



THE BEATLES

Handout 2 - "Beatles LP Cover Banned"

KRLA Beat, 2 July 1966

Uncredited Author

Beatle L.P. Cover Banned

The Beatles have turned out the most nauseating album cover ever seen in the U.S. The jacket is in color and shows the four Beatles in butcher outfits with chopped up raw meat (the meat of what we don't know) lying all over them. If this isn't bad enough, on top of the meat and the Beatles are decapitated baby dolls.

At the very last minute (after 800,000 of these covers had been distributed across the country) someone had brains enough to ban the album cover and demand that no one attempt to sell the album while it is still reposing in that cover.

But the damage is already done. Enough people have already seen the cover and they're all asking the same question—why? Why would a group who will obviously sell a million copies of the album no matter what they put on it stoop to posing and giving their blessing to such a ridiculous attempt at humor, or shock, or whatever it was meant to evoke?

Because it was the Beatles who did it and because no one is supposed to knock them, the comments and opinions which we received from those who had seen the cover will be anonymous. However, we will tell you that they were all given by people in someway connected with the entertainment business.

Not even one person who saw the banned album cover liked it. No one found it even *slightly* amusing. In short, they all felt it was the most sickening spectacle they'd ever seen. Many agreed that it must have been done for

pure shock value. And this poses a question—why do the Beatles feel they must resort to shock to sell an album? Are they afraid that despite all their previous million selling LP's, if they don't put something shocking on the cover of this one, it won't sell?

Others felt that the whole thing came out of John Lennon's head. "If you've read his books," said one of our anonymous souls, "you know Lennon came up with the idea for the cover. Only he could think of something as morbid as that."

Gary Lewis was one performer who did agree to let *The BEAT* use his name along with his opinion of the cover. "I don't get it. Why? What does it mean? I hate that. They did it just so people would say, 'I hate that.' Harrison looks like he's chopping up another one back there."

Telling Us?

Some were of the opinion that the Beatles were trying to tell us something. "I think they're trying to tell us that this is the beginning of the end," said one. And another added, "You know, we've been getting this strange mail concerning the Beatles. The letters have been pouring in and all have been asking the same questions—'what is happening to the Beatles?' 'Why are they becoming so weird?' Personally, I think the Beatles are now so far from their public that they don't even know what their public wants any more.

Actually, ever since the Beatles first were introduced to America, people have been predicting their downfall. But those wise in the

ways of the entertainment business have stuck to the same thought throughout the Beatle reign—"No one can kill the Beatles, except the Beatles themselves." And perhaps they're doing it now.

For months and months the Beatles have been doing nothing—at least, nothing that can be seen. They've been looking for a third movie script. And after almost a year of looking, they say they still can't find one. We're all for the Beatles turning out a fantastic movie but *there's no way* they would have been diligently looking for an entire year and still not be able to find one. There has to be a hang-up somewhere.

Follow-Up

Then, too, the Beatles have been busy recording a follow-up album to "Rubber Soul." Well, "Rubber Soul" has been on the LP charts for 26 weeks. For someone as popular as the Beatles that's a long time to wait between albums. Because, you see, this new album of theirs (the one with the banned cover) contains only *three* songs which you haven't heard before—"I'm Only Sleeping," "Dr. Robert" and "And Your Bird Can Sing." It also contains "Drive My Car" which you've heard but which has never been released on an album here in the U.S.

We'd be very interested in hearing your comments on the banned cover. Do you think it was done for shock value, that they were trying to tell us something, or that it means nothing?