

Chapter 1 : We Can Work It Out (song) - The Paul McCartney Project

'We Can Work It Out' became The Beatles' sixth single in a row to top the US charts. At the time, no other band had achieved such success. The track took over 11 hours to perfect - up to this.

Share via Email Let us begin with a short quiz: Does it mean that sitting around will make a lean person fat? How about a mathematical variation on these questions? And will we continue to slim down at this pace for as long as we continue to exercise? For most of us, fear of flab is the reason we exercise, the motivation that drives us to the gym. Just last month, the American Heart Association and the American College of Sports Medicine published joint guidelines for physical activity and health. The best they could say about the relationship between fat and exercise was this: So far, data to support this hypothesis is not particularly compelling. But the reason for this minute recommendation is precisely that so little evidence exists to support the notion that exercising less has any effect. The report that these experts cite most often as grounds for their assessments was published in by two Finnish researchers who surveyed all the relevant research on exercise and weight from the previous 20 years. Yet the Finnish report, the most scientifically rigorous review of the evidence to date, can hardly be said to have cleared the matter up. When the Finnish investigators looked at the results of the dozen best-constructed experimental trials that addressed weight maintenance - that is, successful dieters who were trying to keep off the pounds they had shed - they found that everyone regains weight. And depending on the type of trial, exercise would either decrease the rate of that gain by 3. We might just enjoy exercise. The one thing that might be said with certainty about exercise is that it tends to make us hungry. Maybe not immediately, but eventually. In the intervening years, he estimates, he has run close to 80, miles and gained about 30lb. When I asked Blair whether he thought he might be leaner had he run even more, he had to think about it. I had no time to do more. But if I could have gone out over the last couple of decades for two to three hours a day, maybe I would not have gained this weight. There is little reason to believe the amount he runs makes any difference. There was a time when virtually no one believed exercise would help a person lose weight. Until the Sixties, clinicians who treated obese and overweight patients dismissed the notion as naive. The problem, as he and his contemporaries saw it, is that light exercise burns an insignificant number of calories - amounts that are undone by comparatively effortless changes in diet. In , Louis Newburgh of the University of Michigan calculated that a 17st man expends only three calories climbing a flight of stairs - the equivalent of depriving himself of a quarter of a teaspoon of sugar or th of an ounce of butter. So why not skip the stairs, skip the bread, and call it a day? Thus men doing heavy physical work spontaneously eat more than men engaged in sedentary occupations. Statistics show the average daily caloric intake of lumberjacks is more than 5, calories, while that of tailors is only 2, calories. Persons who change their occupation from light to heavy work or vice versa soon develop corresponding changes in their appetite. Credit for why we came to believe otherwise goes to one man, Jean Mayer, who began his career at Harvard in the early Fifties and went on to become the most influential nutritionist in United States. As an authority on human-weight regulation, Mayer was among the very first of a new breed, a type that has since come to dominate the field. His predecessors - Wilder, Rony, Newburgh and others - had all been physicians who worked closely with obese and overweight patients. His training was in physiological chemistry; he had obtained a doctorate at Yale with a dissertation on the interrelationship of vitamins A and C in rats. In the ensuing decades, he would publish hundreds of papers on different aspects of nutrition, including why we get fat, but he never had to reduce obese patients as part of his clinical obligation, and so his hypotheses were less fettered by anecdotal or real-life experience. As early as , after just a few years of research on laboratory mice, Mayer began extolling the virtues of exercise for weight control. Mayer knew the obese often eat no more than the lean and occasionally even less. This seemed to exclude gluttony as a cause of their weight gain, which meant that these fat people had to be less physically active. Otherwise, how could they take in more calories than they expend and so become fat? Through the Sixties, Mayer documented the relationship between inactivity and the overweight. They were much less active; they spent four times as many hours watching television. Mayer also studied infants. Every modern convenience, by this logic, from power windows to the electric toothbrush,

only serves to minimise the calories we expend. The first issue is a logical one: This may be, in part, an effect that excess weight would have on the activity impulse of any normal person. But this was never replicated. In more recent experiments, the more rats run the more rats eat; weight remains unchanged. And when rats are retired from these exercise programmes, they eat more than ever and gain weight with age more rapidly than rats that were allowed to remain sedentary. With hamsters and gerbils, exercise increases body weight and body-fat percentage. So exercising makes these particular rodents fatter, not leaner. This article is still commonly cited as perhaps the only existing evidence that physical activity and appetite do not necessarily go hand in hand. But it, too, has never been replicated, despite or perhaps because of a half-century of improvements in methods of assessing diet and energy expenditure in humans. It helped that Mayer promoted his pro-exercise message with a fervour akin to a moral crusade. My favourite study of the effect of physical activity on weight loss was published in by a team of Danish researchers. Over the course of 18 months the Danes trained non-athletes to run a marathon. At the end of this training period, the 18 men in the study had lost an average of 5lb of body fat. One simple reason is that the health reporters bought it, and we were reading their articles, not the research literature itself. In , for instance, the National Institutes of Health hosted its second conference on obesity and weight control. As for the authorities themselves, the primary factor fuelling their belief in the weight-maintaining benefits of exercise was their natural reluctance to acknowledge otherwise. Hence, the idea of working up an appetite was jettisoned. Clinicians, researchers, exercise physiologists, even personal trainers at the local gym took to thinking and talking about hunger as though it were a phenomenon exclusive to the brain, a question of willpower whatever that is , not the natural consequence of a body trying to replenish itself with energy. Ultimately, the relationship between physical activity and fatness comes down to the question of cause and effect. Is Lance Armstrong excessively lean because he burns off a few thousand calories a day cycling, or is he driven to expend that energy because his body is constitutionally set against storing calories as fat? If his fat tissue is resistant to accumulating calories, his body has little choice but to burn them as quickly as possible: His body is telling him to get on his bike and ride, not his mind. Those of us who run to fight fat would have the opposite problem. Our fat tissue wants to store calories, leaving our muscles with a relative dearth of energy to burn. For the past 60 years, researchers studying obesity and weight regulation have insisted on treating the human body as a thermodynamic black box: The fat tissue, in this thermodynamic model, has nothing to say in the matter. Or at least not fatter. And in the strict sense this is true - you can starve a human, or a rat, and they will indeed lose weight - but that misses the point. Humans, rats and all living organisms are ruled by biology, not thermodynamics. When we deprive ourselves of food, we get hungry. When we push ourselves physically, we get tired. Our bodies, like all living organisms, have evolved a fantastically complex web of feedback loops. These physiological mechanisms serve fundamentally to work against the inevitable pull of thermodynamics which is entropy, aka death and so make life possible. From this biological or homeostatic perspective, lean people are not those who have the willpower to exercise more and eat less. They are people whose bodies are programmed to send the calories they consume to the muscles to be burned rather than to the fat tissue to be stored - the Lance Armstrongs of the world. The rest of us tend to go the other way, shunting off calories to fat tissue, where they accumulate to excess. This shunting of calories toward fat cells to be stored or toward the muscles to be burned is a phenomenon known as fuel partitioning. The job of determining how fuels glucose and fatty acids will be used, whether we will store them as fat or burn them for energy, is carried out primarily by the hormone insulin in concert with an enzyme known technically as lipoprotein lipase - LPL, for short. Sex hormones also interact with LPL, which is why men and women fatten differently. In the Eighties, biochemists and physiologists worked out how LPL responds to exercise. They found that during a workout, LPL activity increases in muscle tissue, and so our muscle cells suck up fatty acids to use for fuel. This works to return to the fat cells any fat they might have had to surrender - homeostasis, in other words. The more rigorous the exercise, and the more fat lost from our fat tissue, the greater the subsequent increase in LPL activity in the fat cells. Thus, post-workout, we get hungry: Just as sweating makes us thirsty, burning off calories makes us hungry. This research has never been controversial. But contemplating the means by which we might lose weight without considering the hormonal regulation of fat tissue is like wondering why children

grow taller without considering the role of growth hormones. Or, for that matter, like trying to explain the record-breaking triumphs of modern athletes - Olympic sprinter Marion Jones, for instance - and never considering the possibility that steroid hormones or human growth hormone or insulin might be involved. To be sure, this is the same logic that leads to other unconventional ideas. So maybe if we eat fewer carbohydrates - in particular the easily digestible simple carbohydrates and sugars - we might lose considerable fat or at least not gain any more, whether we exercise or not. This would explain the slew of recent clinical trials demonstrating that dieters who restrict carbohydrates but not calories invariably lose more weight than dieters who restrict calories but not necessarily carbohydrates. And so if we avoid these foods specifically, we may find our weights more in line with our desires. For the rest of us, it may be time to take a scientific or biological view of our excesses rather than a biblical one. The benefits of exercise include the joys of virtuousness. But maybe the causality is reversed here, too.

Chapter 2 : WE CAN WORK IT OUT TAB by The Beatles @ calendrierdelascience.com

"We Can Work It Out" is a song by the English rock band the Beatles, written by Paul McCartney and John Lennon. It was first issued as a double A-side single with "Day Tripper" in December

There are just two vocals, Paul and John. And Paul double-tracked in the verses, obviously. Reply JNagarya Wednesday 22 July Where there is disagreement it is always necessary to check the sources " beginning with listening to the recording. The lead vocalist is Paul. In the middle, Paul is leading too with John singing below him. I would think that with books and interviews, he has already defined his position on who did what. Who else of importance could dispute him? In matters concerning partnerships, it is usually the deceased person who has to be defended against revisionism. Turn me on dead man. Reply Joseph Brush Sunday 8 November Since Lennon was a Beatle, he earned the right to say what he felt whether he changed his clothes or not. Remember that both of them are talking about recollections that occurred over 40 years ago. Naturally, more fans would defend someone who has been dead for almost 29 years and nothing is going to change that. We can work it out is a minor example of that, Paul says the middle was co-written, but Lennon said that was his. I mean, I had read a lot of books about The Beatles and all mentioned Paul as the only lead vocalist in We can work it out. All said, I think your website is great. Goodness me, the mono version has a lot more bass in it than the stereo. Glad you like the site Sebastian, and thanks for sharing your thoughts. There were, surprisingly, little to no differences between them. To put it simply but accurately: It's one of their best songs, because of their vocals and it doesn't interest me, if John's vocal is a lead vocal or a harmony. I never even thought about it. Matt Sunday 4 April I hear a guitar on a clean setting. Teddy Salad Wednesday 20 September Especially since life is very short. I never much cared for it. I got it in about when I was six. Their harmony in the chorus of We Can Work it Out is my personal favorite. John's voice in that song was perfect.

Chapter 3 : WE CAN WORK IT OUT CHORDS by The Beatles @ calendrierdelascience.com

Recorded during the Rubber Soul sessions, "We Can Work It Out" was a gold certified single McCartney possibly wrote about girlfriend Jane Asher. It's an important song in the transition of.

If you like what you are seeing, share it on social networks and let others know about The Paul McCartney Project. Song facts From Wikipedia: Both songs were recorded during the Rubber Soul sessions. The song is an example of Lennon–McCartney collaboration at a depth that happened only rarely after they wrote the hit singles of McCartney then took the song to Lennon: That came on the session, it was one of the cases of the arrangement being done on the session. As Lennon told Playboy in Music critic Ian MacDonald said: The swell-pedal crescendos he adds to the verses are, on the other hand, textural washes added in the studio, the first of their kind on a Beatles record and signposts to the enriched sound-palette of Revolver. They spent nearly 11 hours on the song, by far the longest expenditure of studio time up to that point. It has sold 1. Both sides of the single entered the Billboard Hot pop singles chart the week ending December 18, The Beatles made 10 black-and-white promo films for television broadcasters on 23 November , at Twickenham Film Studios in London, as they were often unable to make personal appearances by that time. The most frequently-broadcast of the three versions was a straightforward performance piece with the group wearing black suits. Another had the group wearing the stage suits from their Shea Stadium performance on 15 August; the third opens with a shot of Lennon with a sunflower in front of his eye. In , McCartney played an acoustic version of the song for his MTV Unplugged performance, memorable for his flubbing the first verse and his good-natured reaction, later released on Unplugged The Official Bootleg. Personnel MacDonald was not sure whether or not Harrison sang a harmony vocal part. MacDonald praised the tambourine playing and noted that some sources attribute it to Harrison, not Starr. However, MacDonald considers it more likely that Starr played the instrument on the recording. That single reached 13 on the Billboard Hot Wonder performed his version of the song for McCartney after the latter was awarded the Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award in In stereo [b], the harmonium is moved around: By contrast, in [c] it just stays to the right. But then again, at the very end, [b] reveals there are two harmonium tracks. Stereo [c] has reverb added to the vocals in places, especially the bridge.

Chapter 4 : We Can Work It Out (Sweetbox song) - Wikipedia

We can work it out and get it straight, or say good night. We can work it out, We can work it out. Life is very short, and there's no time For fussing and fighting.

Chapter 5 : Letra Traducida de The Beatles - We can work it out

Try to see it my way Do I have to keep on talking till I can't go on? While you see it your way Run the risk of knowing that our love may soon be gone.

Chapter 6 : We Can Work It Out - Wikipedia

There's a chance that we may fall apart before too long We can work it out We can work it out Life is very short And there's no time For fussing and fighting, my friend.

Chapter 7 : We Can Work It Out – The Beatles Bible

We Can Work It Out was released as a double a-side single with Day Tripper in December It was recorded during the sessions for The Beatles' Rubber Soul album, and released on the same day.

DOWNLOAD PDF WE CANT WORK IT OUT

Chapter 8 : Paul McCartney - We Can Work It Out Lyrics | MetroLyrics

"We Can Work It Out" peaked at #1 (for 2 weeks) on January 2nd, and spent 12 weeks on the Top , while "Day Tripper" reached #5 (for 1 week) on January 16th and stayed on the chart for 10 weeks.

Chapter 9 : ShieldSquare Block

of results for "WE CAN WORK IT OUT+BEATLES" Amazon Music Unlimited. Listen to any song, anywhere. Learn More about Amazon Music Unlimited.