

## Beatles vs Rolling Stones

## Beatles vs Rolling Stones

### **Introduction**

Half a century ago, any young man who begins to brave the world of Rock 'n' Roll, sooner or later, comes to a halt: Beatles or Rolling Stones? A question as old as time (if time was around 50 years old). A question that has perpetually divided girls, boys, flora and fauna across the globe. Initially inflated by the strategies of the groups themselves, the dispute about the supremacy in the rock realm is part of the imagination of generations and generations, sparking heated debate. Disregarding trivial topics such as album sales, tour receipts and Facebook likes (the contemporary currency of popularity), we delve into the creative crux of these musical monoliths and discover for once and all who is the bigger cheese (Bennett, 2009).

### **Discussion**

In music, comparisons are already complicated because, for more than two bands are similar, they will always have their particularities and it is forgotten when they want to put the two on the same level. Worse still is compared with a band size of the Beatles. No matter who the other side will be many people who will turn up their noses and declare that the comparison is frivolous. So it is very important to discuss the bands that have gone through this situation.

The Beatles are one of the biggest rock bands in history. It's not just a matter of opinion, that's a fact. The Beatles were the first band with the proposal to be more of a band. The idea was to have no leader, and that the four were seen as completely different personalities, and everyone to sing lead vocals on all disks. The band broke out in the 60s, just over 40 years, two of its members or is more alive but their success never ends. The return of the Beatles was seen as utopian in the 70s, when each member continued his solo career and John Lennon repudiated the idea. And that does not end also are comparisons of other bands with the boys from Liverpool.

The Rolling Stones were a super-band. Mick Jagger was the first great frontman, Keith Richards and the first guitar hero within a group. Over the 52 year career, the Stones have been through various exchanges of training. The death of guitarist Brian Jones was the most striking change, but the Stones have had no loss of production, credibility or popularity by members change account.

Prior to the Beatles, music did not affect people's lifestyles, politics, philosophy or ethics until Beatlemania hit the States. They were the first musicians to incorporate their views on world happenings into their music. Before them, music was mostly written to tell a story or about love. Although topics such as these can be important, they can be rather generic as well. One can blame it on conforming to what the public considered comfortable, but artists simply never ventured into the world of changing people's lives. The Beatles wrote songs about changing the world, peace, and rebellion, and people listened (Inglis, 2000). They were one of the pioneers to introduce the questioning of establishment accepted social norms. They encouraged challenging what most people thought and because they were such leaders to society, their opinions mattered and people appreciated the message they were singing. The coming of the Beatles happened to coincide with the peak of frustration amongst the youth of America, and their revolutionary views picked up lots of traction among the young community. They used their fame to promote their beliefs and they vocally advocated change in the world, as they saw fit (Diez, 2001). By taking complex and difficult world issues and portraying them in simple, easy to understand ways, the Beatles were able to reach a majority of the public, regardless of education or understanding of political issues. People who were previously not involved became aware of world happenings through the Beatles' music and adopted their views on the world. The Beatles influenced all the British bands that came over to the States. Each band came over and brought

something different to the American music scene. The Rolling Stones had more edge and sold sex more than most of the other bands. But altogether all these bands had one thing in common: they all followed in the footsteps of the Beatles (Diez, 2001).

A highly respectable quality of the Rolling Stones is that they have never been one to sell their music to what is “popular”, but instead made the music they have loved. Keith Richards puts it, “All we’ve got to do is what we want to do and [the fans] would love it. That’s what we’re about, because if we love it, a certain thing comes from it” (Richards 238). This album, *Let It Bleed*, is where Keith Richards started a unique characteristic which is visible in a majority of his later music: open tuning. Once leaving the 1960s, the Rolling Stones left with a definitive, signature band. The image of Mick Jagger dancing fearlessly in front of thousands is an image no band could replicate. But perhaps the most unique part of the band is its sound. In experimenting with 5-string open tunings on *Let It Bleed*, Keith Richards has created songs which are impossible to replicate in the standard 6-string tuning of a guitar. Since the release of *Let It Bleed*, the Rolling Stones have faced certain negatives: the band suffered a dysfunctional relationship between the “Glimmer twins”, a heroin addiction, and a hiatus. However, after Keith Richards came clean from his addiction, the Rolling Stones have continued to make history in performing in front of an estimated 1.5 million people in Rio de Janeiro, millions more at The Super Bowl, and an induction into the Rock ‘n’ Roll Hall of Fame. From being pushed along by the Beatles to eventually outlasting them four-fold, the Rolling Stones is one of the very few bands whose fan base spans across generations (Paytress, 2009).

One last historical bit: Mick Jagger and Keith Richards have been on-and-off for years. First Jagger disproved of Richards’ drug use in the 70s. Then in the 80s Richards disproved of Jagger’s leadership. Ever since the early 90s it has been strictly business-work between the two,

until finally 2004, when they worked on their latest album, A Bigger Bang. Richards explains, “We were tight together, good some good stuff working. There was less of the moodiness...I mean, if you work with a guy for forty-odd years; it’s not all going to be plain sailing, is it? You’ve got to go through the [tough times]; it’s like a marriage” (Booth, 2014). The two have shared a similar love of music since the age of 8, and now, both in their late 60s, the two returns to this love of music to move past the wounds formed 3 decades ago. This power of music, above all else, proves that what this band stands for spans more than just 4 decades- it is timeless.

### **Conclusion**

In my opinion, no band or group in the current day is likely to have the same kind of influence on society as the Beatles and Rolling Stones have on American culture. Considering that Rolling Stones were contemporary to the Beatles, which existed in fact, was not a comparison, but a certain false rivalry that never existed. Still, it is impossible not to compare two rock bands, formed in the same country at the same time, with a large number of fans and successes on both sides. So therefore, is the only forgivable comparison, although I feel that it is not necessary to be doing it, both are very important in the musical scenarios, then so be seeing the similarities and differences they both have. The very important thing is just to enjoy the music these two rock groups have created.

### References

- Bennett, A. (2009). "Heritage rock": Rock music, representation and heritage discourse. *Poetics*, 37(5), 474-489.
- Booth, S. (2014). *The true adventures of the Rolling Stones*. Chicago Review Press.
- Diez, G. (2001). *Beatles contro Rolling Stones*. Feltrinelli Editore.
- Inglis, I. (Ed.). (2000). *The Beatles, popular music and society: a thousand voices*. Macmillan.
- Paytress, M. (2009). *Rolling Stones: Off the Record*. Omnibus Press.