

I

INTRODUCTION

VERSIONS AND MIXES

The medium of Compact Disc has carried over many variant versions from the vinyl era and added more of its own. This Introduction sets out in some detail the methodology employed in identifying, classifying and characterising such variants.

Studio Versions

Assuming the technical set-up had been properly arranged (and that it was working), then the only hurdle to a good recording in 1958 was the inability of the performer to complete the tune without stumbling. The problems were compounded when an ensemble such as The Shadows was also involved.

In a perfect world the sound engineer and the accountant were hoping to achieve the best recording the first time around; that is, in one TAKE. The best place for controlled conditions was in a studio and the majority (but by no means all) of Cliff and The Shadows' performance recordings were undertaken at Abbey Road in London.

If, on the day, there were false starts or breakdowns during the performance, then extra takes would be required. Certainly there were many instances when a completed take would be thought of as an 'inferior' performance for whatever reason and so things would be repeated until everyone involved was happy with the result – or they were too tired or bored to continue!

Later, one of the completed takes would be deemed 'best' and this would generally become the master tape. It was unlikely that any two studio performances would ever be identical in all respects so the procedure led inevitably to the possibility of an **alternative version** [AV] of a tune "escaping" at some stage either by accident or by design. This does not imply that an AV is always a different take – indeed different takes are somewhat scarce.

In overall terms, because of the relatively primitive taping facilities, the earliest recordings needed spontaneity because nothing could be added or subtracted from a take once it had been completed. People were expected to be competent performers and reasonably practised with their material – the recording engineer could only do so much to cover over the cracks! It was a tough expectation for up and coming artistes such as the untried Cliff and The Shadows in the late 1950s.

*At its simplest, we consider a **VERSION** to be a unique performance completed to the satisfaction of those involved. After release, due to a variety of factors, the original performance might be altered in some way thus creating a new version.*

As an example, it was always possible to cut and splice the recording tape to produce crude alterations before issue. F.B.I. (in the USA) and KON-TIKI (in Brazil) were subjected to terrible treatment before general release in those countries.

Within the *Guide*, VERSIONS are always annotated successively A, B, C, D etc, basically in chronological order of release.

One important liberty that we have taken is to place **undubbed** original recordings (when available) at the beginning of any series, that is, they become Version A. All other known versions have then been re-designated in turn. Latterly, there has been a trend to locate and issue original undubbed takes retrospectively. It was *never* intended that they should be heard in this form – they are inherently incomplete and it remains a moot point whether this practice is justified or even wanted.

Live Versions

When in concert, a performer presents new material and attempts to recreate studio recordings on stage. Regardless of proficiency, *every* live performance is unique and, as such, they create a succession of completely new ‘Versions’ of the artiste’s material. Within the *Guide*, we omit the word ‘version’ when considering live recordings; it is tacit.

As an example, the **live versions** of APACHE (EMI period) are annotated:

APACHE LIVE¹ (1969, JAPAN), APACHE LIVE² (1975, FRANCE), APACHE LIVE³ (1978, UK)

Live recordings were often made on portable machines under relatively poor conditions. The situation was demanding and it gave the engineer and performers little leeway within the limited number of takes at their disposal.

Nevertheless, good stagecraft could save the day and generally ‘best’ takes of the numbers played in the set would be identified. The ‘best’ studio take, or to a lesser extent the ‘best’ live take, would then be subjected to a programme of deliberate **interventions** beyond the recording date and this would include **mixing**.

Mixes

As equipment and techniques improved, the recording engineer imposed a greater influence on the procedure and, ultimately, on the final result. When two-track tape recorders became available, the engineer was able to manipulate discrete portions of the sound. The singer could be recorded on one track and the backing group on the other. Alternatively, by dedicating one of the tracks to an ‘**overdub**’, something extra could be added and this might range from a simple harmonica sound to a full string accompaniment. In addition, different sound levels and effects could also be applied at source to both parts of the recording.

As time went on, huge improvements in sound were achieved when four-track, eight-track recorders and beyond became the norm. This added immeasurably to the engineer’s mixing possibilities.

Thus a MIX is essentially a contrived product – it has more to do with the preferences and experience of the recording engineer and the producer. In the mid 1960s, by the time a new tune was launched upon the public, it would have been subjected to a gamut of interventions and manipulations relating to the final sound locations, relative sound balances and the applied special effects. Generally, the effects would have included echo and/or reverberation, but the final recording would also contain major overdubs. Often the overdubs were taped separately, probably on another day, and after that the engineer and producer would have undertaken the final mixing and balancing of all of the sounds in the studio.

Within the Guide, MIXES are always annotated successively 1, 2, 3, 4 etc, generally according to chronology if this can be ascertained. Otherwise we have used a ‘best endeavour’ basis to order the entries properly.

Classification and Categorisations

We have attempted to address the output of The Shadows, Marvin, Welch and Farrar, Hank Marvin as a solo artist and Cliff and The Shadows when they worked together as a unit. To do this we have had to contrive a unique

description for each recording based firstly on the given title by way of an A to Z listing.

We needed to be inclusive. To be so, we utilised well tried terminologies such as ‘Mono’, ‘Stereo’ and ‘Mock-stereo’ but we needed to develop some of our own, most notably ‘Enhanced mono’, in order to describe some of the things we were hearing.

That is the key factor: neither of us would profess working experience as a sound engineer but we *think* we are qualified to interpret what we hear! We have relied heavily on our independent and collective listening capabilities to examine each recording and classify what we hear. To ensure the widest understanding we have examined much of the material through speaker systems as the sound engineer intended – we have also listened intently through quality headphones and we have been fascinated by the things that this exercise has revealed.

We believe that we are well versed on the subject of ‘**interventions**’ – that is, discernable differences or alterations from the norm. However, we are pleased to say that on some occasions we have been alerted to new ones through specific contact with interested fans or through the voice of the extended Shadows’ community.

We made the decision to put all of these identifiable interventions into just two major classes: **VERSIONS** and **MIXES**. *Mostly, the original, standard (first) release constitutes our ‘control’ recording. We take each one at face value; they are included alphabetically and they have no classification ascribed until an intervention occurs.*

*The following intervention categories warrant a **VERSION** entry in the Guide:*

- The **inclusion** of studio banter/ count-in/ sounds not heard on the standard release:
e.g. 36-24-36 V_{sn} B, LATE NIGHT SET V_{sn} C, GONZALES V_{sn} B.
- The **removal** of studio banter/ count-in / sounds heard on the standard release:
e.g. SCOTCH ON THE SOCKS V_{sn} C, THIS OLE HOUSE V_{sn} B, CHELSEA BOOT V_{sn} B.
- The **addition** of different or extra overdubs:
e.g. BENNO-SAN V_{sn} B, PERFIDIA V_{sn} B, CATCH ME V_{sn} B, THE TROUBLE WITH ME IS YOU V_{sn} B.

- The **omission** of normal overdubs:
e.g. LITTLE 'B' V_{sn} B, TRYING TO FORGET THE ONE YOU LOVE V_{sn} B.
- The **specific shortening** of a standard release for DJ/promo purposes or for use as a Single:
e.g. GOING HOME V_{sn} B, WE ARE THE CHAMPIONS V_{sn} B, EQUINOXE (Part V) V_{sn} B.
- The **undue curtailment** of a standard release. This does NOT include simple early fades –generally they are not acknowledged within the classification (but see below):
e.g. JOHNNY STACCATO V_{sn} B, ON A NIGHT LIKE THIS V_{sn} B, CRICKET BAT BOOGIE V_{sn} B.
- The **loss** of an existing arranged ending by the introduction of an early fade:
e.g. TENNESSEE WALTZ V_{sn} B, WALKING IN THE AIR V_{sn} B.
- Editing **fabrications**:
e.g. OH SENORITA V_{sn} B, F.B.I. V_{sn} B, KON-TIKI V_{sn} B, MAROC 7 V_{sn} B/2.
- Digitisation **faults** caused by poor mastering:
e.g. THEME FOR YOUNG LOVERS V_{sn} B, CHARIOTS OF FIRE V_{sn} B, JUNGLE JAM V_{sn} B, IN THE MOOD V_{sn} B.
- **Intentional editing** differences:
e.g. THE RUMBLE V_{sn} B, BOMBAY DUCK V_{sn} A, DON'T CRY FOR ME ARGENTINA V_{sns} A & B .
- **Different takes**:
WHAT'D I SAY V_{sn} B, ALL DAY V_{sn} C, LES GIRLS V_{sn} B.
- Intentionally different **arrangements**:
e.g. ALL DAY V_{sn} B, FOOT TAPPER V_{sn} B, SOME ARE LONELY V_{sn} B.
- **Performance** (overdub) **differences** between mono and stereo releases:
MARCH TO DRINA V_{sn} B, DAKOTA V_{sn} B, GERONIMO V_{sn} B.
- Latter-day **constructions and reconstructions**.
e.g. ZERO X THEME V_{sn} B, GUITAR TANGO V_{sn} B, GOD ONLY KNOWS V_{sn} B.
- **Repaired** recordings:
e.g. BLUE STAR V_{sn} B, I MET A GIRL V_{sn} A, ON THE BEACH V_{sn} B.

- **Alternative Film** versions:

e.g. SUMMER HOLIDAY V_{sn} B, FOOT TAPPER V_{sn} C, THEME FROM 'THE BOYS' V_{sn} C.

- **Re-recorded** tunes:

e.g. RAZZMATAZ V_{sn} B, RIDERS IN THE SKY V_{sn} B.

- **Miscellaneous** versions:

e.g. F.B.I. V_{sn} C, WONDERFUL LAND 'DJ' V_{sn} of Honeywell recording.

The category listing could continue, but this will suffice to illustrate our point regarding the allocation of a track as a new VERSION.

When it comes to categories of **Mixing** then the range is not as varied but it requires some explanation. In recent years the mix has become the *raison d'être* for many releases and it is quite true that overdubs are a major constituent. In the early days however, overdubs were of prime importance in their own right and the inclusion of strings or brass accompaniment could be the making of a particular tune. As a result, we felt it appropriate to consider the omission or addition of an overdub within the remit of **Version** and not Mix.

Thus, when we have identified a **Mix** difference, we are generally (but not always) referring to the ambient background. This relates to the final locations chosen for the instruments, the singers, and the overdubs, but it also includes the degree of applied effects such as reverberation and echo. It was quite normal for the recording engineer to try to fool the listener into believing there was some 'width' to the sound by adding amounts of echo and reverberation at the time of recording. Echo chambers were an important part of the recording studio set-up.

Mono Mixes

At its simplest, for mono recording there would only be one microphone. Alternatively, a number of microphones would be fed onto a single track of the recording tape. If two balanced speakers were then used, the same fully equalised signal would be sent to each and the audio image on the listener's 'sound-stage' would be central and flat.

During our listening tests we were often confronted with sounds on mono recordings that were plainly different to the *standard* mono release. Characterised by the fact that there was an *extra* degree of apparent 'width'

or ‘ambience’ beyond the standard track, they otherwise displayed absolutely no separation of the sounds of the instruments or singers away from the centre of the audio image. It is uncertain exactly what transpired to make the difference and so we created the term **ENHANCED MONO** to capture this category of releases. It is our belief that interventions occurred in recording studios around the world when engineers decided to ‘boost’ or ‘tweak’ the sound of their local mono master recording to suite their own preferences. As it happens, it seems to be a practice that the French were fond of.

Mock-Stereo Mixes

Another well known and well documented intervention was the development of so-called **MOCK-STEREO** in the late 1960’s. At that time it was a high-tech procedure for enhancing existing mono recordings. The new electronic process enabled engineers to go further by splitting, boosting and arranging the sound signals in an attempt to imitate the sound of stereo. It was a remixing process and most people were unimpressed with the overall result so the technique was eventually abandoned. To compound the felony some tunes with perfectly good existing stereo mixes were treated to this process much to the annoyance of fans.

What is not quite so well known is that there were at least two major ‘mock-stereo’ initiatives relating to Shadows’ recordings. The first was during the period 1969 to 1971 (the ‘stereo’ version of “Greatest Hits” had been completed by February of 1971) and the second attempt was six years later in 1977. Some tunes were put through the process twice and they sound different to the practised ear. To ensure a unique description for these we have chosen to call the two different creations **MOCK-STEREO Type 1** and **MOCK-STEREO Type 2**.

Stereo Mixes

When twin-track recorders (et al.) became available, it was possible for different sounds to be recorded on each of the two tracks and subsequently, varying signals could be channelled back to the two speakers in a ‘stereo’ system. The recording engineer now controlled the location of discrete portions of the final sound – he could place drums and bass in the Right channel with guitars in the Left. The more tracks, the more options the engineer and producer had available to them.

Sound engineer’s preferences abound in the field of stereo mixing. Their canvas is the audio sound-stage and they are not averse to applying their art. As an example, it is quite common for the overall width of the sound-stage to be adjusted by locating sounds and instruments anywhere from the outer

edges to very near the centre. This produces ‘narrower’ mixings, and these differences are heard to best effect through headphones.

Stereo mixings in the 1960s were of necessity relatively simple affairs, but they produced good results. Bruce Welch’s rhythm guitar could often be heard quite distinctly and it was an attribute that increased the overall enjoyment of the listening experience. The discrete placing of sounds also offered the listener an ability to detect mixing differences within these recordings. Somewhat perversely, the relatively complex stereo taping would be ‘mixed down’ to mono for issue as a single or for use on a mono album.

As time moved on into the 1970s stereo mixings became the norm, but they also became much more adventurous. By then, discrete instrument separation was less in evidence and special effects and overdubs prevailed – this made the detection of mixing differences a more difficult affair.

The 1980s brought better technology again and a complete change for The Shadows. Brian Bennett’s Honeyhill studios became the source of all their new recordings and the mixings became very intricate indeed. Brian and recording engineer Dick Plant provided us with a full canvas of sound that is almost impossible to unravel in any meaningful way: identifiable mixing differences, other than intentional ones, are non-existent! Studio techniques had been turned on their head. It was possible to record a basic track (often just designated take 1) and then the performers and engineers would spend months building up their final sound using as many dubbing and mixing interventions as they saw fit. It was common for people to be on opposite sides of the globe during this process!

Quadraphonic Mixes

At the start of the 1970s a new listening experience was mooted – it was called ‘Quadraphonic sound’. This required four channels rather than two and the listener was surrounded by four carefully balanced speakers. It raised new possibilities, and Marvin, Welch and Farrar toyed with this short-lived technology when they released their new album “Second Opinion” in 1971. For ‘Quad’ sound recordings, initial studio mixing took a lot more thought – there were four sound outlets rather than the normal two!

A word of caution: few people have the equipment to experience Quad sound properly, but the LP could always be played through a normal stereo system and there are audio differences. This should not surprise us because the Quad album was mixed with other requirements in mind. We decided to include entries for a number of long-standing Quad tracks where discernable

differences have been noted. They are all MIX differences, not alternative versions, and if you listen carefully to any of the Quad LP tracks then other minor mixing changes can be detected, but the recording of these is outside our scope.

Reversed Stereo Mixes

One ‘mixing’ anomaly that causes us concern is the complete reversal of the stereo image. That is, the reversal of the Left and Right hand channel signals – it seems to achieve no particular useful purpose, but there have been many instances of this. We believe that ‘reversed stereo’ recordings are almost always the result of a mistake in the studio rather than a conscious attempt to improve matters. To illustrate our belief we draw your attention to the 1996 Australian reissue of “Another Twenty Golden Greats”, where *all nineteen* stereo tracks on the CD had the channels reversed!

*The following intervention categories warrant a **MIX** entry in the Guide:*

- **Deliberate variations** in the final released mix:

e.g. DANCING IN THE DARK Mixes 1 to 4.

- **One-off Mock-Stereo** mixings:

DRIFTIN’ Mix 2, LONESOME FELLA Mix 2, SWEET DREAMS Mix 2.

- **Multiple Mock-Stereo** mixings:

e.g. F.B.I. Version A Mock-stereo Type 1 and Type 2, WONDERFUL LAND Version B Mock-Stereo Type 1 and Type 2.

- **Enhanced mono** mixings:

e.g. BLUE SHADOWS Mix 1, FRIGHTENED CITY Mix 2, SHAZAM Mix 2, KON-TIKI Vsn A Mix 2, APACHE Mix 2.

- **Remixing** that results in an **altered** stereo layout (mostly with significant **relocations** of individual instruments relative to each other).

e.g. APACHE Mix 3, LAS TRES CARABELAS Mix 2, THE LUTE NUMBER Mix 2, THE FRIGHTENED CITY Mix 3.

- **Narrower stereo mixings** with a different audible ‘width’ but with relative instrument placing remaining unaltered:

e.g. IT’S BEEN A BLUE DAY Vsn A Mix 3, COSY Mix 2 & 3.

- Mixings with significant **duration difference** between the original mono and stereo mixes:

e.g. THE BOYS Mix 1 & 2, GEE WHIZ IT’S YOU Mix 1 & 2, MEAN WOMAN BLUES Mix 1 & 2.

- **Reversed stereo** mixings:

e.g. BLACK IS BLACK Mix 2, DEEP PURPLE Mix 2, SACHA Mix 2, BOMBAY DUCK Vsn B Mix 2.

- **Miscellaneous** mixings:

e.g. SHOTGUN Mix 2

As you can see from the above, we often identified mixing differences that applied only to particular VERSIONS of a tune and here we had to combine the two major classes. It is perfectly normal to have entries with descriptions such as: Version A (Mix1), Version A (Mix 2), Version B (Mix 1) etc.

In addition, to save space in some of the sections of the book we have resorted to simple shorthand to record the classifications. You will find entries designated: BRAZIL M1, GERONIMO VA, FOOT TAPPER VB M2, or F.B.I. VA/M3 MS-T2.

Some of the interventions recorded in both classes are easily identified and have been known about for years – you may be well aware of them. You could be less familiar with those that are more subtle and you will certainly find some that will be brand new to you. It is also true to say that the number of interventions has multiplied with the advent of the digital age. Unfortunately, this superior technology appears to have engendered a lackadaisical approach to the handling of sound files.

A final point. It might be argued that a number of the variants presented are slight and barely worth noting. We take the view that *all* divergences from the norm on CD (minor timing variations involving fades apart) require to be documented. What may appear trivial or inconsequential to one listener may be significant in the estimation of another, and some relatively mild deviations are nonetheless recurrent and of interest on grounds of frequency alone. In short, in the presentation of data we aim to be comprehensive rather than arbitrarily selective.

Postscript

The eagerly awaited 18CD *Complete French Sixties EP Collection* appeared as we were putting the finishing touches to this book. To our dismay, it rapidly became clear that the set fell far short of the high standards we have come to expect from them in terms of presentation, documentation and musical content.

In the first place, the veracity of the information provided relating to these 1960's mono EP releases *has* to be queried. Two conflicting conventions appear to have been utilised: catalogue number and release date. The resulting anomalies affect three of the first five CDs in the set.

Assuming that the boxed set rear cover details illustrating all eighteen French EPs are correct (and this rigidly follows the EP catalogue number order), then the front cover pictures on the booklet and the box are equally correct. The inner booklet details however adopt an unsubstantiated chronological ordering the places CD3 at No.4, CD4 at No.5 and CD5 at No.3.

Second, only twelve of the CDs provide a facsimile of the first (original) release of the EP with its label. On half of these [CDs: 1,4, 5, 7, 10 & 12 (to catalogue number)] the labels are printed with EDSF instead of ESDF.

The facts relating to the remaining half-dozen are:

CD2 depicts the third issue of the EP (hence the red label) and not the original ESDF 1357 with a green label.

CD3 is the second issue of the EP, not the original ESDF 1378.

CD6 is utterly mismatched. Here, the proper first release EP cover is combined with the red label from the third issue (complete with the entirely different catalogue number).

CD8 has a spurious catalogue number: ESRF 1447 instead of ESDF 1447.

CD9 is once again the second issue of the EP and not the original ESDF 1457.

CD13 is the second issue of three, assuming that the reported (but totally elusive) first issue ESDF 1520 actually exists.

We turn now to the music. The professed aim (see the booklet) is to have everything in mono, quote, "in their original sixties versions". However, these mono tracks have to be treated with extreme caution; a significant number of them are bogus, in the sense that they are not proper mono implementations at all!

Here is a breakdown of the 71 tracks, with an indication of how we have gone about documenting and classifying them for the purposes of this book.

(i) In a nutshell, some tracks are unquestionably the result of combining and mixing-down both channels of the relevant stereo mix. We begin with a particularly disconcerting example. A stereo version of WONDERFUL LAND, lacking the tom-tom overdub, was produced for release in 1990: here that very stereo version is presented *in mono*, though no such mono version would ever have been produced by EMI, either then or subsequently. Others (refer to the relevant entries in the Track Listings for the closer details) come in for the same treatment: ATLANTIS, DAKOTA, I MET A GIRL, STINGRAY (not one of them the correct *mono variant* but the *stereo* version reduced to mono), to which can be added what must surely be an artificially generated mono cut of the “unrepaired” version of BLUE STAR.

(ii) Regrettably, the matter cannot be left there. There is every reason to suppose that other tracks have been Magically transformed from stereo to mono, because some have not previously appeared on CD: the strong presumption must inevitably be that Magic on present performance (not even cloning any of the above mentioned AVs from perfectly respectable and easily obtainable compact discs) did not take the trouble to call up original mono masters from the only wholly dependable source, EMI UK.

In fact, two categories are of note in this connection:

(a) Those tracks not available at all on CD: ALICE IN SUNDERLAND, BACK HOME, LATE NIGHT SET [VA/M1], I WISH I COULD SHIMMY LIKE MY SISTER ARTHUR [M1], LITTLE PRINCESS, ME OH MY, MY GRANDFATHER’S CLOCK [M1], SWEET DREAMS.

(b) Those tracks which had not previously appeared on *overseas* (as opposed to UK) CDs, to which we habitually attach an identifying symbol. It is likely that one or more of the following, being produced by sleight of hand, merit no such distinction: ARE THEY ALL LIKE YOU?, BO DIDDLEY, COSY [M1], LITTLE ‘B’ [VA], STARS FELL ON STOCKTON, TALES OF A RAGGY TRAMLINE.

In all cases of (a)(b) above, we do actually enter the tracks under the pertinent mono categories, but *with a warning note* (“but see ...”) directing attention to this discussion.

(iii) Yet further tracks in the collection (examples: BONGO BLUES, IT'S A MAN'S WORLD, or MARY ANNE) are readily available, if not widespread, in mono on CD, but again there is no knowing how they were generated *for this particular release*. Nonetheless, we have given them all the benefit of the doubt, and classify them (perhaps unwisely) as we would any other release. One tricky track deserves special mention. We have associated IT'S BEEN A BLUE DAY with the mono version found on the CD *A's B's & EP's*, though once more it is unclear whether we are really dealing with that here, or rather with yet another specimen concocted from a stereo model: the latter eventuality seems to us the more likely. As for FBI, is it the true mono version, or has it been sourced from mock stereo? The hollowness of the reproduction suggests the latter.

(iv) To finish on a more positive note, a few tracks are entirely immune to our criticisms: that is to say, a handful that exist only in mono anyway; and also the mono implementations of GERONIMO (properly behaved AV!), PERFIDIA [VB correctly presented], and, we think, SOME ARE LONELY [VB], this last definitely not reflecting the groove noise of the one available stereo version on compact disc, unless that too has been processed out of earshot.



