The Faul Guy

TEFLONRABBIT ARTICLE No.264

Unique Identifier:14fc6033-f6b1-41ce-b7be-30d3ebef3637

Image not found or type unknown John Lennon and Paul McCartney

60's Paranoia

Monday, December 25, 2023 - 12:58


PDF Version
Aroma
Image not found or type unknown
99
Rumness
Image not found or type unknown
99
Subscription Only
Off
£
999

Behind an outrageous conspiracy theory lies a plausible truth that is even more challenging. Beneath the high profile facade of popular music exists an alarmingly mercenary industry which cares nothing for the lives of those caught up in the whirlwind.

Popular Music *Conspiracy* *Mind Control* *Perception management* *Corruption*

One of the more fantastic of the alternative narratives circulating on the internet would be the 'Paul is dead' theory. Basically the premise being that the original cheeky Scouse chappy was brutally slain in a car crash in the late 1960's. A lookalike competition winner then took over the role, continued the legacy of his great works and walks among us today as Sir Paul McCartney.

In terms of first impressions, the story represents a fairly sizeable requirement for the suspension of disbelief. However in terms of endurance the narrative is beyond well established. Consequently the media spin offs from the original story are innumerable. In among the usual multimedia overviews and opinion pieces is the book 'The life and times of Billy Shears'. A weighty tome which stands out among the other offerings like a man with no shoes following a man in a white flared trouser suit across a pelican crossing in West London. The general consensus is that the quote inside the front cover is a bit of a whistle blower from the get go. It uses conventional disclaimer terminology and essentially states that '*this book would not have been possible without the assistance of Sir Paul McCartney*'. Using any celebrities name in such a way is an invitation for litigation. Using the name of a member of either The Order of the Companions of Honour, or the Order of the British Empire is simply going too far. Such disrespect for the honours system would surely bring down the wrath of the British establishment. Despite this clear anomaly, the book is still available, the ISBN has not been deleted and sales continue. The only logical conclusion is that the book is certainly authorised. Going further, it appears to be a bizarre hybrid of abstracted memoirs and veiled background details from the Hoffner playing MBE himself.



Without going into any spoiler territory, the book seems to be much more than just another bandwagon. The analysis by notorious 'conspiracy theorist' / Doctor, Nick Hollestrom is quite compelling in regards to explaining the pointers revealing the identity of the author. Dr. Nick is quite a flamboyant character but his cognitive capacity is clearly not in question. In addition there are associated narratives which could complete a section of the jigsaw depending on interpretation. Foremost among them is the DNA paternity suit brought against Sir Paul by German national Bettina Krischbin. While there have been many claims of the Beatles taking advantage of the groupies flocking around them, the Krischbin suit stands alone as any official claim. However this would appear to be a particularly relevant claim in that it seems unlikely to be such an isolated event.

The entire narrative surrounding the Billy Shears persona is verging on ludicrous. The chances of finding another left handed guitarist / bassist with the natural talent of Sir Paul are frankly minimal. The claim is that Billy Shears was ambidextrous and also a gifted musician. While this is technically possible, there are few professional bass players who would relish the prospect of learning to play hundreds of bass lines in the precise style of McCartney. To attempt it with the bass the wrong way round is akin to climbing Everest in flip flops. Truly ambidextrous musicians are exceedingly rare. Even if they display ambidextrous capabilities with writing and the use of hand tools, they will generally adopt the conventional orientation when it comes to handing musical instruments.



Viewed through a figurative lens, the emphasis on a fictitious character could be a vehicle with which to delve into a rather awkward fact. Many of the appearances by The Beatles were indeed fulfilled through the use of doubles. The behaviour of said doubles while they were appearing as the Fab Four would not have been the responsibility of Apple Records, Brian Epstein or any of the official entourage. It does not take a professor of logistical analysis to connect the dots between fake 'personal appearances' up and down the country with potential scandal. Any young man invited to portray one of the band would be inclined to afford themselves some comfort from the screaming hoards of fanatical worshipers. The vast majority of these so called 'appearances' would have been in (or outside) department stores and record shops. The actors would have been miming and nobody could hear the music anyway. Discerning anything whatsoever over the incessant screaming

coming from the hormonal audience was a notorious issue when attending anything associated with Beatlemania. The fees commensurate with such lookalike work are not particularly attractive, to the point where any lookalikes will endeavour to gain additional value wherever possible. The number of young women who engaged with such liaisons based on the false identity of the performers, is hard to estimate.

The music industry is by it's very nature heavily invested in the liberal application of smoke and mirrors. Behind the spectacle lies a world of extremely aggressive capitalism. The fact that these performers were not the real John, Paul, George or Ringo, would be a matter of some confidentiality. The entire purpose is to convince the audience that their local department store values their custom so much that they paid thousands of pounds for a personal appearance from the biggest band in the world. Consequently there would have been additional financial consideration which also relied on this confidentiality. In the event of one of these young women bringing any form of legal action against the performers they had sexual encounters with, that confidentiality would be threatened. As a result it seems that certain interests were best served by these women never speaking about their experiences. When this simple behavioural constant is applied across a large data set, probability indicates that keeping these women quiet must have been quite an undertaking. Conventionally this type of requirement is met through two avenues, those being reward and punishment. Given the less than permissive attitudes of small town Britain in the 1960's, it's likely that any unplanned children resulting from these encounters would be absorbed by the state or church adoption systems. Admitting to such a situation would be considered a bad idea. The family of the young women would be extremely unlikely to perceive the situation in a positive light. Being British it would be a bone of contention for life, but never talked about for fear of being too open and far too *European*.



There is a clear distinction between the dynamic of the performances by the Beatles before the turn of the decade. the familiar scene of three Beatles singing around a single microphone was never seen in colour. During the few years that the band were on hiatus, there was a fundamental shift in the psyche of the band. Much of this is co-opted by the Billy Shears narrative. According to the story, the other Beatles did not particularly like Billy and John Lennon hated him. While this suits the Shears narrative, there is a less challenging explanation that can be deduced from McCartney's apparent changes. The two to three years of the hiatus afforded McCartney the opportunity to spend some time in Africa. During this very isolated time, he put on quite a lot of weight in the face and appeared to change quite dramatically in his appearance. This is accredited to the fact that it wasn't actually the same person and the new Paul (nee Billy) was recovering from extensive plastic surgery. Again, the Shears narrative is far from low value in terms of pushing the envelope. It is however potentially somewhat more feasible that the change in personality was due to emotional factors as opposed to a proxy based resurrection after a high speed death on the A1. The stress of touring, the suspicious death of manager Brian Epstein, his moped crash and the band's experimentation with hallucinogens, could all well have contributed to a serious breakdown.

The two most popular members of the band would probably account for the greater number of potential scandals. As a result it's possible that both John and Paul were carrying the guilt of a substantial number of broken lives brought about by the libidinous behavior of their irresponsible lookalikes. For all that John Lennon was considered to be the more enlightened of the band, he could be notoriously sociopathic, crass and detached. His behaviour toward Brian Epstein was notoriously unpleasant including regular ethnic and homophobic remarks. Conversely McCartney was a bit square but broadly considered to be the charismatic and approachable 'nice guy' in the band. It is likely that he had far greater problems dealing

with the reality of what the Beatlemania commercial machine was doing in small town Britain. Still, nothing that a six month isolation in Africa with nobody for company but an entourage bodyguard can't fix. It should be noted that the change in peoples demeanour following a major breakdown can render them almost unrecognisable. This change is what fuels much of the Shears narrative. It is the opinion of TEFLONRABBIT that the change was nothing to do with plastic surgery and everything to do with the ravages of mind control applied as a result of involvement with the business interests behind the Eastman family.



The relationship between Linda Eastman and Paul McCartney seemed to appear from nowhere, undoubtedly as a result of her father replacing Brian Epstein. Prior to McCartney's departure for the African interior he was involved with well known British actress Jane Asher. They had been in a relationship for some time and everyone anticipated their matrimonial appearance in the next 'Hello' magazine spectacular. According to most outlets it was McCartney's indiscretion with American actress Peggy Lipton that ended teh romance. Whether this otherwise unremarkable display of stereotypical 1960's promiscuity actually caused the split, it doesn't appear to have been particularly acrimonious. Neither have ever publicly voiced any major opinions on the subject and simply change the subject if pressed by emboldened interviewers.



There is also the fact that after his pairing with Linda Eastman, he purchased a sizable tract of the Mull of Kintyre and pursued the life of a semi recluse. The acreage of the land is impressive. The main domecile is not visible from any public roads and requires a drive of a substantial distance on private roads in order to even see it. In terms of preventing any attention from unwanted forces, the property is exceptionally well secluded.

Despite the overwhelming evidence indicating that the Shears narrative is a load of nonsense, there are still certain persistent anomalies:

- Facial differences between late 60's and early 70's

There's no honest way to refute the claims that the images of McCartney presented as evidence do indeed look like two different people. However The Beatles were quite young when they were first in the media spotlight. The ravages of life on the road are well documented and can age anyone much faster than a career in accountancy. These factors could well have altered McCartney's appearance.

- Height changes

This particular glitch is a bit of a systematic failure. If he had actually been replaced by a noticeably taller Billy Shears, it would explain why the familiar scene of John, Paul and George all singing into one microphone was never repeated. It's also incredibly difficult to alter the height of a human without resorting to years of surgery. In terms of compelling evidence for the Shears narrative, it's about as good as it gets.

- Personality clashes

Bands fight, that's what they do. However the escalation of bitter acrimony between Lennon and McCartney appears to have had a greater driving force. While numerous bands have ended up literally punching the shit out of each other, the Fab Two took things to a whole other level with a decade of sniping and backstabbing in the media. The rift between them, along with with Lennon's murder, Harrison's attack and the threats of exposure from Heather Mills do nothing to detract from the suspicion surrounding McCartney's identity.

In terms of a definitive opinion, TEFLONRABBIT is erring on the side of caution. The Shears narrative is just a bit too out there to be acceptable. It's not entirely without merit as detailed above. However it's entirely likely that it's actually a highly elaborate smoke screen of scandal and disinformation intended to obscure a much darker truth.