The Beatles
The Struggles of Ideologies and the Shaping of National Identity in Britain

Vera Syamsi

ABSTRACT *Tampilnya The Beatles disambut dua macam reaksi yaitu sambutan yang hangat dari generasi muda, dan keberatan dari pihak orang tua, guru, dan pemerintah* (the establishment). *Kelompok musik itu membawa banyak hal yang tidak dibayangkan sebelumnya. Bagi generasi muda, The Beatles menumbuhkan semangat kebebasan, sarana ekspresi, saat untuk menjadi perhatian ; bagi kelas pekerja, The Beatles adalah harapan untuk menghapuskan pembatasan yang tidak terlihat—seperti pembagian kelas—dan media untuk menuju tempat yang lebih baik di masyarakat; dan bagi* the establishment, *The Beatles adalah ancaman bagi kekuasaan dan otoritas yang mereka miliki. Dengan berbagai ideologi yang berbeda artikel ini berupaya memahami berbagai alasan di balik perubahan dan kondisi masyarakat Inggris sejak 1960-an.*

KATA KUNCI *The Beatles, identitas nasional, kelompok sosial, ideologi.*

1969 - 70

Until now I don't think there is a music group that can give an impact as 'enormous' as the one called The Beatles. This group did not only influence young people as their 'target' audience but now also older people from the so-called society class known as The Establishment (in England), who — after rejecting the group strongly for quite a relatively long time — finally admit the greatness/grandeur of this band consisting of four young men from Liverpool working class, England. At their ultimate years, the group could cause a great hysteria wherever they went, and that for the first time gave girls (women) a chance to be at the front line of a 'cultural moment' in the world-scale phenomenon.

The popularity of this group brought a lot of things to the surface, besides the 'role' for women mentioned just now, people also realized — for the first time (?) — the importance/the need for identity; and those from the

economic domain found a new source for making a huge amount of money. Concerning the matter of identity, at the time of the emergence of this group Britain was in a 'desperate' need of gaining a new identity after experiencing a bitter consequence of the two World Wars. The Beatles, whose birth was warmly welcomed by the youth for their significant role in symbolizing a rebel (and that became the identity of the youth at that time), at first was an "enemy" of The Establishment. Those in power/government were afraid of – and therefore rejected – all that could inspire the subaltern to speak. And since the Beatles could unite those people who were 'anti-establishment' (under the term of Beatlemania) and could give them power, The Establishment 'denied' the existence of this group. Some teachers from some schools would send away the students who had the same hair cut as the Beatles from the class; parents were against this band for these young Liverpudlian were suspected/strongly believed to be able to encourage drug-taking, a reason which was taken by BBC to justify its TV and radio ban against the Beatles (Buskin 1998: 238).

So from the short exposition about the condition/reception of The Beatles, I would conclude that at the beginning of its era (early 60s), The Beatles was something that faced two extreme views: from the youth in Britain (and the world) they got an awfully good acceptance, while from the point of view of the people from the establishment (including the parents) The Beatles was something 'ugly', 'dangerous', not good for the young, and consequently they should be 'banished'. But now things were different: I think eventually, because 'people all over the world' loved The Beatles, The Establishment faced some kind of dilemma; whether to keep banning the band or to 'adopt' them, in spite of those 'deviant' attitudes shown by the fab four. I think after some 'thought' was given, finally the government chose the latter, therefore the Beatles were awarded some honorable title from the monarch: MBE (I will elaborate more on this later) and now (at the beginning of the twenti-first century) even the queen herself utilized one of the songs from the group in the celebration of her golden reign this year (May 2002). So, the question is 'why', what has changed in the society. Why something rejected in the past for it was considered to be 'dangerous' (because it showed disobedience and rebel), is now widely accepted and even taken as something that people can be proud of (I would say that it was even adopted as the nation's identity). I found this quite intriguing, that is why I would attempt to explore some possibilities that can answer this question.

THE BEATLES CAME INTO BEING/HISTORY

Britain post-(world) war (II) is a country in 'despair'. A once-used-to-be one of the strongest countries in the world, Britain was no longer the superior one. Actually this condition had begun at the end of the nineteenth century, as noted in the book entitled *England* in 1885 (McDowall 1989: 156): "we have come to occupy a position in which we are no longer

progressing, but even falling back . . .We find other nations able to compete with us to an extent such as we have never before experienced." People already sensed that there was something 'wrong' with the condition of the country. Britain was not as powerful as before, especially when compared to the time during the reign of Elizabeth I; England's 'most glorious time'.

After the World War I, economic condition was not good, many factories were ruined/closed, people lost their homes and jobs; the cost of the war had led to an enormous increase in taxation. In short, life was difficult. The terrible end of the World War II was also a terrible beginning to the post-war world. In Britain, this time was known as the age of uncertainty. Like much of post-war Europe, Britain had become economically dependent on the United States. And it was due to the US Marshall Aid Program that Britain was able to recover quickly from the war (McDowall 1989: 156). So now it is clear that Britain was a 'subordinate' of the 'new' superpower country, USA. This fact was of course not the one that British people preferred, moreover considering that actually USA used to be one of the 'colonies' of Britain.

What makes it worse is that even in Europe Britain was presently no longer the' leader' (moreover now Germany was united which made it have become very strong). In Germany the economic prospects were clearly greater than an Britain. Like the USA it was producing more steel than Britain, and it used this to build strong industries and a strong navy. But thanks to that US aid, the condition in the 50s and 60s was better and better. Wages were about 30% higher than in 1939 and prices had hardly risen at all. People had started to have free time to enjoy themselves; they went to stadium to watch football, to cinema and they began to go away for holidays to low-cost "holiday camps." It seemed as if the sun started shining again in Britain, as even one Prime Minister said, "You 've never had it so good," and that remark soon became widely known (McDowall 1989: 170). But things were not the same as before, because this better condition was not because of what the British had done to their own country, rather it was partly because of the help from another country, USA. So like I said earlier Britain, which used to be the 'most powerful country' (together with France) is now a 'subordinate' of a younger country. And the fact that this young country could give them some 'charity' was not appealing to the British.

That time was also the age of youth. Young people had more money in their pockets than ever before, and as the result the young began to 'think' about fashion, particularly in clothing and music. And that was the time when 'the greatest icon in British music' came up, The Beatles. This is what is written by McDowell (1989: 170-1):

> Nothing expressed the youthful "pop" culture of the sixties better than the Beatles, whose music quickly became internationally known. It was no accident that the Beatles were working-class boys from Liverpool. They were real representatives of a popular culture.

So The Beatles was taken as the 'appropriate' model to represent the youth of Britain, and what makes it even more meaningful and substantial is the fact that the fab four (the other name referred to the members of the band, shortened from the fabulous four) had come from working class, a class which had been repressed and needed to break all the 'bars' enclosing them; a class that needed to articulate their demands and at the same time a class that needed to make their statement in order to be acknowledged and therefore not be neglected by The Establishment. This is the thing that made this class in the opposition from the point of view of the establishment. And this is also the thing that made the Beatles and those who were fond of it the opponents of The Establishment represented by–among others–the government, teachers and parents.

The Young and Rock Music

In line with the new progress in economic of Britain (and the world), young people began to express themselves in other ways. In Britain, not too long ago people had to follow the strict norms of the Victorian time. It was time for all 'controlled-behavior' (at least in public life) if one was to be considered cultured. But the young didn't want to cope with it any longer. Many youngsters started to look upon music as their new 'religion', because music offered them away out of repression and 'hypocrisy' prevailing in the society. The role of radio gave way to it. In the West Coast (in US of course), emerged the 'new tradition' that involved mixed audiences (white and black) that allowed teenagers there to go beyond the first excitement of discovery into a region of experience that was often (as had been the case of jazz) spoken of in terms echoing religious conversion (Maltby 1989: 143). And as the 'new kind of music' emerged (R & B), everywhere the white, particularly working-class, teenagers identified with rhythm and blues, a lifestyle rapidly grew up centered on some kind of outlaw or deviant status. And again this R & B came from the US with the prominent musicians were the black American singers.

Soon after the founding of R & B, rock music came along. And again the radical fear that had been a feature of earlier hostility to popular music present, as before it only partly cloaked in general descriptions of rock and roll as "barbaric" and "primitive." This is more as the result of generation gap, in which parents considered Rock music as "devil's music" (Rees and Crampton 1996: 4). The development of a separate teenage identity had resulted, among other things, in the perception by the adult world that its authority was being eroded. Rock and Roll was being castigated as the most powerful symbol of the teenage attempt to tilt the balance in the parent-child relationship. But it can also be that besides it was the older generation's hostility to the teenage culture, there was also its envy of the freedom and independence which that culture seemed to have been achieved. But this rejection didn't last that long. Under pressure from parents and from

representatives of moral and civic authority, radio stations and record producers and companies began to turn the prospect of independent, anti-authoritarian teenage culture into an expression of tolerably obstinate adolescence (Maltby 1989: 145). So through this kind of music teenagers realized and began to express their own identity, even within the world of consumer culture.

In the following discussion I would 'equalize' the rock music with the rock and roll, quoting from Encyclopedia of Rock Stars (p. 4):

> there are two common criticisms of rock history works : first, that 'rock' and its predecessor 'rock 'n roll' are generic terms, traditionally incorporating a wide range of music styles 'second, a popular cry from critics and consumers alike questions the inclusion of certain artists to the exclusion of a diverse selection of artists from punk to funk, pop to rock, country and western to rhythm and blues, folk to rap, surf to mod, reggae to metal, new wave to old hat (Rees and Crampton 1996: 4)

What I am trying to say by quoting this is that before The Beatles came and was known by people, there had been Rock and Roll, which means Elvis Presley. Through Elvis for the umpteenth time again US 'dominated' the world. So I think it is now quite understood that the British needed something that they could claim to be originating in their country and to be theirs or be able to represent them in the world, but this something should also be able to 'dominate' the world.

Pop Culture (Read: Pop Music) in Britain

As mentioned at the beginning of the previous part that the Beatles came after 'the long winter of postwar austerity'. Just as Rock and Roll had provided a commodity around which the American teenage could be defined in the 50s, the Mersey Beat—a raucous and driving fan of rock that emerged from Liverpool (too) in 1962–63–signaled the arrival of the young British consumer as a commercial cultural force. But as so often in Britain, their arrival was touched with class division. To be young, affluent and rebellious was not enough. As John Lennon later put it, "A working class hero is something to be" (Rees and Crampton 1996: 182). So now again, we can see that music doesn't simply mean something the young wanted or could enjoy, in fact it had become something deeper; music had become the identity of the youth. And in Britain to be 'someone', it was not enough that the youth just achieved do something outstanding, they must go beyond it: breaking through the class division that encircled them. This is something that the Beatles had done.

But this does not mean that the new 'wave' was accepted easily. This apparent resistance was apart due to a moral and/or cultural backlash, but it was also due to the paternalism of the 'maiden Auntie' BBC. British record companies were content–if not enthusiastic–to sell Rock 'n Roll, but BBC resistance severely restricted airplay. But there is always a way out of 'trouble'. The so-called Radio Luxemburg as the only alternative broadcasted

this from mainland Europe, and latter flourished the 'pirate stations' broadcasting unlicensed from ships moored just outside territorial water (Rees and Crampton 1996: 182). The pirates introduced an American style of disk jockey to an enthusiastic British audience. But on the other hand, as the Beatles started its journey, pop music held center stage in fashionable culture for the first time (Rees and Crampton 1996: 183).

The surge of British beat music, which followed the meteoric rise of the Beatles was greeted with much national wonderment on all sides; this resulted in the ignorance of grassroots activity which lay behind. The new music overwhelmed the British teenagers; they welcomed this as something they had been longing for as an answer of their long searching. As the effect there came a new phenomena on that was called Beatlemania. And this phenomenon which involved 'only' girls was not unimportant. The chief importance of this Beatlemania is the fact that it was for the first time girls took a leading role in the formation of popular culture (Rees and Crampton 1996), Beatlemania did not only let this adulation to come into open, it also provided girls with the chance to impose themselves and to take part in some way upon events around them. In other words, this had become the means for the girls to step forward to the center of the happenings, which so far had marginalized them/their roles.

Aside from the chance for the girls to show themselves, industries grabbed this golden opportunity to make it as a gold mine. Soon everything that had something to do with the Beatles were produced and sold. Starting from the cassettes, photos, eclectic trinkets with the logo and photos of the Beatles on them, up to the sheet on which they just slept (which had been cut off to small pieces) and the pillows where they had just laid their heads on. Now that we talk about the youth subcultural consumption, Phil Cohen (in Storey 1996: 117) had a foundational analysis of working-class culture and youth subcultures in the East End of London that stated that youth subcultures are an attempt to solve problems experienced by the parent culture. From the mid-50s onward, the working class had been confronted by two contradictory discourses: the new ideology of affluence and 'conspicuous consumption' and the traditional claims of working-class life. Changes in local manufacturing (resulting in de-skilling) and changes in the local environment (high-rise flat) had together undermined traditional working class tradition without increasing access to the new 'affluent society'. He mentioned that the latent function of subcultures is to express and resolve the contradiction, which remain hidden or unresolved in the parent culture. The parent culture generated many things such as the contradiction, at ideological level, between traditional working-class Puritanism and the new hedonism of consumption; at an economic level, between a future as part of the socially mobile elite or as part of the new lumpen proletariat. To the young, the subculture was one of the means to break out from the 'confusion' or pressure they received from around them.

As the realization, youth subcultures communicate through acts of consumption, therefore it was no wonder the idea of Beatlemania had a place in the very heart of so many young people in Britain—if not to say in the whole world. As Dick Hebdige (in Storey 1996: 119—21) mentioned that youth subcultures are 'concerned first and foremost with consumption'. For Hebdige, style is not the expression of class location; it is a signifying system, communicating both cultural identity and cultural difference. The youth used the subcultures as a way to tell their distinct identity and their difference from and in opposition to peer, parent and dominant cultures through a politics of style. The move from subcultures to the consumption pattern of young people as a whole was developed around the recognition that all young people are active consumers of culture and not the passive cultural dupes of much subcultural theory .

Beatlemania was a result of fan culture (one of the ways to realize subcultures). There are two categories of treating fans traditionally; they are ridiculed or pathologised (Rees and Crampton 1996: 183). Fans is consistently characterized as a potential fanatic, so that fandom is seen as excessive, bordering on deranged behavior. And in relation to industry, this fan culture is a culture of both consumption and production. As Jenkins said (in Storey 1996: 127) fandom is not just about consumption, it is also about the production of texts—songs, poems, novels, fanzines, videos, etc.— made in response to the professional media texts of fandom.

Finally, I would like to rewrite Jenkins' notion on fan, in which he said that there are three key features which mark fan culture's mode of appropriation of media texts:

1. *The ways fans draw texts close to the realm of their lived experience.* The text is drawn close so that the fan can fully possess it. Only by integrating media content back into everyday lives, only by close engagement with its meanings and materials, can fans only consume the fiction and make it active resource

2. *The role played by rereading within fan culture.* Fans do not just read texts they continually reread them. Roland Barthes contends that rereading of texts alter a reader's experience of a text. Rereading thus shift the reader's attention from 'what will happen' to 'how things happen', to question of character relations, narrative themes, the production of social knowledge and discourses.

3. *The process by which program information gets inserted into ongoing social interactions.* Finally, fans consume texts as a part of a community. Fan culture is about the public display and circulation of meaning production and reading practices. Fans make meanings to communicate with other fans. Without the public display and circulation of this meanings, fandom would not be fandom.

All those long explanation was confirming my 'suspicion' that the youth needed something to be identified with and subcultures offer a way to get

out of the confusion and to get an identity, and in the Beatles they found the answer. The same as the youth who—so far—had been 'repressed' by their parents and the society around them, the Beatles was a representation of the working class who had been repressed by the 'super structure'. That 'sameness' has become the glue bonding the two or as in Adorno's term: popular music operates as social cement (Storey 1996: 95).

THE BEATLES: ITS RISE AND FALL

For this 'history' of the Beatles, all of the data/'facts' quoted are from the book of *The Complete Idiot's Guide to the Beatles*, and therefore after every quotation I would just mention the page.

As already mentioned at the beginning that during the post-war and pre-Beatle, Britain was in a pretty dull state, it was a drab place, especially for teenagers. The arrival of rock and roll during the mid-1950s then helped wake up the kids and wind up their parents. But while America blazed the trail, the Brits were only able to respond with the cover versions of the US hits and a few dozen Elvis clones, compete with moody expressions, curled upper lips and an ability to sing in an accent that would put true Americans to shame (p. 4). So Britain was just at the stage of imitating and entailing what had been set forward by the US.

Enter the Beatles. After a long time of being under the domination of the US (in music, film and economy), Britain's teens were ecstatic that they were finally able to find idols of their very own. What's more, while the parents rolled their eyes and snickered among themselves, it was obvious that they were won over by the Beatles as well. At the beginning of their emergence, the Beatles appeared to be nice, clean-cut-boys-next-door. These four "youngsters with the scraggy hairdos" looked cheeky, charming, and not at all impressed by the fame and fortune-unlike those glossy Hollywood types! (p. 4). Those young men really looked innocent, cheerful, 'healthy' and smart. They dressed smartly and didn't seem 'bizarre' as other artists usually performed themselves; in short they seemed to be friendly and 'harmless'; something that most parents would prefer to be the idols of their youngsters. Compared—for example—with the picture attached at the beginning of this article, in which they were in the peak of their career and started to try something new and unusual (at least when we can see their outlook performance is different). So now instead of imitating and adoring Elvis, "Mr. And Mrs. Brit and the kids could now all sit back and watch some homegrown talent live out their own fantasies on foreign shore" (p. 4). Finally they had something of their own. And this made London and the rest of Britain ready to swing.

Soon the Beatles arrived in the US, and the assassination of President Kennedy was an incident that paved the way for 'British invasion', something that was called as 'good timing' (p. 6). During the early years of their success, The Beatles charmed virtually everyone, while also repre-

senting the voice of the youth. They led the way in redefining their own generation. There has been a 'shift' from a rebel icon to a 'fashion' icon. Soon everything that the Beatles did was followed by the 'millions' of teens in the world. Their hairdo that is called the *moptop* was something the youth 'should' have. But according to the press, parents, headmasters and heads of state, to have a *moptop* was to have along hair, a reason that was used to send students out of school. Apparently none of them noticed that it was way shorter that the pompadour style that had been preferred by Elvis and millions of their followers until then, including the pre-fame Beatles. So I think behind this act of 'forbidding' the hairdo by the establishment, there is some anxiety felt by those 'in power' that the Beatles would lead all the youth to be one and against them. Since the Beatles had led the way in voicing the aspiration of the youth, in finding identity and setting the trend in fashion, there was enough reason for The Establishment to suspect the sense of rebellion in the youth plus the Beatles.

However, besides those 'perks' that related the Beatles and the youth with 'negative things' in the eyes of The Establishment, the Beatles was the apple of the eyes of much of the world. As I have mentioned at the beginning that this kind of condition was a dilemma for the establishment, but then eventually they could set aside their arrogance because the Beatles' influence in the world was not something of a trivial matter/importance. Soon, in 1965, the Queen awarded each of the Beatles with the Membership of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (MBE), something that was apparently recommended by Prime Minister Harold Wilson, a fellow Liverpudlian with a sharp eye for self-promotion (p. 7). This award provoked quite some reaction from society, some were pro and some other —the war veterans—were against. (Regardless of the reaction, the Beatles was nervous when they received it and proud, but on November, 25, 1969 Lennon returned this honor as his protest against Britain's involvement in the Nigeria-Bafaria incident and against Britain's support of America in Vietnam (p. 235).)

Soon, the glory of the Beatles peaked. The years of 1963 to 1970 was time for record-breaking in selling records (cassettes) and inviting audience to their stage performance. And this record continues long after the group has 'gone', until about four decades after the birth of the group. Below is a little quotation of the statistics (p.10), not only record for those golden years but also up to now (this book is printed in the year of 1998):

- The greatest sales of any group, estimated by EMI at over one billion disc and tapes worldwide.
- The most multi-platinum albums (13 in the US).
- The most number-one singles (22 in the US)
- The biggest first-week sales of a double album (*The Beatles Anthology* Vol. 1, which sold 855, 473 copies in the US from November. 21 to 28 1995)
- The most successful songwriters (Lennon and McCartney) in terms of number - one hits. (In the US, Paul takes the credit for 32 and John for

26, with 23 of these having been written together; in the UK, John takes credit for 29 and Paul for 28, with 25 of these having been written together.)

- The most covers of any song (over 3,000 versions of *Yesterday*)
- The fastest-selling singles (*I Want To Hold Your Hand*, which sold 250,000 copies within the first three days of its US release, 1 million after two weeks and a staggering 10,000 copies per hour in New York City alone after 20 days).
- The biggest advance orders for a single (2.1 million copies of *Can't Buy Me Love* in the US).
- Their most-played song is *Yesterday* which has so far been broadcasted more than 6 million times on US radio alone.

From the statistics above, we can see that the standard for 'everything' was in the US, though it can be because the book was printed there (and probably written by Americans), but from these facts we can also see that the US is the 'capital' of the recording industry. Watching the data closely, we can come to a conclusion that to the US The Beatles gave a lot of money and therefore became something worth maintaining, though the case is not the same with the UK, in which money-making is not 'as important' as (and that's why it came second after) the pride of the country. No wonder after all the 'ugly' things done by the Beatles; still they become the symbol of Britain's invasion in the US (read: the world).

Along with the fame they got, the Beatles was also abundant with the fortune. Perhaps because they 'had everything', they started to try something new; LSD (Lysergic acid diethylamide), a powerful hallucinogenic drug. This caused some argument among themselves. Lennon and Harrison consumed it, but Paul and Ringo resisted it. But eventually, the latter two were also tempted to try the drug. And this caused BBC placed a TV and radio ban, explaining that they could encourage drug taking, several US stations followed suit.

The drug-taking, Lennon's statement that the Beatles was greater than Jesus both caused a 'commotion' in the society; and finally the disagreement between Paul and John that peaked (for which Paul thought Ono had intervened too much in the affair of the Beatles) led to the dismissal of the Beatles.

There goes the Beatles and their glory, but the effects and the fame are still there and still influence the world until present time. The world would have never been the same without it. As written by Rees and Crampton in their *Encyclopedia of Rock Stars* (1996, Introduction):

> Each era has yielded performers whose music has influence subsequent singers and musicians: without Hank Williams and Arthur Crudup, there would likely have been no Elvis Presley; without Little Richard and James Brown, No Prince; without Chuck Berry, Buddy Holly and Lonnie Donegan[1], no Beatles: no Beatles, one shudders to think.

---

[1] These three were the predecessors of the Beatles in rock and roll, all of them are Americans who had pioneered the music (*Encyclopedia of Rock Stars*. pp. 91, 271, 408).

CONCLUSION

I think it is quite understood that after the glorious time during the reign of Elizabeth I and the year of self-confidence (during the reign of Queen Victoria) when 'suddenly' the nation had to face the age that was called the age of uncertainty, it caused them to be in a confusion of their own identity (floating identity) because they were no longer the superior but merely a mediocre country; this made the nation tried hard to seek for the identity and to find something to hold on to.

The same thing was felt by the y   1: they who used to be under the control of the older generation and ;   norms finally turned their heads to a way out of the '(invisible) cage' limiting their expressions and they happily left the dull situation in which they had been. So when the Beatles came along, it was too good a chance to pass up.

Then came the need for the myth; according to Zeffry (1998: 7) in a myth there is an implied moral code that can be utilized as a guide to live our life in a society. The influence can be in the form of metaphor or analogy. Myth is needed by 'everybody', even a modern society will need it as an inspiration of their life. The Beatles was the answer. The fab four soon became the inspiration for many things, as we can see there are many other bands play their music in the same style. Many films are made because of the Beatles, and probably more important is how people of Britain could use this pop music icon as something to cling to as being British; something to be proud of/the pride of Britain. When the world listens to the Beatles it is as if reviving the spirit of British Empire as the country where the sun never sets (as old time).

In his statement concerning myth (similar to the previous one), Levi-Strauss (in Storey 1996: 57) said that

> all myths have a similar socio-cultural function within society. Their purpose is to make the world explicable, to magically resolve its problems and contradictions, mythical thought always progresses from the awareness of opposition toward their resolution... .the purpose of myth is to provide a logical model capable of overcoming a contradiction and make the world explicable. Now we can see that myth can communicate a conceptual order to the member of the society.

Once again I would say that The Beatles showed the young in Britain that to be a good citizen was not just by abiding by all the rules set by government, but the fundamental thing is that the Beatles was able to break the invisible barrier known as class division in a society – in this case of course in Britain – in which class division keeps prevailing. There is one more thing which is also very and more important, i.e. the Beatles could help Britain get important/superior position in the world that so far had been dominated by USA.

How a myth is used as a means of communicating a concept to society is clearly seen when finally the authority in England decided to use John Lennon's name for the airport in Liverpool (*Kompas*, March, 16, 2002) and also how Yoko Ono (Lennon's wife) bought the house on Menlove Avenue,

Liverpool–with a high price I presume–and keeps it as a place worth remembering, because it is a place where Lennon lived his childhood until the beginning of the Beatles time. He wrote a song that became one of the hits: *Please Please Me* in that house.

But is it truly only that? for there is always a possibility of having a 'stowaway' in the ship called 'British Empire', e.g. music industry that represented the capitalism. Moreover considering what Michael J. Wolf said in his book *The Entertainment Economy* (quoted from *Kompas*, May, 5, 2002) that "Entertainment–not autos, not steel, not financial services–is fast becoming the driving wheel of the new world economy ". What has become the 'core' of the world's economy is entertainment industry. The focus of consumption done by people now is *fun;* people want to spend their money to feel happy. This finally resulted in what is called (by Wolf) as *hedonomic* (hedonistic + economic); people would buy 'anything' for the sake of getting the fun in their life. This and the idea of capitalism of course spur people from music/entertainment industry to keep selling and therefore reviving the Beatles.

Finally I would say that for the sake of a bigger importance, the establishment in Britain in the end 'sacrificed' and 'swallowed' their pride, because with the Beatles Britain can become the big ruler of the world again. The idea of British hegemony in the world is quite tempting in order to realize the idea of the country where the sun never sets for the second time. The Beatles signaled the awakening of Britain's supremacy in the world when they invaded the US (as shown by the data statistics of the records written earlier), for it also suggests that they (the Beatles Ò the British people) could finally invade the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buskin, Richard (1996), *The Complete Idiot's Guide to The Beatles.* New York: Alpha Books.
Clarcke, Donald (ed.) (1996) *The Penguin Encyclopedia of Popular Music.* Penguin Books; second edition.
Kompas., March, 16, 2002.
Kompas, April, 2, 2002.
Kompas, 5, 2002.
Maltby, Richard (1989), *"Dreams for Sale": Popular Culture in the 20th Century.* London: Harrap.
McDowell, David (1998), *An Illustrated History of Britain.* Longman.
Pritchard, David and Alan Lysaght (1989), *The Beatles: An Oral History.* Allen and Unwin
Rees, Dafydd and Luke Crampton (1996), *Encyclopedia of Rock Stars.* London, etc.: Dorling Kindersley Book.
Storey, John (1996) *Cultural Studies and the Study of Popular Culture: Theories and Methods.* Edinburgh University Press
Zeffry (1998), *Manusia, Mitos dan Mitologi.* Depok: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.