


## Beatles vs. Stones

*John McMillian*

*ebooks | Download PDF | \*ePub | DOC | audiobook*



[Download](#)

[Read Online](#)

#409126 in Books McMillian John 2014-11-11 2014-11-11 Original language: English PDF # 1 8.37 x .80 x 5.50l, .66 #File Name: 143915970X320 pages Beatles vs Stones | File size: 30.Mb

**John McMillian : Beatles vs. Stones** before purchasing it in order to gauge whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised Beatles vs. Stones:

0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. Disappointing to fans of how their music was made. By Paul CoolA disappointing book. There is no subtitle, but it might have been Lennon, sometimes McCartney, rarely Harrison, and a virtually absent Starr tee off against Jagger, Jones, a sometime Richards, and a virtually absent Wyman and Watts. This book is largely about the press and public image of the perceived personalities, love lives, drug hijinks, and often

misfiring political toe-dipping of the two groups, or rather Lennon, Jagger, Jones, and sometimes McCartney. It is good for explaining that the "rough edged" Stones actually came from better backgrounds than the economically hard pressed Beatles youths. The roles of Epstein and Oldham in raising them to the heights they deserved are explored. It is only secondarily about the music, both groups reason for being. The Rolling Stones ambitions to play catch-up to the remarkable Beatles is here, but precious little. The author does hammer on the point that the Stones were inspired by the Beatles evolution from Rubber Soul through Revolver to Sergeant Pepper, and back again through their later albums, notably the harder rocking White Album. The Beatles did Rubber Soul, so the Stones did Aftermath in reply, playing catch-up. Sergeant Pepper was indeed answered by the clearly inferior Their Satanic Majesties Request. But there is no mention of the fact that the Beatles, and especially Paul, was equally driven to play catchup to Brian Wilson of the Beach Boys. And a band does not just knock out Aftermath, with its Mothers Little Helper (UK version), Paint It Black (US version), Under My Thumb (both versions, and marked by one of their greatest musical arrangements ever), Out of Time (UK version), Stupid Girl (both albums), etc. A band can be driven by the achievements of another. It does not mean it can respond in similar quality. How did the Beatles and Rolling Stones do it, how, as musicians, did they keep the rivalry going? What role did Watts and Wyman play, for example, in providing the bottom to the singing, guitar playing, and musical leaps of a healthy if seriously declining Jones? These and similar questions regarding the music of these two foremost British bands of the 60s are of very little interest to the author. But we do get the dirt, most of it published elsewhere. Unless you are most interested in the origins and the dirt, pass this one by.

0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. Rockin'By Bevinadel ReyGot this for my dad, who's in his late 60's and loves this era of music as well as the Beatles and the Stones individually, as a gift. He loveeeeee it and talks about it all the time. Really in-depth comparison/analysis of not just the two bands but their place in rock n' roll history and their impact on the social scene/popular culture. Get it!

0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. So many great stories and tidbitsBy Tara HurleyMcMillian is such a great story teller, so enthralling! This book is packed with countless amazing stories you've probably never heard before, and some very keen and well-researched insight into both bands, their relation to one another, and the cultures that surrounded them.

A lively examination of the most legendary (and least understood) rivalry in the annals of rock n roll: Beatles vs. Stones is one of the best rock biographies I have seen this yearIf you thought you knew everything there was to know about these two groups, think again (Seattle Post-Intelligencer).In the 1960s an epic battle was waged between the two biggest bands in the worldthe lovable Beatles and the bad-boy Rolling Stones. Both groups liked to maintain that they werent really rivalsthat was just a media myth, they politely saidand yet they plainly competed for commercial success and aesthetic credibility. On both sides of the Atlantic, fans often aligned themselves with one group or the other. In Beatles vs. Stones, John McMillian gets to the truth behind the ultimate rock and roll debate. Painting an eye-opening portrait of a generation dragged into an ideological battle between Flower Power and New Left militance, McMillian reveals how the Beatles-Stones rivalry was created by music managers intent on engineering a moneymaking empire. He explores how the Beatles were marketed as cute and amiable, when in fact they came from hardscrabble backgrounds in Liverpool. By contrast, the Stones were cast as an edgy, dangerous group, even though they mostly hailed from the chic London suburbs. For many years, writers and historians have associated the Beatles with the gauzy idealism of the good sixties, placing the Stones as representatives of the dangerous and nihilistic bad sixties. Beatles vs. Stones is balanced, informed, yet still passionateEven the most gnarled and intransigent veterans of the debate will emerge enlightened by this book.McMillian negotiates these thickets with insight, care, and a willingness to unsettle clichs (The New York Times Book Review).

From Publishers WeeklyAn assistant professor of history at Georgia State University, McMillian has created what amounts to an extended compare-and-contrast essay by juxtaposing the careers of the two greatest rock 'n' roll bands of the 20th century. He hopes to uncover whether these two bands were rivals or allies, and whether the Beatles were truly the good boys and the Stones were really the bad boys as each was respectively portrayed. McMillian builds a case for both sides of each argument, using existing interviews, an impressive bibliography, and some little-known sources. While the history of both bands is oft-covered territory, the author turns up some great nuggets, like the true origins of the Beatles' name; police information about one of the Stones' famous drug busts; and how Mick Jagger and Keith Richards wrote their first song together. In the end, McMillian has written an informative look at music's image machinea powerful combination of media, marketing, and celebrity. (Oct.)From BooklistIt was the greatest rivalry in popular music: in one corner, the eclectic pop of the amiable Beatles; in the other, the raunchy blues-based rock of the sullen Rolling Stones. But the truth lies somewhere in between, as McMillian notes, since the Beatles were not as nice as they were supposed to be, nor were the Stones as thuggish as their reputation seemed to indicate. McMillian maintains that the gap between private reality and public facade was humongous. In this pleasurable romp through popular-music history, McMillian discusses what set the two groups apart and what brought them together. The rivalry between the two groups was real enough, but so was their mutual respect. And despite appearances to the contrary (Sgt. Pepper vs. Their Satanic Majesties Request, or Revolution vs. Street Fighting Man), their recording output wasnt

always tit for tat either. Eventually each band went its own way. The Beatles broke up while at the top of their game while the Stones continue to tour. Fans of both groups will enjoy this musical duel. --June Sawyers Balanced, informed, yet still passionate . . . Even the most gnarled and intransigent veterans of the Beatles-Stones debates will emerge enlightened by this book. . . . [McMillian] negotiates these thickets with insight, care, and a willingness to unsettle clichs. (Anthony DeCurtis, The New York Times Book )"Smart, fantastically gossipy, and utterly compelling . . . The best parts of McMillian's story are his careful re-creations of various Beatles-Stones interactions" (Tom Bissell, Harper's)Fun and eye-opening . . . If you thought you knew everything there was to know about these two groups, think again. . . . John McMillian has done something I thought was no longer possible. He has written a book with a fresh perspective about these rock legends. . . . Beatles vs. Stones is one of the best rock biographies I have seen this year." (Seattle Post-Intelligencer)Engaging . . . Nuanced . . . McMillian uses historical rigor to pull this conversation out from the jaws of celebrity memoir. His account pulls no punches, and injects new vitality into a well-worn subject. . . . McMillian's greatest success here is his ability to dispense with the tidy, nostalgia-soaked versions of the counterculture that are so prevalent in rock history. (Salon)What is there that's left to be said about such a tired debate in 2013? As it turns out, there's still plenty to be said. . . . Beatles vs. Stones takes on a wholly different angle on how the greatest rock 'n' roll rivalry of all time was fostered by the fans, the music industry, the media, and by the bands themselves. By bringing to light mounds of source materials that most scholars and critics have never mined, namely the alternative newspapers and fan magazines of the late '60s and early '70s, McMillian taps into the stories of both bands as they unfold. By tracing their evolutions, side-by-side, as they appeared in the underground publications of the times, McMillian offers fresh insight into the dynamics of both groups as they grew and changed, with a real-time and palpable sense of excitement. (Creative Loafing)Incisive . . . Masterful . . . McMillian works a certain magic here. . . . Beatles vs. Stones is the best kind of pop culture study, revivifying familiar material while stimulating the reader to question his own assumptions and tastes. (American Spectator)A delightful read . . . I've no idea whether universities still offer classes on the great rock and roll acts of the 60s and 70s, but McMillian's Beatles vs. Stones ought to be included in any such curriculum. (Russ Smith, Splicetoday.com)