹

The Christian Science Monitor’s David Sterritt echoed Cohn’s sentiments in his review of *Beggar’s Banquet*: “With ‘*Beggar’s Banquet*’ the Rolling Stones leave the psychedelic-experimentation bag into which they had temporarily slipped and leap with a wild yell back into their traditional mainstream of raucous rock-blues... This music is what the Stones do best, and they do it better than anyone.”³¹⁰ Sterritt also referred to the bands’ musical abilities: “To boot, ‘*Banquet*’ shows them still to be the most versatile and expert rock instrumentalists anywhere... Without question, they remain one of the two most influential forces on the British rock scene.”³¹¹

³⁰⁸ McMillian, 181.

³⁰⁹ Nik Cohn, “A Briton Blasts The Beatles: Briton Blasts,” *New York Times*, Dec 15, 1968.

³¹⁰ David Sterritt, “Stones whoop up a ‘Banquet’: The pop scene,” *The Christian Science Monitor*, Feb 20, 1969.

³¹¹ Sterritt, “Stones whoop up a ‘Banquet.’”

Adding to the chorus of praise, Carl Bernstein in *The Washington Post*, *Times Herald* wrote “the Stones have unleashed their rawest, lewdest, most arrogant, most savage record yet. And it’s beautiful. Banquet is a rarity perhaps even in the same league as “Revolver” and “Sergeant Pepper...”³¹² *Beggar’s Banquet* being likened to what is considered two of the best Beatles’ albums ever produced was no small feat, and with nothing but glowing critical acclaim for their new album, the Rolling Stones left the disasters of the previous year behind and regained their footing as one of the top bands of the British Invasion.

The year 1968 also saw the Stones take a crack at a movie, with the hope it would air on the British Broadcasting Corporation, or BBC. *The Rolling Stones Rock and Roll Circus* released in 1968, featured footage of the Stones, along with other groups like the Beatles and the Who. Filming did not go along smoothly, and eventually Klein decided to scrap the project. As newly hired assistant Peter Swales recalled: “Allen Klein sat next to Jagger and – right there – killed the movie. He said ‘I don’t like it. Why? Because the Who blew you off your own stage!’ It was all he had to say.”³¹³ Eventually, the film would see a public release in 1996. Despite being shelved for years, *The Rolling Stones Rock and Roll Circus* still deserves at least a mention, as it was an honest attempt by The Stones to try to get on television. Moreover, it was also, as McMillian suggests, maybe a way to upstage the Beatles and the critically panned television special they put out a year earlier on BBC *Magical Mystery Tour*.³¹⁴ One can only speculate whether the film would have impacted the Stones’ already massive popularity in any way, shape, or form.

³¹² Carl Bernstein, “Rolling Stones: Contempt for Just About Everything Except Music,” *The Washington Post*, *Times Herald*, Jan 12, 1969.

³¹³ McMillian, 202.

³¹⁴ McMillian, 202.

Hence, with 1968 ending, the Stones were back with a bang. But, alas, the following year, 1969, would introduce more turbulence, and provide more tough tests for The Rolling Stones. Their next film project went by two names: celebrated French new wave director Jean-Luc Godard's cut was titled *One Plus One*, whereas the company that funded the film, Cupid Productions, opted to retitle it *Sympathy For The Devil*, with Cupid changing the ending so that "the ten million teen boppers who were going to see the film in America would understand it better."³¹⁵ The latter title came from the opening song of *Beggar's Banquet*, and that is essentially what the film showed: The Rolling Stones working on the album. The reviews were polarizing, with *Disc Magazine* calling the film "complete and utter rubbish" and "a mind-boggling mixture of sex, music, black power and politics – and its entertainment value is less than nil."³¹⁶ Yet Philip Strick of *Films and Filming* called *One Plus One* "a really superb piece of work."³¹⁷

Even with the mixed reviews, the Rolling Stones were happy with the finished product. Jagger commented on the filming of the movie: "Godard happened to catch us on two very good nights... One night he got us going over and over this song called 'Sympathy for the Devil.' It started out as a folky thing like 'Jigsaw Puzzle' but that didn't make it so we kept going over it and changing it until it finally comes out as a samba. So Godard has the whole thing from beginning to end. That's something I've always wanted to do on film."³¹⁸ While the movie did not receive as much critical acclaim as the aforementioned Beatles' films, or documentaries

³¹⁵ Stephen Glynn, *The British Pop Music Film: The Beatles and Beyond* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 145-6.

³¹⁶ Quoted in Demitri Coryton and Joseph Murrell, *Hits of the Sixties* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1990), 219, as cited in Glynn, 146.

³¹⁷ Philip Strick, *Films and Filming*, vol. 15, no. 5, February 1969, 67, as cited in Glynn, 146.

³¹⁸ Jonathan Cott and Sue Cox, "An Interview with Mick Jagger," in David Dalton (ed.), *The Rolling Stones: An Unauthorized Biography in Words, Photographs, and Music* (New York: AMSCO Music, 1972), 100, as cited in Glynn, 146.

showcasing The Who (discussed next chapter) *One Plus One/Sympathy For The Devil* still warrants attention. As Stephen Glynn points out, the movie contained two significant aspects. The first was, as Jagger alludes to, its depiction of how a song was formed, and the process the group went through in putting it together. The second was it showed how the dynamics within the group had shifted. Once seen as the leader of the Rolling Stones, *One Plus One/Sympathy For The Devil* shows how Brian Jones has been pushed to the sidelines, with Jagger and Richards controlling the musical direction.³¹⁹ In addition, film demonstrated the willingness of the Stones to try out this form of media. When Godard came asking for them to film a different type of pop movie, the Stones agreed.³²⁰ Therefore, despite the mixed reviews and lack of viewership, *One Plus One/Sympathy For The Devil* still provides valuable insight into the band, and it still signifies, like *Rock and Roll Circus*, the group's decision to use these forms of media to promote their music and image.

Entering 1969, the Rolling Stones were at a crossroads. They had not toured since 1967, and a lot has changed since then. As Joel Selvin points out, since the Stones had not toured for so long, they were out of touch with the music scene in the United States. Instead of the screaming teenagers, a more subdued cohort of fans were listening to the music. There were groups like the Who (discussed in the next chapter) that rocked the music scene with dynamic live appearances. Also, the west coast American artists, such as Creedence Clearwater Revival (CCR) and Jefferson Airplane, brought new fresh sounds to pop music.³²¹ Before considering a return to America, Brian Jones' deterioration needed to be dealt with.

³¹⁹ Glynn, 146.

³²⁰ Glynn, 144.

³²¹ Joel Selvin, *Altamont: The Rolling Stones, the Hells Angels, and the Inside Story of Rock's Darkest Day* (New York: Harper Collins, 2016), 21.

By this time, Brian Jones was spiraling out of control. Starting as early as their first tour of the United States in 1964, his conditioning had already started to worsen. As seen in the movie *One Plus One/Sympathy For The Devil*, he was no longer regarded as leader of the band, instead being continually pushed aside as Jagger and Richards gravitated to the forefront. Seemingly, the “straw that broke the camel’s back” was when the Stones arrived at Olympic Studios on June 1, 1969 to record “Honky Tonk Women.” Jones was not there. He continued to be drugged out and exhibited erratic behavior.³²² In his absence, the group brought in guitarist Mick Taylor to work on their new song. Jagger and Richards, a week after the song was mixed, would drive to Jones’ home and fire him. Two weeks later, the Stones held a press conference announcing Jones’ firing, and that he would be replaced by Mick Taylor, who would make his first public appearance at the free concert at Hyde Park on July 5, 1969.³²³

On June 12, 1969 a *Los Angeles Times* article reported, “Guitarist Brian Jones has quit the Rolling Stones pop group in a dispute over what kind of music it should play,” and that they “parted amicably.”³²⁴ As discussed, tensions went beyond creative differences, and included a whole other host of problems he was experiencing. Unfortunately, Jones would drown in his pool, tragically passing away on July 3, 1969, two days before the Hyde Park concert.³²⁵ After finishing the concert a return to the United States was inevitable, but with the group being absent for so long and having increasing struggles with their manager, questions arose if they would be able to match the success they had previously and maintain their status as a top British Invasion group.

³²² Selvin, 17.

³²³ Selvin, 18.

³²⁴ Los Angeles Times, “Brian Jones Quits Rolling Stones,” *Los Angeles Times*, Jun 12, 1969.

³²⁵ Selvin, 18.

Planning that very return to the United States, they were becoming increasingly weary of Klein and started to lose trust in him. He was causing money issues for the group, and with tours being their main source of income, they did not want him handling their return tour to the United States.³²⁶ Not trusting Klein with the duties and financial management of the tour, they went behind his back and hired his nephew Ronnie Schneider to minimize Klein's role in the tour. The Stones as well hired their stage manager from the Hyde Park concert Sam Cutler to help oversee the tour.³²⁷ When tickets went on sale, they sold out almost instantly in most places, with the only venues not selling out in pre-sale being Phoenix and San Diego.³²⁸ Their 1969 tour of America started on November 7 in Colorado and this was their introduction to the new type of concert. It was not all girls and they were not screaming, they were listening, and the Stones could tell the difference right away.³²⁹ The next shows in Los Angeles had Jagger shining on stage and the audience under his spell. Despite being away from the States for three years, band members were exuding confidence on stage. The important addition of Mick Taylor also shone through in this concert. He brought a new touch with his guitar playing, had remarkable solos, and allowed Richards to return to his favored role of chugging rhythms.³³⁰

The concert in Baltimore demonstrated even further how much America still loved the Stones. Two separate newspaper articles in *The Washington Post*, *Times Herald* focused on the energetic performance. B.J. Phillips mentioned the crowd in his article, saying how it was strange that the audience “did not indulge in the kind of group screaming that distinguished earlier Rolling Stone tours in this country.” He also noted the amount of people trying to scalp

³²⁶ Selvin, 16, 21.

³²⁷ Selvin, 21-3.

³²⁸ Selvin, 44.

³²⁹ Selvin, 61.

³³⁰ Selvin, 64-5.

tickets outside and how the “Sold-out performance testified to the Stones’ continuing popularity.”³³¹ The author of the second article, William C. Woods, while a little disappointed with the atmosphere, pointed out that the concert was still spellbinding. Overall, Woods liked the concert, and remarked that the Stones were “very, very damned good at what they do.”³³²

The Rolling Stones’ next album was set to release a week after the tour ended and sold more than one million copies in pre-release.³³³ *Let It Bleed* came out on November 28, 1969 to overall positive reviews. Robert Hilburn of The *Los Angeles Times* called *Let It Bleed* “...Merely more of what the Stones have been doing for years. But that is about as good as anything rock ‘n’ roll has produced.”³³⁴ Robb Baker, who was travelling with the Stones, liked some songs better than others, calling the title track (“Let It Bleed”) “One of the all-time great it-grows-on-you Stones.” He also enjoyed “Gimme Shelter” although he was not impressed when it was played live on the tour.³³⁵ Despite such faint praise, it was clear that the Stones’ could anticipate massive success based on pre-sale numbers.

One of the complaints of the tour was the steep ticket prices. In a press conference before the 1969 tour started, the Stones were pressed on the matter. One reporter asked the band to comment on an article stating that their ticket prices were too high, and a lot of people could not afford them. Jagger replied, “we’ll have to do something about it. If there really is a lot of people who can’t afford it, maybe we’ll try to fix something up for these people.” One reporter suggested a free concert, and at the time Jagger was not sure.³³⁶ Ultimately, events would come

³³¹ B. J. Phillips, “Rolling Stones: Conjuring a Heavy Spell: Rolling Stones,” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Nov 27, 1969.

³³² William C. Woods, “Stones’ Age: Music Stones’ Age,” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Nov 28, 1969.

³³³ Selvin, 92.

³³⁴ Robert Hilburn, “Farewell Present From Stones: Farewell Present From the Stones,” *Los Angeles Times*, Dec 14, 1969.

³³⁵ Robb Baker, “The Sound: Rolling Stones Ooze in Latest: ‘Let It Bleed,’” *Chicago Tribune*, Dec 14, 1969.

³³⁶ Selvin, 49.

together, and that free concert became reality at Altamont Motor Speedway on December 6, 1969.³³⁷ While their intentions were good, Altamont would have a tragic ending.

Unfortunately, while there may have been good intentions behind it, Altamont ultimately became a black spot on rock 'n' Roll. The infamous biker gang the Hell's Angels were hired to be bodyguards, and before the night was over, there were four deaths, with the most well-reported one being the stabbing of Meredith Hunter by a Hell's Angel. *Rolling Stone* called it "rock and roll's worst day" and put forth an article attempting to dissect what happened. This was their first attempt at investigative journalism, and it immediately changed the mind of the public, sending shock and horror through the rock world.³³⁸

The decade could not have ended on a worse note. Yet, despite the tragic endings of Brian Jones' death and the violence at Altamont, the Rolling Stones would maintain an impressive momentum. They would continue into the 1970s, riding high with huge record sales and critical acclaim, and with that, their journey to superstardom was complete. They are still going strong today, with much of the same line-up as the original incarnation. Starting as a R&B band in the early 1960s, they grew and evolved into a massively successful pop group that exemplified at times the essence of rock 'n' roll. They survived all the drug charges of 1967 and came back with one of their best albums in *Beggars' Banquet*. They not only survived, they flourished, and emerged as one of the British Invasion's premier bands in the United States and found the traction to continue to be popular today. The third major group of the British Invasion

³³⁷ There is a lot that went into how this free concert came together, and Selvin does a good job of going into the details, so if the reader is interested in those details, Selvin provides a well-written story of the events leading up to, during, and after Altamont.

³³⁸ Selvin, 252-3. Unfortunately, Selvin does not specify which *Rolling Stone* article he is talking about but does cite multiple in his bibliography. Most are easily accessible with a quick google search. The most in-depth of those (or at least the longest) seems to be this article from 21 January 1970 which has interview clips and an overview of the concert: <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/the-rolling-stones-disaster-at-altamont-let-it-bleed-71299/>

the Who, found it even more difficult to find their way in America. The last of the Big Three to come out of the initial wave, their story is one of struggles, hard work and dedication.

CHAPTER 4

THE WHO

The third band that saw major success in the early British Invasion was the Who. Unlike the Beatles and Rolling Stones however, their path to fame was much longer and harder. Consisting of singer Roger Daltrey, guitarist Pete Townshend, bassist John Entwistle, and drummer Keith Moon, throughout the mid-sixties they had shown up on the record charts in the United States. Yet their highest single “I Can See For Miles,” charted only at number nine. Their dealings with Decca Records as well proved to be another challenge, and at times it seemed like the group was not going to survive.

Despite this, they persevered and struck gold in 1969 with their rock opera *Tommy*, thus firmly implanting them in the hierarchy of the British Invasion. While their rise to fame was slower than the other members of the Big Three, the same factors that aided the Beatles and Rolling Stones to success aided the Who as well. This chapter will track the group from 1964 through to 1969 and chronicle their struggles and ultimate success at the end of the 1960s with their hit album *Tommy*.

The Who found themselves in the middle of both America and Britain during the 1960s, and 1964 is when they shape. Originally known as The Detours, in early 1964 they were forced to change their name when a band with a similar name appeared on a pop show. It was Pete’s flat mate who suggested the name the Who, and it stuck.³³⁹ The Who were forced to replace their

³³⁹ Ben Marshall, with Pete Townshend and Roger Daltrey, *The Who: The Official History* (New York, Harper Design, 2015), 56-7.

original drummer Doug Sandom, as it seems him being fifteen years older than the rest of the group was a key reason that they failed to impress Fontana Records at their audition for the label.³⁴⁰ After going through many session drummers with no success, they found the drummer that would perfectly compliment and the group, Keith Moon.³⁴¹

Finding Moon was a stroke of luck that, according to singer Roger Daltrey, seemed cosmically ordained.³⁴² Both John Entwistle and Pete Townshend recalled how Moon fit perfectly with the group. Entwistle recalled the time when Moon first played. He asked the group if they could play the song “Roadrunner.” The band members played, and thought, “Yeah, this is the fella.” Similarly, Townshend realized that “from the moment we found Keith it was a complete turning point. He was so assertive and confident. Before then we’d just been fooling around.”³⁴³ It was clear that the group had finally found their drummer, and the four that would come to be known as the Who were complete. Yet stardom and success were still a few years away.

With the line-up assembled, the management that led the Who to fame was still coming together. Originally managed by Helmut Gorden, the group was eventually taken over by Pete Meaden. Meaden, a well-known music promoter, started out as the Who’s publicist, and also assisted with the Rolling Stones’ marketing.³⁴⁴ He was also one of the major influences that brought mod into the band’s image, and in 1971 he explained his reasoning for why he wanted to make the Who mod. “I had this dream of getting a group together that would be the focus, the entertainers for the Mods. They would be a group that would be the same people on stage as the

³⁴⁰ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 57.

³⁴¹ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 57.

³⁴² Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 57.

³⁴³ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 57.

³⁴⁴ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 60.

people in the audience.”³⁴⁵ This was a reason why they changed their name from the Who to the High Numbers, as at the time “number” was slang for a working-class mod. The group released only one record under this name: the single “Zoot Suit,” with “I’m the Face” on the B-side.³⁴⁶

The band that broke into America was completed on the managerial side when Kit Lambert and Chris Stamp took over management. Lambert discovered the group at the Railway Hotel in July 1964. A director, he was looking for a group for his next film. Stamp came to see the group play and had “never seen anything like it.”³⁴⁷ In August 1964, they officially take over, and one of their first actions was to revert the name of the group back to the Who.³⁴⁸ Lambert was also the person who bought Townshend recording equipment, allowing him to start composing material.³⁴⁹ Giving this opportunity to Townshend would allow him to develop his skills as a songwriter.

Also, this is where the group, specifically Townshend, started to adopt the auto-destruction aspect of their live performances. Townshend learned about auto-destruction as an art form when he was a student at Ealing Art College. According to John Atkins, “Auto-destruction is based on the premise that the material world is worthless and brings about its own decay and demise.”³⁵⁰ This means that by destroying their instruments at the end of the performance, the group was feeding into this idea that their work and instruments were ultimately worthless.

Auto destruction came with a price, as the equipment the Who were smashing was expensive. Daltrey recalled: “If we had gone down then [1964], we would have faced a debt of

³⁴⁵ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 60.

³⁴⁶ Marshall, with Townshend and Daltrey, 60.

³⁴⁷ Mark Wilkerson, *Who Are You: The Life of Pete Townshend* (London: Omnibus Press, 2009), chap. 2. Kindle.

³⁴⁸ John Atkins, *The Who on Record: A Critical History, 1963-1998* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., 2000), 37.

³⁴⁹ Wilkerson, chap. 2. Kindle.

³⁵⁰ Atkins, 38.

sixty thousand pounds [\$168,000]. We were getting fifty quid [\$140] a night, and Pete was smashing guitars worth two hundred pounds [\$560] and amps worth twice that. It took us three years to pay off those debts.”³⁵¹ The Who needed an American record producer, and that was Shel Talmy and Decca Records. Talmy had signed on the Kinks and produced two of their singles that ended up being big hits: “You Really Got Me” and “All Day and All of the Night.” He liked the demo of “I Can’t Explain” and decided to sign the Who.³⁵² The deal, however was not a good one for the Who, as they only received two and a half percent of the retail price, where as a typical royalty was four to six percent. With a deal like this, it was inevitable that it would cause problems in the future.³⁵³

The year 1965 saw the release of the Who’s first three singles. The first was “I Can’t Explain,” released one year into the British Invasion.³⁵⁴ The second one released was “Anyway, Anyhow, Anywhere,” and the third one, and probably one of the best known Who songs, was “My Generation.” Kit Lambert saw “Anyway, Anyhow, Anywhere” as a song containing pop art music, describing it as “The sounds of war and chaos and frustration expressed musically without the use of sound effects.”³⁵⁵ Unfortunately the songs did not do well in the *Billboard Top 100*, with “I Can’t Explain” reaching only 93, and “My Generation” reaching only number 74.³⁵⁶

This is where the group also introduced the idea of pop art into their music. As previously mentioned, the Who, every chance they got identified with pop art, and scholar Peter Stanfield effectively identified the pop art aspects of the Who. One element was the clothing. In an issue

³⁵¹ Dave Marsh, *Before I Get Old: The Story of The Who* (London: Plexus, 2015), 126.

³⁵² Marsh, 126-7.

³⁵³ Marsh, 128.

³⁵⁴ Andy Neill and Matt Kent, *Anyway, Anyhow, Anywhere: The Complete Chronicle of The Who, 1958-1978* (New York: Sterling Publishing, 2002), 44.

³⁵⁵ Neill and Kent, 46.

³⁵⁶ Nicholas Schaffner, *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 137.

of *Melody Maker* in 1965, Townshend said that pop art “is re-representing something the public is familiar with, in a different form... Like clothes.”³⁵⁷ What Townshend was referring to was the Union Jack suit he sometimes wore. Keith had a RAF shirt (the shirt with the target on it), and Townshend occasionally donned a jacket covered in medals. When it came to Townshend and pop art, Stanfield put it perfectly: “For Townshend, Pop Art in this instance is about the presentation of self through co-opting the symbols of authority.”³⁵⁸ In addition, when talking about the song “My Generation” Townshend said that the song is “Really pop-art. I wrote it with that intention. Not only is the number pop-art, the lyrics are ‘young and rebellious.’ It’s anti middle-age, anti-boss-class and anti-young marrieds!”³⁵⁹ In short, the Who surely identified as a pop art band.

The year 1966 could probably be described as a dire period for the Who, as they went through many different trials and tribulations both professionally and personally. The Who’s first studio album was released in the United States, even though it was out in Britain since 1965. *The Who Sings My Generation* saw many changes in the American release, the first and foremost being the name of the album. In Britain, it was simply known as *My Generation*. Released under the Decca label, one of the changes involved the album cover. The American cover was the group posed in front of the Westminster Clock Tower. Other changes came with the songs. In “The Kids are Alright,” a twenty-one second power chord solo was cut out, and “I’m a Man” was deleted entirely in favor of “circles,” which was titled “Instant Party.”³⁶⁰

³⁵⁷ Peter Stanfield, “The Who and Pop Art: The simple things you see are all complicated.” *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 29, no. 1 (March 2017): page 6 of 17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpms.12203> (accessed April 2, 2018).

³⁵⁸ Stanfield, page 6 of 17.

³⁵⁹ Stanfield, page 6 of 17.

³⁶⁰ Atkins, 60.

Personally for the group, there was a lot of internal conflict, and at times it looked like the band was going to break up. According to Richard Barnes, “Things were not well within the group and several fights and arguments later there was a possible breakaway from the group by Keith and John, who were planning to combine with two members of The Yardbirds to form a new group to be called Led Zeppelin – a name invented by John.”³⁶¹ It was not just Moon and Entwistle thinking about leaving. Daltrey had been considering jumping ship as well. As Townshend told *Zigzag*, “Roger was going to leave the group. It was just an amazing time in The Who’s career. We were more or less about to break up.”³⁶²

Professionally, 1966 presented a host of problems in dealing with their American record company, Decca Records. Pete Townshend put it bluntly in 1966 when he told *Zigzag* that record producer “Shel Talmy had to be gotten rid of.”³⁶³ The group took Talmy to court, but it was ultimately a losing battle. Allen Klein, who started out as an accountant but at the time represented the Rolling Stones, offered to help extract themselves from Talmy’s contract.³⁶⁴ Lambert and Stamp ended up settling with Talmy. They stayed with Decca on a renegotiated deal that gave them three times the royalties than were originally received. This however took Shel Talmy out of the picture.³⁶⁵

By the end of 1966, things were not looking too good for the Who’s prospects in America. They lost the court battle with Talmy, and with internal frictions between members, it seemed that the group was on the verge of disintegrating. In addition, the Beatles and the Rolling Stones were successful in the United States, and both bands enjoyed a massive and fiercely

³⁶¹ Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

³⁶² Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

³⁶³ Neill and Kent, 72.

³⁶⁴ Marsh, 175.

³⁶⁵ Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

dedicated fanbase. The Who, however were not so lucky, as they were known to have a formidable live act. Therefore, they were not easily marketable, and as such, only limited numbers of hardcore fans embraced their music. To make matters worse, Decca Records was not promoting them. Still though, the Who needed America to *survive*.³⁶⁶

The band's fortunes began to shift in 1967. The Who enjoyed an upward trend in America, but even so, 1967 was not without its struggles. The Who started to slowly make their name known in the United States, three years into the British Invasion. After the disaster with Decca Records, Lambert and Stamp formed their own record company, Track Records. Naturally, the Who were signed on by default, but only after Track signed on a young American guitarist, new to the rock scene: James Marshall Hendrix.³⁶⁷

As Townshend recounted in his memoirs, "The Who's first performance in the USA was almost an accidental event."³⁶⁸ The Who debuted on the *Murray the K* show, and according to close friend Richard Barnes, this was the band's big advance.³⁶⁹ However, this cost them lots of money as well, because Moon and Entwistle ran up charges at their hotel, and that alone reportedly exceeded the payment the *Murray the K* show paid them.³⁷⁰ Regardless, according to Wilkerson, "this first exposure in America was critical to their future success."³⁷¹

With the release of the album *Happy Jack* in the United States, a repackaged and retitled version of their British LP *A Quick One*, the Who nudged the door to the United States open slightly further to make way for their entrance. As one *Los Angeles Times* article put it when

³⁶⁶ Neill and Kent, 75.

³⁶⁷ Neill and Kent, 98.

³⁶⁸ Pete Townshend, *Who I Am: A Memoir* (Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers Ltd, 2012), chap. 9. Kindle.

³⁶⁹ Richard Barnes, *The Who: Maximum R&B* (London: Plexus, 1996), 45.

³⁷⁰ Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

³⁷¹ Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

discussing the group, their impact was only just starting to be felt in the United States, and when it came to *Happy Jack*, the article called it “an excellent album.”³⁷² Unfortunately, despite some seemingly good reviews, the album only reached number 67 on the *Billboard Top 100*.³⁷³

A breakthrough for the Who occurred on June 18, 1967 when they played at the Monterey Pop Music Festival. They played on the last night of the event, and when they finished their set, Wilkerson noted, “There was a momentary stunned silence before the crowd rose in waves to applaud. The Who had experienced their first breakthrough in the New World although they were displeased with their sound, as they hadn’t brought their own Marshall equipment over from England.”³⁷⁴ The Monterey Pop performance showed America how good the Who were live, and the event effectively launched the band’s thriving concert career in the United States.³⁷⁵

The critically acclaimed documentary *Monterey Pop*, produced by Lou Adler and John Phillips and directed by D.A. Pennebaker, chronicled the festival, featuring interviews with participants and footage of performances, including extended scenes of the Who. In the *Monterey Peninsular Herald*, one review noted, “The Who were effective as a crowd pleaser, but it seemed more theatrics than intense musical involvement. Jimi Hendrix outdid the Who by focusing his passions on his guitar.”³⁷⁶ A more flattering review appeared in the *San Francisco Examiner*: “The Who, the most impressive British group, has an out-a-sight drummer in Keith Moon. Their lyrics are imaginative, and they have a hard Beatles-Stones sound.”³⁷⁷ The

³⁷² Pete Johnson, “Popular Records: 2nd Helping of the Who,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 14, 1967.

³⁷³ Schaffner, 137.

³⁷⁴ Wilkerson, chap. 3. Kindle.

³⁷⁵ Atkins, 85.

³⁷⁶ Neill and Kent, 115.

³⁷⁷ Neill and Kent, 115.

documentary allowed many others to view the event and further spread the Who and their crazy onstage performances.

After the group played at Monterey Pop, they set out for a seven-week tour with Herman's Hermits.³⁷⁸ Pete Townshend summed up the experience in his memoirs:

We had no illusions of making any money on this tour. We just weren't very well known yet, and we were primarily playing in a support role. Many of the shows were less than half full; some were cancelled. I'm sure we collected a few fans on the way, and the word probably spread that we were a colourful, eccentric English outfit. But ten minutes on stage, a smoke bomb and smashed equipment says very little about what The Who hoped to become.³⁷⁹

Barnes echoed Townshend's sentiments, as he believed that this tour, while financially a disaster, significantly increased the group's exposure, and allowed them to lay the foundations for a fan base, "Kids were in shock originally, but after thinking about it and talking about it with their friends, a couple weeks later they realized what they saw."³⁸⁰

Yet along with the groundwork being laid, the Who needed a hit single. Townshend was holding one song back because he was certain that this song would be a guaranteed hit, "I Can See for Miles." Eventually, it would become the highest placing Who single in the top 100, rising to number 9 on the U.S. charts.³⁸¹ Townshend was disappointed it did not go higher in the charts.

Townshend's frustration deepened upon the release of *The Who Sell Out*. The album was unique in the sense that it was linked together by ads, and was meant to be a critique of the forces that had sustained the pop industry, and this was implicit in the title, as it makes it sound

³⁷⁸ Barnes, 46.

³⁷⁹ Townshend, chap. 10. Kindle.

³⁸⁰ Barnes, 46.

³⁸¹ Atkins, 90.

upon first hearing it that the Who “sold out” to become rich and famous.³⁸² Unfortunately, the reception was not as good as he had hoped it would be. “I felt certain that radio stations in the States would adore *The Who Sell Out* (italics added)- it was, after all, a tribute to their power and influence,” Townshend noted in his memoirs. “But Joe Bogart, director of WMCA, New York’s biggest radio station, called our album ‘disgusting’ and said he had ‘grave doubts anyone would play it.’”³⁸³ Wilkerson echoed similar sentiments, but ultimately the album did not fare well, reaching only number 48 on the American charts.³⁸⁴ To add further salt to the wound, the group was meant to appear on the famous *Ed Sullivan Show*, as the Beatles and Rolling Stones did before them, but unfortunately decided to drop out in support of a CBS newsreaders strike.³⁸⁵

While *The Ed Sullivan Show* did not work out, one last key television performance in 1967 for the Who that did come when they appeared on *The Smothers Brothers’ TV Show*. Tom and Dick Smothers had seen the Who at Monterey Pop and were impressed. The show was also ending after a three-season run, and they wanted to end off the series with a bang, and sure enough they did.³⁸⁶ The plan was to have a small amount of explosives in Keith Moon’s drum kit go off at the end of the set. Moon, however, had more grandiose plans. He bribed some of the stagehands to overload the drum with flash powder. When the number finished, the “official” amount of powder went off, causing a round of applause, then Moon’s addition exploded, causing a massive bang, singeing Townshend’s hair, damaging his hearing, and sending a shard of cymbal into Moon, cutting his leg.³⁸⁷ The shocking event came to symbolize the Who’s

³⁸² Atkins, 97.

³⁸³ Townshend, chap. 11. Kindle.

³⁸⁴ Wilkerson, chap. 4. Kindle.

³⁸⁵ Neill and Kent, 108.

³⁸⁶ Barnes, 47.

³⁸⁷ Barnes, 47.

outrageous stage theatrics, and was featured prominently in the opening of the 1979 Who rockumentary, *The Kids Are Alright*.³⁸⁸

By this time, the Who's standing was fading in Britain for multiple reasons: they were difficult to categorize, not fitting neatly into underground or commercial pop; their singles had been disappointments; and with their overseas touring, other groups like Cream and Jimi Hendrix were challenging their spotlight. Now more than ever, the Who needed America to keep them alive.³⁸⁹ "They were too much in debt," wrote George Tremlett. "In one interview with me, Daltrey had said that their total debts had risen to around £100,000."³⁹⁰

The Who continued touring in 1968, especially in the United States. As Roger Daltrey told Gary Herman, "I think it was America that really brought us together. It was like the four of us and a couple of road managers on a desert island, so we just had to come together 'cause there was nobody else."³⁹¹ The Who were slowly on the rise, but still not to the extent that they maybe hoped. As an article in the *Hartford Courant* noted, "In Britain, The Who are one of the top groups, but in America they are lost in the maze of pop music. Only four or five of their records have been released this side of the Atlantic, and their albums are not top sellers."³⁹² Yet, it seemed like maybe they were finally gaining traction in the States, according to an article from *The Washington Post, Times Herald*: "The Who... is popular back home, but it has never really fired audiences here. If Sunday night's crowd response was any indication, that may not be true much longer."³⁹³ The Who were working on building their fan base, and slowly, it was building,

³⁸⁸ *The Kids Are Alright (1979)*, online video, directed by Jeff Stein (United Kingdom, 1979) https://archive.org/details/TheWhotheKids_are_alrightfilm1979.

³⁸⁹ Wilkerson, chap. 4. Kindle.

³⁹⁰ Wilkerson, chap. 4. Kindle.

³⁹¹ Neill and Kent, 133.

³⁹² Henry McNulty, "They Self-Destruct on Stage," *The Hartford Courant*, Jul 27, 1968.

³⁹³ Jim Hoagland, "Smashing Guitar Concert's High Note," *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Apr 2, 1968.

but as Pete Townshend told Melody Maker, “The States offers us more money, fans, and excitement.”³⁹⁴ It came to a point where the Who needed America to survive.

The result of the Herman’s Hermits tour was not a positive one, and the financial consequences put the Who into even more debt. “The financial picture was bleak,” Townshend later observed. “As I’d guessed, the Hermits tour had actually cost us money... and we were spending money on recording.”³⁹⁵ It did not help that on a regular basis, band members destroyed their equipment. Auto-destruction had become a key component to the Who’s live performances, and naturally with that, the group needed to purchase new equipment, putting a strain on their finances.

“The Who were also realising that we too needed something very special if we were ever to succeed in a major way,” Townshend added.³⁹⁶ This “very special” something Townshend started to discuss in his 1968 *Rolling Stone* interview with Jann Wenner. When Wenner asked what other ideas Townshend had, he replied,

Well, the album concept in general is complex... But it’s derived as a result of quite a few things. We’ve been talking about doing an opera; we’ve been talking about doing like albums, we’ve been talking about a whole lot of things, and what has basically happened is that we’ve condensed all of these ideas, all this energy and all these gimmicks, and whatever we’ve decided on for future albums, into one juicy package. The package I hope is going to be called “Deaf, Dumb and Blind Boy.” It’s a story about a kid that’s born deaf, dumb and blind and what happens to him throughout his life. The deaf, dumb and blind boy is played by The Who, the musical entity. He’s represented musically, represented by a theme which we play, which starts off the opera itself and then there’s a song describing the deaf, dumb and blind boy.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁴ Neill and Kent, 134.

³⁹⁵ Townshend, chap. 10. Kindle.

³⁹⁶ Townshend, chap. 10. Kindle.

³⁹⁷ Pete Townshend, “Pete Townshend Talks Mods, Recording, and Smashing Guitars,” interview by Jann S. Wenner, *Rolling Stone Magazine* (September 14, 1968) <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/news/pete-townshend-the-rolling-stone-interview-part-one-19680914> (accessed April 10, 2018).

This was the original concept for *Tommy*, the album that would eventually give the Who the break they needed. The group as well started to receive some attention in 1968 from *Rolling Stone* outside of the interview as Wenner also awarded the Who “Group of the Year,” which according to Andy Neill and Matt Kent was “a supreme accolade coming from an influential rock paper.”³⁹⁸

“Effectively, 1969 signalled the end of Who ‘Mark One’ and the transformation of a Mod, Op-Art, pop art, quasi-psychedelic singles band into a bonafide ‘rock’ act,” noted authors Andy Neill and Matt Kent.³⁹⁹ Throughout the early and mid-1960s, the Who recorded mostly singles, with the three albums they released in the States not gaining any major traction. This changed as this was the year the Who were finally able to thrive in the American music scene, and this was due to the release of their album *Tommy*. According to John Atkins, “*Tommy* brought fame, adulation, wealth, and critical acclaim and put the final touch to The Who’s growing aura of mystery and superiority.”⁴⁰⁰

Thomas Willis described *Tommy* as the next landmark album, putting it in the same vein as The Beatles *Revolver* and *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*.⁴⁰¹ John Mendelsohn of the *Los Angeles Times* echoed similar sentiments, noting that, “the group recently completed and released what many critics have acknowledged as one of rock’s most brilliant accomplishments.”⁴⁰² In *The New York Times*, Nik Cohn stated, “*Tommy* is just possibly the most important work that anyone has yet done in rock.”⁴⁰³ *Tommy* also united the band like never

³⁹⁸ Neill and Kent, 133.

³⁹⁹ Neill and Kent, 152.

⁴⁰⁰ Atkins, 23.

⁴⁰¹ Thomas Willis, “Records: The Best of The Who: a ‘Rock Opera’ with Lyrics Called ‘Tommy,’” *Chicago Tribune*, Jun 8, 1969.

⁴⁰² John Mendelsohn, “The Who Still Rocking the Music Scene,” *Los Angeles Times*, Sep 21, 1969.

⁴⁰³ Nik Cohn, “‘Tommy,’ The Who’s Pinball Opera,” *New York Times*, May 18, 1969.

before. In the 2007 rockumentary *Amazing Journey: The Story of The Who*, Daltrey discussed how when he took up the mantle of playing Tommy, he started to feel accepted in the band again. Townshend described this newfound unity as a good marriage, as they became balanced when playing.⁴⁰⁴

Kit Lambert also greatly contributed to *Tommy* as he provided some invaluable input. Chris Stamp recalled that “[*Tommy*] was falling all over the place. It was just not coming together and that’s when Kit wrote a script.”⁴⁰⁵ Townshend also acknowledges Lambert’s contributions to the project: “Kit was much more involved in the overall concept of the thing – much more than people imagine. Not all that much, in fact, with the overall sound, although he did produce it and mix it and he did make us work at it.”⁴⁰⁶ Lambert’s contributions to the project that would vault the Who to the top of the charts shows how important a manager can be to a band.

In August 1969, the Who played at Woodstock, but it took the organizers a lot of prodding to get the group there. Concert planners decided they needed one more key act to round out the roster, and after repeated efforts to lobby Townshend, he broke down and said they would come play Woodstock.⁴⁰⁷ The group was not pleased by the event. All of the drinks backstage were spiked with acid, and their set was delayed. However, they walked on stage before a crowd of hundreds of thousands, and they played memorably, finishing their set as the sun rose.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁴ *Amazing Journey: The Story of The Who* (2007), online video, directed by Paul Crowder and Murray Lerner (2007) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b1Ia4N4EQhw> (accessed April 17, 2018). Note that this YouTube link is part 1 of 2 of the documentary.

⁴⁰⁵ Wilkerson, chap. 5. Kindle.

⁴⁰⁶ Wilkerson, chap. 5. Kindle.

⁴⁰⁷ Wilkerson, chap. 5. Kindle.

⁴⁰⁸ Wilkerson, chap. 5. Kindle.

Further raising the stock of the Who was the rockumentary on Woodstock. *Woodstock: Three Days of Peace and Love* had footage from the three-day event, including the Who, and this allowed further exposure for the band. In 1987, Pete Townshend recalled how the Woodstock movie caused the “See Me, Feel Me” chorus to become a real anthem for the hippie dream.⁴⁰⁹ Townshend also recalled when he met director Michael Wadleigh and how Wadleigh had done some great work for the Who sequence in the movie.⁴¹⁰ In his memoirs, Townshend recalled how important Woodstock was not just for The Who, but for everyone who played at this legendary event:

It would be some time before we realised that our Woodstock performance, which might easily have never happened, would elevate us into American rock aristocracy, where we would remain year after year, even into the twenty-first century. It wasn't just The Who; everyone who performed at Woodstock enjoyed mythic status once the film was released.⁴¹¹

The film ingrained the acts of Woodstock into the popular culture, and the movie allowed a much wider audience to watch these legendary performances.

By 1970, the Who had managed to climb their way to the top echelon of rock and roll in the United States. With the unfortunate breakup of the Beatles, the Who stepped into the void to compete with the likes of the Rolling Stones and others. Throughout the 1960s, the group had their trials, and tribulations, but ultimately, the Who succeeded for multiple reasons. Of utmost importance, the Who managed to score a top-five album with the release of *Tommy*. *Tommy* elevated the Who to new heights of success, selling over 100,000 copies in the United States in the first two weeks.

⁴⁰⁹ Wilkerson, chap. 5. Kindle.

⁴¹⁰ Wilkerson, chap. 6. Kindle.

⁴¹¹ Townshend, chap. 12. Kindle.

The road to success was rough for the Who, but eventually, they reached fame and continued that trend into the 1970s. The development of Townshend as an expert songwriter, their appearance on two major documentaries of the era via Monterey Pop and Woodstock, their eventual top five hit with *Tommy*, the ability to take a different direction and evolve from their mod/pop art phase, and their managers Kit Lambert and Chris Stamp who grew with them and encouraged them, allowed the Who to reach the success so many other bands of the British Invasion dreamed, but ultimately fell short of.

CONCLUSION

The British Invasion of the 1960s brought multiple bands from Great Britain to American soil. The Beatles, the Rolling Stones, the Who, Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, and the Dave Clark Five were part of the first wave, starting in 1964 through to 1969. The major distinction between these bands is that only a few managed to achieve lasting traction in the United States. This thesis identified five key reasons that aided these bands in maintaining support and success in America. Outstanding songwriters, the ability to adapt to changing times, era-defining hits, the use of film and television, and effective managers all contributed to the lasting successes, and ultimate rock canonization, of the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and the Who.

The songwriting talent that emerged from these three groups helped push the Beatles, the Stones, and the Who to new heights of mainstream enduring influence. The Beatles' John Lennon and Paul McCartney, the Stones' Mick Jagger and Keith Richards, and the Who's Pete Townshend all excelled at their craft, and the original music they created allowed them to stand above their contemporaries. Along with songwriting, the ability to adapt their music to better fit with the changing tastes of American society gave the Beatles, the Stones, and the Who the ability to add complexity and nuance to their music and move away from a simpler pop sound. Also, era-defining hits that stand out as classics upon their release gave the groups a big boost. The Beatles' *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band*, the Stones' *Beggars Banquet*, and the Who's *Tommy* all received massive critical acclaim and success immediately upon release and brought new ideas that challenged the current musical structure.

Influential films such as the Beatles' *A Hard Day's Night* (1964) and *Help!* (1965), the Stones' *One Plus One/Sympathy for the Devil* (1968), and the Who's appearances on the critically acclaimed documentaries *Monterey Pop* (1968) and *Woodstock: Three Days of Peace and Love* (1970) gave audiences access to their music outside of live performances and albums. Lastly, shrewd managers contributed greatly to the exposure of each band. The Who's managers Kit Lambert and Chris Stamp and The Stones' Andrew Loog Oldham encouraged Pete Townshend and Jagger and Richards, respectively to write their own material. Thanks to shrewd negotiating, Brian Epstein helped take the Beatles from unknown quantity to worldwide phenomenon with his influence, especially with regards to their style, appearance and manners.

Yet in contrast, Gerry and the Pacemakers, the Yardbirds, the Animals, the Zombies, and the Dave Clark Five did not find the same lasting success. Where the Beatles, the Stones, and the Who possessed all five of the abovementioned factors, these less influential five bands lacked a enough of them to prevent them from maintaining the initial success they enjoyed after charting a first hit in the United States. The Yardbirds' and the Animals' managers, Giorgio Gomelsky and Mike Jeffery respectively, did not meet the needs of their groups and mismanaged their money. Both groups, as well, did not develop the same songwriting prowess that the Big Three. Gerry and the Pacemakers and the Dave Clark Five never left the early beat pop music sounds of the mid-sixties, where the Big Three grew with the changing sixties and adapted their music accordingly. The Zombies were close, but with the failure of *Odyssey and Oracle* upon its release, the group's general dissatisfaction with recording, and songwriter Rod Argent going solo, the group dissolved at the end of 1969.

There is still much history to explore in the British Invasion, with many more bands beyond the ones discussed here in decades that span beyond the 1960s. Also, an examination of

American bands whose worldwide acclaim and commercial success coincided with the events of the British Invasion would offer additional context that would deepen our understanding of this crucial crossroads of popular culture. Regardless, the study of music history to help understand American social and cultural history in any decade is still underdeveloped, and the hope is that this thesis will provide ideas, inspiration, and show that music history intertwines with other types of history and should be considered as way to understand not just the United States in the 1960s, but anywhere and anytime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amazing Journey: The Story of The Who (2007). Online video. Directed by Paul Crowder and Murray Lerner. 2007. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b1Ia4N4EQhw>.

Anthony, Ted. *Chasing the Rising Son: The Journey of an American Song*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007.

Atkins, John. *The Who On Record: A Critical History, 1963-1998*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2000.

Barnes, Richard. *The Who: Maximum R&B*. London: Plexus, 1996.

Bowman, Rob. "Into the Pressure Cooker." In *According to The Rolling Stones*, edited by Dora Loewenstein and Philip Dood, 106-9. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2003.

Brackett, David. *The Pop, Rock, and Soul Reader: Histories and Debates*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Bronson, Harold. *My British Invasion: The Inside Story on The Yardbirds, The Dave Clark Five, Manfred Mann, Herman's Hermits, The Hollies, The Troggs, The Kinks, The Zombies, and More*. Los Angeles: Rare Bird Books, 2017. Kindle.

Clayson, Alan. *The Yardbirds: The Band That Launched Eric Clapton, Jeff Beck, Jimmy Page*. San Francisco: Backbeat Books, 2002.

Cleave, Maureen. "'How Does a Beatle Live?' John Lennon Lives Like This," *London Evening Standard*, March 4, 1966. In *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles*,

Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter, edited by June Skinner Sawyers, 87-91. New York: Penguin, 2006.

David Dalton, David. *Rolling Stones: The First Twenty Years*. Edited by David Dalton. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.

----- “Pictures of Us Through The Steamy Haze.” In *The Rolling Stones: The First Twenty Years*, edited by David Dalton, 105-6. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.

Egan, Sean. *Animal Tracks – Updated and Expanded: The Story of The Animals: Newcastle’s Rising Sons*. n.p.: Askill Publishing, 2012. Kindle.

-----. *The Rough Guide to The Rolling Stones*. London: Rough Guides, 2006.

Fricke David, and Robert Christgau. “50 Essential Albums of 1967.” *Rolling Stone* (September 19, 2017) <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-lists/50-essential-albums-of-1967-198515/the-rolling-stones-flowers-198807/>.

Gildart, Keith. *Images of England Through Popular Music: Class, Youth, and Rock ‘n’ Roll, 1955-1976*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Glynn, Stephen. *The British Pop Music Film: The Beatles and Beyond*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Goldsmith, Martin. “The Beatles come to America.” In *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, edited by June Skinner Sawyers, 48-50. New York: Penguin, 2006.

Gould, Jonathan. *Can't Buy Me Love: The Beatles, Britain, and America*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2007.

Harry, Bill. *The British Invasion: How The Beatles and Other UK Bands Conquered America*. Surrey, UK: Chrome Dreams, 2004.

Hertsgaard, Mark. “‘The Breakup Heard ’Round the World’: from *A Day in the Life: The Music and Artistry of the Beatles*.” In *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, edited by June Skinner Sawyers, 158-163. New York: Penguin, 2006.

Isserman, Maurice, and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Let it Be (1970). Online Video. directed by Michael Lindsey Hogg. 1970.
https://archive.org/details/LetItBe_724.

Lifton, Dave. “The Day the Beatles Hired Allen Klein as Their Manager.” *Ultimate Classic Rock*. <http://ultimateclassicrock.com/beatles-hire-allen-klein-as-manager/> (accessed August 4, 2018).

Marsh, Dave. *Before I Get Old: The Story of The Who*. London: Plexus, 2015.

Marshall, Ben, with Pete Townshend and Roger Daltrey. *The Who: The Official History*. New York, Harper Design, 2015.

Martin, George, with William Pearson. *With a Little Help From My Friends: The Making of Sgt. Pepper*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1994.

McMillian, John. *Beatles vs. Stones*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2013.

Miles, Barry. *The British Invasion*. New York: Sterling, 2009.

Millard, André. *Beatlemania: Technology, Business, and Teen Culture in Cold War America*. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

Neill, Andy, and Matt Kent. *Anyway, Anyhow, Anywhere: The Complete Chronicle of The Who, 1958-1978*. New York: Sterling Publishing, 2002.

Newsweek. "Beatlemania," November 18, 1963. In *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, edited by June Skinner Sawyers, 43-4. New York: Penguin, 2006.

Norman, Philip. *Sympathy For The Devil: The Rolling Stones Story*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984.

------. *The Stones*. Oxford: Pan Books, 2002.

O'Donnell, Jim. "'The Afternoon Hours' from *The Day John Met Paul*." In *Read the Beatles: Classic and New Writings on the Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*, edited by June Skinner Sawyers, 5-9. New York: Penguin, 2006.

O'Grady, Terence J. *The Beatles: A Musical Evolution*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983.

Paino, Troy D. *Social History of the United States: The 1960s*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC Clio, 2009.

- Rolling Stone. "500 Greatest Albums of All Time." *Rolling Stone* (May 31, 2012)
<https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-lists/500-greatest-albums-of-all-time-156826/the-zombies-odessey-and-oracle-172848/>.
- Rolling Stones, Jools Holland, and Dora Loewenstein. *The Rolling Stones: A Life on the Road*. New York: Penguin Studio, 1998.
- Russo, Greg. *Yardbirds: The Ultimate Rave-up*. Floral Park, NY: Crossfire Publications, 1998.
- Sandford, Christopher. *The Rolling Stones: Fifty Years*. London: Simon & Schuster, 2012.
- Sawyers, June Skinner, ed. *Read The Beatles: Classic and New Writings on The Beatles, Their Legacy, and Why They Still Matter*. New York: Penguin, 2006.
- Schaffner, Nicholas. *The British Invasion: From the First Wave to the New Wave*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.
- Selvin, Joe. *Altamont: The Rolling Stones, the Hells Angels, and the Inside Story of Rock's Darkest Day*. New York: Harper Collins, 2016.
- Stanfield, Peter. "The Who and Pop Art: The simple things you see are all complicated." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 29, no. 1 (March 2017): 17 pages.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jpms.12203>.
- Strong, MC. "The Dave Clark Five Biography." *The Great Rock Bible*.
<http://thegreatrockbible.com/portfolio-item/the-dave-clark-five-biography/>.
- The Beatles at Shea Stadium* (1966). Online Video. Directed by Bob Precht (1966).
<https://vimeo.com/67634284>.

The Beatles: Eight Days A Week- The Touring Years (2016). Online Video. Directed by Ron Howard. 2016. <https://www.watchonline.red/the-beatles-eight-days-a-week-the-touring-years-2016-watch-online/>.

The Beatles. "The Beatles on the Ed Sullivan Show, 9th February 1964, performing 'I Want To Hold Your Hand.'" Filmed February 1964. YouTube video, 0:56. Posted February 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=It3Cctk6BRs>.

The Beatles Bible. "Live: Candlestick Park, San Francisco: The Beatles' final concert." *The Beatles Bible*. <https://www.beatlesbible.com/1966/08/29/candlestick-park-san-francisco-final-concert/> (accessed August 3, 2018).

The Dave Clark Five and Beyond: Glad All Over (2014). TV Movie. Directed by Dave Clark. 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfOlijx0tZU&t=34s>.

The Kids Are Alright (1979). Online video. Directed by Jeff Stein. United Kingdom, 1979. https://archive.org/details/TheWhotheKids_are_alrightfilm1979.

The Rolling Stones, Jools Holland, and Dora Loewenstein. *The Rolling Stones: A Life on the Road*. New York: Penguin Studio, 1998.

Townshend, Pete. "Pete Townshend Talks Mods, Recording, and Smashing Guitars." Interview by Jann S. Wenner. *Rolling Stone Magazine* (September 14, 1968) <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/news/pete-townshend-the-rolling-stone-interview-part-one-19680914>.

Townshend, Pete. *Who I Am: A Memoir*. Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers Ltd, 2012. Kindle.

Turner, Steve. *Beatles '66: The Revolutionary Year*. n.p.: Ecco publishing, 2016. Kindle.

Wilkerson, Mark. *Who Are You: The Life of Pete Townshend*. London: Omnibus Press, 2009.
Kindle.

APPENDIX: NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Archer, Eugene. "The Screen: 'Ferry Cross the Mersey': New Film Stars Gerry and the Pacemakers." *New York Times*, Feb 20, 1965.

Baker, Robb. "The Sound: Rolling Stones Ooze in Latest: 'Let It Bleed.'" *Chicago Tribune*, Dec 14, 1969.

Bassett, Pamela. "Young Fans Dig English Yardbirds." *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 12, 1966.

Bell, Charles W. "Stones in Crises, Keep Rolling Along." *Los Angeles Times*, Jan 2, 1968.

Bernstein, Carl. "Rolling Stones: Contempt for Just About Everything Except Music." *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Jan 12, 1969.

Caldwell, Marilyn. "DC5 Keep on Rolling Along." *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 29, 1965.

----- . "Yardbirds Find Own Style in the Far Out." *Los Angeles Times*, Feb 26, 1966.

Champlin, Charles. "Rolling Stones Ready to Go Into Orbit: Rolling Stones Ready to Go Into Own Orbit." *Los Angeles Times*, Dec 10, 1965.

Chicago Tribune. "Visitors from British Isles: Beatle-Like Group Is Mobbed by Girls Chicago Tribune." *Chicago Tribune*, Jun 7, 1964.

Cohn, Nik. "A Briton Blasts The Beatles: Briton Blasts." *New York Times*, Dec 15, 1968.

----- . "'Tommy,' The Who's Pinball Opera." *New York Times*, May 18, 1969.

Crowther, Bosley. "Neighborhood Houses Show 'Wild Weekend.'" *New York Times*, Aug 19, 1965.

----- . "Screen: Beatles Star in 'Help!', Film of the Absurd." *New York Times*, Aug 24, 1965.

Dallos, Robert E. "Beatles Strike Serious Note in Press Talk: Group Opposes the War in Vietnam as Being 'Wrong.'" *New York Times*, Aug 23, 1966.

Deppa, Joan. "The Rise And Fall Of The Beatles: The Pop Boom Poops Slowly." *The Chicago Defender (National edition)*, Nov 26, 1966.

Gardner, Paul. "3,000 Fans Greet The Beatles." *New York Times*, Feb 8, 1964.

Goldstein, Richards. "Recordings: We Still Need the Beatles, but..." *New York Times*, Jun 18, 1967.

Harford, Margaret. "A Tame 'Wild Weekend.'" *Los Angeles Times*, Oct 22, 1965.

Hilburn, Robert. "Beatles Are Back in Top Form." *Los Angeles Times*, Oct 26, 1969.

----- . "Farewell Present From Stones: Farewell Present From the Stones." *Los Angeles Times*, Dec 14, 1969.

Hoagland, Jim. "Smashing Guitar Concert's High Note." *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Apr 2, 1968.

Jahn, Mike. "'Abbey Road' by Beatles Marked by Moderation." *New York Times*, Oct 4, 1969.

----- . "First Beatles Album in a Year Is Here." *New York Times*, Nov 21, 1968.

Johnson, Pete. "Latest Stones Album Best Yet." *Los Angeles Times*, Feb 26, 1967.

----- . “Popular Records: Animals Calling It Quits After U.S. Tour.” *Los Angeles Times*, Sep 4, 1966.

----- . “Popular Records: 2nd Helping of the Who.” *Los Angeles Times*, May 14, 1967.

Los Angeles Times. “Brian Jones Quits Rolling Stones.” *Los Angeles Times*, Jun 12, 1969.

----- . “Too Potent To Forget: Beatlemania Ending; Echo Lingers On.” *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 19, 1966.

McNulty, Henry. “They Self-Destruct on Stage.” *The Hartford Courant*, Jul 27, 1968.

Mendelsohn, John. “The Who Still Rocking the Music Scene.” *Los Angeles Times*, Sep 21, 1969.

New York Times. “300 Teen-Agers Welcome The Animals, Singing Group.” *New York Times*, Sep 3, 1964.

Phillips, B. J. “Rolling Stones: Conjuring a Heavy Spell: Rolling Stones.” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Nov 27, 1969.

Rice, Bill. “The Beatles Pull a Fast One; It’s a Fine, Funny Film.” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Aug 14, 1964.

Sterritt, David. “Stones whoop up a ‘Banquet’: The pop scene.” *The Christian Science Monitor*, Feb 20, 1969.

Stone, Leonard W. “Beatles Need ‘Help.’” *The Hartford Courant*, Aug 29, 1965.

The Boston Globe. “Dave Clark Five, Beatles Toppers, Coming in June.” *Boston Globe*, May 16, 1964.

Thompson, Howard. "Teen-agers Howl for the Animals: 5 Beatlelike Britons Come to the Paramount." *New York Times*, Sep 5, 1964.

Tinee, Mae. "Beatle Film Chaotic, but is Good Fun: 'A Hard Day's Night.'" *Chicago Tribune*, Sep 3, 1964.

United Press International. "Beatle Quote Brings a Hard Day's Night." *Los Angeles Times*, Aug 5, 1966.

Willis, Thomas. "Records: The Best of The Who: a 'Rock Opera' with Lyrics Called 'Tommy.'" *Chicago Tribune*, Jun 8, 1969.

Woods, William C. "Stones' Age: Music Stones' Age." *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, Nov 28, 1969.