

HIPPIE FILMS, HIPPIESPLOITATION, AND THE EMERGING COUNTERCULTURE, 1955-
1970

Britton Stiles Rhuart

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2020

Committee:

Cynthia Baron, Advisor

Dawn Anderson
Graduate Faculty Representative

Angela Ahlgren

Bradford Clark

Johnny Walker

© 2020

Britton Stiles Rhuart

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Cynthia Baron, Advisor

The 1960s was a turbulent time in the United States. The war in Vietnam and the assassinations of leading progressive figures created great cultural anxiety. One response to the divisive war and the rightwing violence was the Hippie movement, which advocated peace, love, and social equality. In American cinema, films touting their cultural relevance or appeal for the lucrative youth market came to include representations of Hippies. Initially, mainstream films failed to capture Hippie style and ideology, but subsequently featured sympathetic portrayals of Hippies. By comparison, exploitation films depicted stylistic elements associated with Hippies even at the outset, but offered sensationalized characterizations of Hippies throughout the 1960s.

The study's primary method is textual analysis of films, reviews, marketing materials, and print documents ranging from mainstream news coverage to counterculture manifestos. To provide a context for analyzing the various trends in cinematic representations of Hippies, the study examines cultural events and filmmaking patterns that led to and sustained the Hippie movement and its representation on screen.

Studying depictions of the Hippie movement on-screen sheds new light on how dominant American society viewed the Hippie counterculture. Most on-screen representations of Hippies reflect the views of the country's dominant culture, because, in contrast to other Hippie art forms, Hippie films were produced, distributed, and exhibited almost exclusively by companies outside the Hippie movement. At the same time, because certain Hippie films feature *vérité* footage of events such as the Woodstock festival and the 1968 Democratic Convention riots,

some on-screen representations offer a window into ways that people sympathetic to the Hippie movement viewed the lifestyle and values associated with Hippies in the 1960s.

Analysis of Hippie films illuminates several key distinctions among mainstream, independent, and exploitation filmmaking. The study reveals that exploitation films were generally unfavorable in their on-screen depictions of Hippies, whereas mainstream films featured generous depictions of Hippies when they had left leaning directors at the helm. The handful of independent Hippie films produced in the 1960s capture the movement's eccentric spirit and its interest in nonviolence.

First to Roger Corman, without whose films this dissertation would not be possible.

More importantly, to my family, both blood and chosen:

Les and Susie Rhuart

Britt and Penny Burns

Nanny, Stacie, Kimber, Caden, Kate, and Sara

Melanie Schultz and Shawannah Garza

“We are stardust, we are golden. And we’ve got to get ourselves back to the garden.”

- “Woodstock” by Joni Mitchell, 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A lot of work went into making this dissertation readable and even more work went into making me able to get it to where it needed to be. I certainly could not have done it on my own. The first person I must recognize is my chair, Dr. Cynthia Baron. I want to thank her for her seemingly infinite patience and kind words throughout the writing of this work. I could not have achieved a fraction of what I have without Dr. Baron's input nor without her keeping tabs on me and my project. She helped shape it from the very beginning and for that I thank her.

My other committee members need recognition as well. Dr. Johnny Walker has become someone I consider a good friend and academic icon. He writes on all the topics I want to research, and he is very supportive of my efforts. We are separated by an ocean, but we can sit and have a pint and talk exploitation cinema whenever we get together. Dr. Angie Ahlgren and Brad Clark were two of my favorite instructors going throughout my first two years. They have always been available for a kind word and quick conversation. Their advice and input on several projects have been invaluable. Brad also is my chair for my Performance Studies certificate. My grad rep, Dr. Dawn Anderson, is not someone I know very well, but I have greatly appreciated her support. I appreciate that she has been able to keep everything above board.

My cohort has provided me with some of my new, lifelong best friends and I am eternally grateful I was in the group that I was. Elizabeth Brownlow is the person I need to most thank for her help on this project. For the last semester or so, she has been my constant writing partner, a friendly ear, and a solid editor. Knowing and working with Liz, particularly this last semester, has been one of the highlights of this program and certainly took some of the sting out of writing everyday just by her presence. The rest of my cohort including Kathleen Kollman, Elizabeth Neihaus, David Stephens, and Michail-Chrysovalantis Markodimitrakis (Michael Poe) have been

some of my best support over the last several years. I should also acknowledge my cohort member Buddy Avila, who provided support in the Ray Browne Popular Culture Library and helped me with historical and other data throughout the project. He also read several chapters and I greatly appreciate his input.

My Bowling Green State University “Family” extends far beyond my Ph.D. cohort. Unfortunately, I do not have the length and breadth to write my thanks to all of them individually, but I want to thank Nick Clark, Nick Canada, Tyler Wertsch, Keisuke Kimura, Chrissy Jones, Liz Seung-A Lee, Leesi Patrick, Elizabeth Collins, Aju James, Trinidad Linares, Washeika Torres, Graeme Wilson, Shane Snyder, Erin Carlyle, Jacqueline P. Hudson, Jordan Wilson, Leda Hayes, Courtney Bliss, Naykishia D. Darby, and Ericka Findley. They are all good friends of mine and kept me sane throughout my four years here.

I also want to recognize some BGSU faculty who have also made my life easier. I want to thank Dr. Mark Hain, Dr. Hannah Miller, Stephen Crompton, Lucas Ostrowski, Dr. Andrew Schocket, Dr. Radhika Gajjala, Rob Sloane, Dr. Molly Gardiner, and Dr. Susana Peña in particular, though there are so many more names I could list. All of them have helped me survive here, whether it be through academic input or pure friendship. And, of course, I cannot forget Beka Patterson, the program secretary for American Culture Studies. Not only do I have to thank her, but I do not think there is a person in the program whose life she has not touched in a positive way. Without Beka, everything would come to a grinding halt.

Next, I want to thank people who helped me on the research end. Erin Weigand is also an advisee of Dr. Johnny Walker and was with me while we looked through pressbooks and other movie ephemera at Something Weird Video in Seattle. She is a kind person, a great academic, and helped me fill in a lot of gaps, particularly in discussing Hippie exploitation documentaries.

Speaking of Something Weird, I really have to thank Lisa Petrucci, who allowed Erin and I into her home for two days to do research. She was always there with any information on certain films I may have been lacking. I must quickly recognize the staff at the BGSU Popular Culture Library, where I wrote probably a third of this work. Amongst the many folks there who helped me find obscure underground press materials and movie pressbooks were Dr. Nancy Down, Dana Nemeth, Steve Ammidown, and Stefanie Dennis Hunker. They were all wonderful people with whom to work. Amy Fry in the BGSU library helped my find all the necessary resources to cite obscure materials. My friend back in Phoenix, Hal C.F. Astell, helped me find some of the more obscure films in my work that were either out of print or exceedingly difficult to track down. He is a good friend and one of my favorite non-academic film reviewers. Ren Baron helped copy edit this work for more hours than I would like to admit, and I could not have finished it without her kind input.

Finally, I want to thank my family. I mentioned some names in my dedication, but to my Mom and Dad, Susie and Les Rhuart, thank you for introducing me to movies at such an early age. Fostering that appreciation got me here, as did your love and support. My godparents Britt and Penny Burns have always managed to make me feel happy and silly in times of struggle. Aunt Nanny and my cousins Kimber and Stacie Lambeth are as close to me as anyone could be. I would like to recognize my many godchildren, including Thomas and Maryanne Rotchford, Jack and Lucy Weaver, Caden Lambeth, Kate and Sara Onken, and Jeremy Garza. Those kids make life worth living. Lastly, I want to thank two close friends who are my family. Shawannah Garza is my oldest and best friend from childhood. She is my sister. Melanie Schultz has been my friend for years, both here and at home in Phoenix, and is my favorite person. I consider her as close to family as anyone. I love both Shawannah and Melanie more than I can say. These are the people

who have made me who I am today, for better or worse. Without them and without everyone else, I would have nothing. Thank you all for making my life better. And now, on with the opera.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Analysis Framework	12
Scholarly Contribution.....	16
Pertinent Scholarship	17
Film.....	17
Cultural Context.....	22
Critical Framework and Approach.....	26
Chapter Breakdown	31
CHAPTER I. BEFORE “ATLANTIS”: TRANSITIONS FROM TEENS TO BEATS TO HIPPIES, 1955-1963.....	38
The 1950s and the Emergence of the Teenage Audience	40
Mainstream Teen/Juvenile Delinquent/Coming of Age Films	43
Teensploitation.....	48
Beatniks at the Movies.....	58
Preparing for the Hippies: Cultural Events and Counterculture in the Early 1960s..	65
CHAPTER II. “THE TIMES THEY ARE A-CHANGIN’”: THE BIRTH OF THE HIPPIES AND THE MOVE FROM TEENSPLOITATION TO HIPPIESPLOITATION	70
The Gulf of Tonkin and the Escalation of the Vietnam War	72
The Hippies Make the Scene	74
How to Identify a Hippie	83
The Decline of Teensploitation.....	94

The Rise of Counterculture at the Movies	101
“Riots” on Sunset Strip and Events Leading to the Emergence of the Hippies.....	109
CHAPTER III. “THERE’S SOMETHING HAPPENING HERE”: HIPPIES, LOVE, DRUGS, AND REVOLUTION ON FILM, 1967	113
Hip Cultural Events of 1967	114
Hippies at the Movies	129
CHAPTER IV. “IN LINCOLN PARK THE DARK WAS TURNING”: TRANSITIONAL HIPPIE FILMS IN THE WAKE OF U.S. POLITICS, 1968.....	151
“The Whole World is Watching!” The Hippies, Chicago, and 1968 U.S. Presidential Politics.....	152
1968 Hippiesploitation and Hippie Films	163
CHAPTER V. “THEY MIGHT THINK IT’S A MOVEMENT”: HOLLYWOOD EMBRACES THE HIPPIES AND THE WAR COMES HOME, 1969	179
Hippies in 1969 Culture	180
The Hippies on Film in 1969	200
CHAPTER VI. “HALLELUJAH, I’M A BUM”: 1970 FILMS AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS	217
Positive Representations in Hippiesploitation, Mainstream, and Independent Hippie Films.....	218
Conclusion	231
ENDNOTES	235
REFERENCES	240
FILMOGRAPHY	255

INTRODUCTION

The 1960s was one of the most tumultuous historical moments in twentieth century America. In the winter of 1964, much of the nation was still reeling from the loss of civil rights activist Medgar Evers and President John F. Kennedy, who were assassinated in June and November of 1963 respectively. Over the next several years, there would be more assassinations of people fighting for social justice, including Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Bobby Kennedy. As a backdrop to these highly publicized deaths, the Vietnam War raged once U.S. involvement began to ramp up in 1964 after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The Vietnam War (known in Vietnam as the American War) became a cultural touchstone of the Baby Boomer generation with strong, often divisive opinions characterizing the public debate over the ethics of the United States military actions in Southeast Asia. Additionally, events such as Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs, the riots at the 1968 Democratic convention, the Kent State Massacre, and the rise and fall of the Nixon presidency left an impact on how America viewed itself and how it was viewed by the world.

Perhaps no social movement or group embodies that era more than the people who would become colloquially known as the Hippies. The Hippie movement emerged when youths across the country began migrating to the west coast, many of them ending up in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco. The young Hippies were influenced by the Beatniks already living there, and soon became politically, socially, and culturally relevant, so much so that much of the 1960s is associated with them (Miller 1991, 6). Distinct from the New Left, which was a more organized group directly involved in politics, the Hippies were essentially a loose-knit left-leaning group that promoted Free Love, open use of drugs like LSD and marijuana, an end to the War in Vietnam, and other causes related to personal freedom, the environment, spirituality, and

social justice. The Hippie movement began as a peaceful movement, advocating for what young people thought was best for America, yet it became increasingly more militant as the 1960s gave way to the 1970s. By the 1970s, the Hippies were not simply associated with the image of the peaceful Woodstock Nation, but had become linked in the minds of many Americans to social upheaval and riots, criminal far-left groups like the Symbionese Liberation Army and the Weather Underground, and murderous cults like the Manson family. Due to the end of the war in Vietnam in 1975 and the fracturing of the movement's focus towards other causes like environmentalism and feminism, the Hippies as a group were a visible social force for only about a decade.

While cultural and political developments were changing the country in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the American film industry had already begun undergoing significant reorganization. The studio system had been in decline since the Paramount Decree of 1948, and major studios were losing money on films that would likely have been successes in earlier times. Yet several things began to happen between the late-1950s and the mid-1960s that saved the film industry as a whole. Independent production companies like American International Pictures (1954-1980) began to achieve greater success, and major studios began to give more control to independent production companies, fostering a rise of auteurs and opening the door for the Hollywood Renaissance between 1966-1974, which eventually gave rise to New Hollywood when corporate conglomerations took over the studios between 1975 and the early 1980s (King 2002, 11-54). Another major change was the end of the Production Code in 1966 and the institution of the MPAA Ratings System by Jack Valenti in 1968 that allowed for more freedom in terms of filmic content while keeping the regulatory system of censorship safely under control of the Hollywood elite. These changes have been documented in detail in film and media

scholarship,ⁱ thus this dissertation aims to offer new insights into American culture and related filmic representations rather than the Hollywood film industry between 1955 and 1970.

The exploitation film has existed since almost the beginning of cinema. For example, Eric Schaefer explains that the white slave film cycle of the early 1910s was a “precursor to the development of exploitation films” (2001, 18). Occurring in film cycles, ranging from slasher to sexploitation and teensexploitation to Blaxploitation, products of exploitation cinema are films that exploit certain topical or salacious issues, their audience, their casts in the case of women in sexploitation films, or their subject matter, which often tends towards the extreme in their representations of sex and violence. Exploitation films are often associated with cult cinema, but to suggest a connection between cult and exploitation films is a risky proposition, according to Austin Fisher and Johnny Walker, who write:

While there may be political advantages to championing exploitation cinema’s implicit differences to the mainstream, there is also a risk in assuming that *all* exploitation films are somehow imbued with such anti-mainstream, “cult,” status. To consider exploitation movies solely on the grounds of their alleged transgressions, or because they are curious cult oddities, in many cases risks undermining the historical and industrial contexts that birthed these films in the first place, or lays claim to cult recognition that, frankly, isn’t there. Not all of the exploitation films from the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s were made “beyond” the mainstream. In fact, many were made *because of* the mainstream, or *as part of* cycles of films that were proving popular with theater-going audiences. (2016, 2)

One of the goals of this dissertation is to show that mainstream, independent, and exploitation Hippie films released between 1964 and 1970 warrant analysis because they illuminate how mainstream society viewed Hippies. This dissertation considers

Hippiesploitation, mainstream, and independent Hippie films, in connection to U.S. social and cultural developments. In addition, the contrast between Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films illuminates distinctions between mainstream Hollywood filmmaking and exploitation cinema conventions, with Hippiesploitation films being more sensational in their content, production, or marketing. These films often did not abide by the classic Hollywood style of production. Ernst Mathijs and Jamie Sexton explain:

Exploitation producers would survey the market for exploitable popular themes and build films around them. They were in a good position to jump on a topical wave because their rapid production schedules meant that they could get a film onto the market while the topicality of the exploitable element(s) was still current. (2012, 149)

Because of this, exploitation filmmakers saw Hippies as an “exploitable popular theme” and began to make movies about them beginning in late 1966 with the production of the Hippiesploitation film *Hallucination Generation* (Mann 1966). By comparison, mainstream Hippie films, produced or distributed by major Hollywood studios, tended to abide by classic Hollywood conventions. However, because most of the mainstream Hippie films were made in the Hollywood Renaissance era between 1966 and 1974, new filmmaking techniques were often employed. Geoff King writes:

It is possible, at the risk of some simplification, to divide the social context of the Hollywood Renaissance into two main currents. One, as we have seen, celebrates aspects of 1960s rebellion. The other explores or manifests elements of a darker mood in which alienation leads towards fear and disillusion. If the counterculture, “flower power” and 1967’s proclaimed “summer of love” represent one side of the equation, Vietnam and Watergate are pervasive reference points for the other. (2002, 18-19)

They were also, more often than not, far less graphic than Hippiesploitation films, particularly in their content and marketing. Whereas in a Hippiesploitation film, a theme like sex or drug use would be explicitly shown and stated, a mainstream Hippie film might make that concept or theme a subtext or cut away from the actual on-screen action.

Thus, the simplest definition of a Hippie film is that it is a film focused on characters and/or themes that are easily identifiable as being “Hippie,” either through style or ideology. A mainstream Hippie film is produced and/or distributed by a major studio and is often not explicit in its depictions. A Hippiesploitation film is a Hippie film produced to be explicit and sensational, and it is identifiable as such through its themes, production, and marketing.

I analyze one main cultural movement between 1955 and 1970; the rise and fall of the Hippie counterculture movement. I examine this cultural moment through an analysis of Hippie exploitation, or Hippiesploitation, and mainstream Hippie films. There are several reasons for using these dates. The first is to limit the dissertation to this exact cycle of filmmaking. The first Hippiesploitation film, *Hallucination Generation* (Mann), premiered in 1966 and, although there are outlying films in the cycle, Hippie films end right around 1976 with the television film *Helter Skelter* (Gries, CBS). However, I limit my timeline to 1970 because I focus on the Hippie movement and films of the 1960s, while including cultural and filmic events which influenced the counterculture and cinema. After 1970, few films were based on Hippie cultural events besides the emerging Manson sub-cycle, and Hippie films tended to rely on more and more narrative devices, rather than directly commenting on the counterculture or making any type of significant statement about Hippies. Additionally, this timeline reflects Roger Corman’s time with American International Pictures, leading to his break with the company after the release of *Gas-s-s-s* (Corman 1970). This timeline also reflects the Hippie counterculture movement at the

height of its visibility. The first group of young people who would become known as the Hippies arrived in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco in 1964-1965. The dissolution of the Hippie movement is observable by 1970, therefore the study takes that as its end date.

There is value in studying selected Hippiesploitation, mainstream, and independent Hippie films. The main point is clarifying the approach that distinguishes representations in Hippie exploitation films from other on-screen depictions. Perhaps the most important reason to highlight Hippiesploitation films is to illustrate ways they contrast with independent and mainstream Hippie films. Independent and mainstream Hippie films often featured positive portrayals of the counterculture, as opposed to the more negative depictions inherent in Hippiesploitation. Thus, this study allows for parallels and distinctions to be drawn between mainstream, independent, and exploitation cinema. This comparison helps to provide new knowledge concerning differences between different types of film productions. My study does incorporate several mainstream Hippie films as a contrast to the Hippiesploitation cycle, therefore focusing on Hippiesploitation films specifically is a delimitation that should prove useful for providing a wider understanding of cultural artifacts in America.

The argument my dissertation makes is that because unlike other counterculture art forms, including literature, music, and other more traditional forms of art, the films about Hippies were almost exclusively produced by film companies rather than Hippies themselves. Therefore, the films function as a representation of the group not by the counterculture, but instead by people who were often best served by discounting a progressive youth movement. To illustrate this point, I examine Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films to present how these films portrayed the counterculture from its beginning around 1964 through 1970. These films were usually informed by cultural events surrounding Hippies, some being based on

Hippie-centered events, some reflecting lifestyle trends. In the case of the former, *Woodstock* (Wadleigh 1970) and *Medium Cool* (Wexler 1969) were based on the historical events of the Woodstock festival and the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention riots. On the other hand, films like *Psych-Out* (Rush 1968) seemed more to be inspired by cultural touchstones like life in Haight-Ashbury during the Summer of Love, rather than being based on a singular event.

Mainstream Hippie films generally seem to portray Hippies in a more positive light, though Hollywood seemed to pick up on Hippie style and ideology more slowly than exploitation films. Mainstream Hippie films also focused on more established, older stars over building young talent, at least in the beginning. Hippiesploitation films were able to capture Hippie style more readily because they had younger casts, with established stars serving in supporting roles, the inverse of what mainstream Hippie films were doing. Mainstream Hippie films often had more positive portrayals of the counterculture was because they focused on individual, sympathetic characters, while Hippiesploitation films often concentrated on the movement as a whole, with unlikeable, interchangeable characters. This is not true for all Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films, but there are enough examples to notice this pattern.

Hippiesploitation films often depicted the counterculture as irresponsible, hedonistic drug users. Part of the reason for this is that much of the business of exploitation films plays into existing moral panic, and the older generation of exploitation film producers tended to make films that encouraged fears of youth groups, such as Hippies, Beatniks, and to a certain degree, teens. In discussing moral panics, Stanley Cohen writes, “They are *new* (lying dormant perhaps, but hard to recognize; deceptively ordinary and routine, but invisibly creeping up the moral horizon) – but also *old* (camouflaged versions of traditional and well-known evils)” (2002, vii-

viii). While many Hippiesploitation films were marketed as moral panic to an older audience, they were more often produced with a younger demographic in mind. The younger audience was intended to find these films cool and edgy. The positive portrayals of Hippies on-screen tended to be from left-leaning filmmakers who sympathized with youth movements and who had more control as auteurs during the Hollywood Renaissance. Such progressive stances were more readily available in mainstream Hippie films, with one of the only directors making positive Hippiesploitation films was Roger Corman, himself a champion of left-leaning, progressive youths. Additionally, there were a few independent Hippie films that were produced by Hippies. These latter films featured some of the most realistic and sympathetic depictions of Hippies because of their producers.

There are several terms to define at the outset: Hippie, exploitation film, exploitation company, exploitation strategy, moral panic, Hippie film, Teensploitation, and Hippiesploitation. The term Hippie was first used by the Beatniks to classify the new young people making their way to the Haight-Ashbury area of San Francisco in 1964-1965 (Moretta 2017, 32). It achieved mainstream use as a term in 1966. Hippies can be identified through two ways, their “style” and their core beliefs. Style can refer to how the Hippies wore their hair, what types of clothes they wore, or what types of drugs or “dope,” as Timothy Miller puts it, they consumed. Of course, there are exceptions to all of these rules, as the Hippies were not a monolithic group. Still, Hippies tended to wear their hair long, wear clothes like bellbottoms, tie-dye, and love beads, and do mind-expanding drugs such as marijuana, LSD, peyote, and mushrooms. Hippies also tended to be young, usually under 35, shared an affinity for rock and occasionally folk music, were often middle-class, and tended to be white. There are exceptions to all of these identifiers for Hippie style, but these are the easily identifiable traits many Hippies shared. They also tended

to share left-leaning beliefs in the cause of personal freedom. They tended to be anti-war in general, anti-Vietnam in specific, pro-legalization of many drugs, like the ones previously mentioned, and often protested for civil rights. There were many more causes in which the Hippies were involved, and just how extreme they took their involvement in these causes varied wildly, from peaceful protesters to radical groups like the Weather Underground to people leaving the wider world behind for communes.

Exploitation films focus on sensational themes, modes of production and distribution, and marketing. In the early to mid-twentieth century, many, though certainly not all, exploitation films were independently produced and/or distributed. A few exploitation films were produced by independent film companies but distributed by mainstream Hollywood corporations. This began to change between the Hollywood Renaissance and New Hollywood eras. Though referring to the “classic” era of exploitation films of the 1930s-1950s, Mathijs and Sexton’s description of exploitation films is easily applicable to the exploitation films of the 1960s-1970s. They write:

The films often dealt with forbidden topics, such as sex, vice, drugs, nudity, and anything considered to be in “bad taste.” As these films were made on extremely low budgets, dealing with such lurid material was a way to give them an edge, in that they were providing material that could not be found in other types of films. The name of exploitation stems from the fact that filmmakers exploited such material in their promotional campaigns, moving beyond typical film trailers, posters, and ads. (2012, 147)

There are many exploitation film companies. These companies are outside of the mainstream Hollywood studios and only or primarily produce exploitation films. The most

successful of these companies between 1955 and 1970 was American International Pictures, but there were plenty of others. The companies were most often independent production and/or distribution companies. Exploitation companies were most easily identifiable because of the exploitation strategies they implemented. When it came to production, quick turnover and explicit themes were often viewed as exploitation strategies. In terms of distribution, exploitation films, particularly from the “classic” exploitation era of the 1930s-1950s, were often shown through “roadshowing,” which involved the producers taking the film between various markets, or by selling the rights to an independent exhibitor for a certain period. Exploitation strategy was also employed in marketing, which often included, “sensational, eye-grabbing posters, trailers, and other paraphernalia, plus ear-grabbing radio spots and a host of other extravagant gimmicks” (Mathijis and Sexton 2012, 149). Exploitation strategies often involve fostering a moral panic, which is a cultural fear of something corrupting society. Cohen defines moral panic as,

A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved or (more often) resorted to; the condition then disappears, submerges or deteriorates and becomes more visible. (2002, 1)

In the case of Hippiesploitation, that moral panic was centered around the counterculture in general and Hippies in specific. Because Hippies stood opposed to common U.S. cultural practices like capitalism and monogamy, and were often active drug users, exploitation filmmakers often marketed films based upon concerns involving youth culture. Many of these concerns carried over from the Teensploitation cycle, which carried fears of teens as juvenile

delinquents who need to mature. Beatnik films were often drearier, usually ending up with main characters dying or going to prison. They also played like usually played like juvenile delinquent teen films, with some exceptions such as Roger Corman's *A Bucket of Blood* (1959), where they function more as background characters.

Hippie films are easily identifiable as having primary characters or themes that are easily identifiable as "Hippies." In this dissertation, the term "Hippie films" will be used exclusively to refer to mainstream or independent non-exploitation Hippie films, which are not as explicit and do not follow the same production or marketing strategies as exploitation films in general or Hippiesploitation films in specific. These are films that are often produced and/or distributed by major studios or were independent productions carried out by actual Hippies.

Teensploitation was a cycle of exploitation films that directly preceded Hippiesploitation and were marketed to a teenage audience, often via drive-in theaters. Major themes of these films included rock n' roll, teenage rebellion, and youthful spirit, often exhibited through partying, budding sexuality, and occasionally monsters. Hippiesploitation films featured ostensibly Hippie characters and were produced, distributed, and marketed as exploitation films. Much like mainstream Hippie films, the Hippiesploitation movies had characters and themes easily identifiable with the counterculture movement but were far more sensational in what they showed on-screen and how the films were produced and marketed. Themes from Teensploitation all became heightened in the Hippiesploitation cycle. Mathijis and Sexton explain:

Though exploitation films continued to be consumed by a predominantly younger audience, the teenage demographic itself broadened. In the 1960s "teen" culture was supplanted by "youth" culture ... Youth became a state of mind, a "concept" that, as the 1960s progressed, became very much associated with the counterculture (a term which

itself began to replace “subculture” in its usage). Films themselves began to reflect the themes and tastes associated with the new counterculture: rock music, sex, drugs, and a new form of politicized rebelliousness. This mode of rebelliousness did not constitute a radical break from earlier teenage alienation so much as an extension of it. (2012, 149-150)

Analysis Framework

To provide a cultural and filmic context for representations of Hippies in American cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, the first chapter looks at Teensploitation and mainstream teen films beginning in 1955. Teensploitation films emerged in the mid-1950s, following the decline of the studio system and the rise of the small exploitation film companies. Many factors contributed to the success of the Teensploitation cycle, including the growing popularity of the drive-in theater, the emergence of teenagers as a distinct audience, and the failings of studios to adequately gauge the interests of this newly formed youth audience. The most important independent film company to rise during this time was American International Pictures, which did business largely in exploitation films. The company was run by Samuel Z. Arkoff and James A. Nicholson, who owed a large part of their success to the work of producer-director Roger Corman, whose films they regularly distributed. Corman will be discussed throughout this study, and the influence of Arkoff and Nicholson will be recognized. It is through Arkoff that AIP got its strategy for producing the types of films they did between their founding in 1954 through the late-1960s. AIP recognized that “a younger child will watch anything an older child will; an older child will not watch anything a younger child will; a girl will watch anything a boy will watch; a boy will not watch anything a girl will watch; therefore, to catch the greatest audience you zero in on the 19-year-old male” (Tzioumakis 2006, 152). Yannis Tzioumakis calls this

phenomenon “Peter Pan syndrome.” While this is an oversimplification of how exploitation films worked at the time, it should be noted that through following this edict, AIP became one of the most successful independent studios of all time.

However, as with all cycles of filmmaking, Teensploitation films eventually faded in popularity, and the fall of Teensploitation gave rise to Hippiesploitation. Cynthia J. Miller and A. Bowdoin Van Riper discuss that transition in their work on rock n’ roll monster Teensploitation films. They explain:

The years 1964–65, the peak period of the monster-rock cluster, also saw the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the first large-scale antiwar protests, the assassination of Malcolm X, and race riots in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and a half-dozen other major cities ... The shared message that the monster-rock films delivered to their teen audiences was clear: Leave behind childish things and grow up. The subgenre died because the American teens, confronted by changes in the wider world, began to do just that. (2015, 140)

Because the Teensploitation audience changed, films did as well. Though there were anti-establishment positions before this in Beatnik subculture that would become prevalent in the upcoming counterculture, the Hippies emerged as a counterculture around 1964-1965 (MacFalane 2007, 2-3). Thus, my study of Hippiesploitation, independent, and mainstream Hippie films begins in 1964. Hippies embodied one position in the social schisms of the country, between young and old, liberal and conservative. Exploring specific cultural representations of the Hippie movement, the dissertation also traces Hippie and Hippiesploitation films, which include sub-cycles such as acid films, rock films, and Manson films. It shows how the

representations most often reflected major biases against the Hippie movement in the United States.

There are important questions to ask about how the Hippie movement began and changed between 1964-1970, including questions about distinctions among Hippies, Yippies, head-freaks, protestors both peaceful and violent, the New Left, and other countercultural groups of the era. My work involves a cultural study of events and mores occurring outside the film industry. Thus, my first three research questions are culturally based. The first question is in two parts: how did the Hippie counterculture begin and what is identifiable in a person or group as being a Hippie? I will consider these by examining Hippie and Beatnik history and by viewing Hippies through two lenses: through their “style,” as Dick Hebdige puts it, and by their ideology. Hebdige says, “Style in subculture is, then, pregnant with significance. Its transformations go ‘against nature,’ interrupting the process of ‘normalization.’ As such, they are gestures, movements towards a speech which offends the ‘silent majority,’ which challenges the principle of unity and cohesion, which contradicts the myth of consensus” (1979, 18). This two-part question will be answered by analyzing primary sources published in the late 1960s. The second question is: what were Hippies’ original goals and how did they change over time? This will be answered by examining Hippie ideology, largely through primary sources such as Tom Wolfe’s *Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* and works published by Hippies in the Underground Press, as collected in Timothy Miller’s *The Hippies and American Values*, amongst other sources. The next question is: how were the Hippies viewed by others outside the movement and how did that change over time? This is the opposite side of the first set of questions. Instead of asking how Hippies viewed themselves and how they presented themselves to the world, I will ask how those around them, particularly those in power both in and out of the film industry, viewed Hippies. This information is gleaned from

the popular press of the day, as well as other non-Hippie primary sources of the era, such as *Time*, *Life*, and *Newsweek* magazines. Similarly, this question can be answered by analyzing contemporary reviews of the films themselves, as they were most often done by those outside the Hippie movement, making them a valuable source of information on how those outside the counterculture viewed Hippies.

This inquiry leads to the next series of questions, those concerning the films themselves. The first major question about Hippiesploitation and Hippie films is: how did Hippiesploitation and mainstream films begin and evolve? To answer this question, I examine the major films of the cycle and see when they occurred, what cultural events or mores they were trying to reflect, and how the portrayals of Hippies in those films changed over time. The next question is what are the content, visual, narrative, and marketing strategies that make Hippiesploitation films distinct from mainstream or independent Hippie films? In addition to using textual analysis of Hippie and Hippiesploitation films, the evidence to answer this question comes from marketing material, such as pressbooks, posters, trailers, and radio spots. I compare Hippiesploitation with mainstream Hippie films to see how their marketing strategies, as well as their filmic content differ from one another. Finally, the last question is: do Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films reflect differing views of the Hippie movement and did films' depiction of Hippies change over time? Comparisons between the exploitation and mainstream films provide an answer to these questions. Research also reveals that Hippies were not involved in the production of Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films, and instead produced a handful of independent films. At the same time, there were filmmakers who were sympathetic to the Hippie cause, but not necessarily in the movement themselves. Filmmakers sympathetic to the Hippie movement included Roger Corman and Tom Laughlin.

Scholarly Contribution

There are three main scholarly interventions this dissertation will make. It is the first extended study of the Hippiesploitation cycle. While other studies have examined the 1964-1970 period, cultural studies of the Hippie movementⁱⁱ and studies of the film industryⁱⁱⁱ have not focused on Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films. There have been articles on some of these films, as well as on sub-cycles within the Hippie film cycle, but thus far no in-depth work has been done on these films, despite the notable body of scholarship on Hippie music and Hippie narratives and literature. In their book on cult cinema, Mathjis and Sexton note the importance of Hippiesploitation, while leaving the door open for further research, writing, “Many exploitation films would draw more specifically on the politicized counterculture and feature protagonists seeking an alternative mode of living. In many of these films, youth is associated with hopes for a new age, with the elder generation represented as negative, greedy, and out of touch” (2011, 150). While their analysis is accurate, it leaves out the fact that most Hippiesploitation films also depicted the counterculture in a negative light, often as lazy, drug using, and criminal, helping to tap into moral panic about the Hippie movement.

The study’s second contribution is that it explores films’ depictions of Hippies. Around 1968, Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films seem cautiously optimistic about the youth movement, while still showing some hesitancy towards the wild nature of the Hippie identity. Later Hippiesploitation films focus more on the perceived dangerous aspects of Hippies, for instance the Manson cult murders and the use of drugs such as LSD. Mainstream and non-exploitation independent Hippie films were generally fairer to the movement, though they were much slower at capturing the style and ideology of the counterculture.

The dissertation also serves as a study of the relationship between the mainstream cinema and exploitation films of this era, a period which lines up to a certain degree with the Hollywood Renaissance. I examine this dichotomy by showing how each type of film approached topics related to the Hippie movement and how they depicted Hippie-centered cultural events when they were the basis for a film. This comparison will show that cultural events could lead to representations on film, that exploitation companies approached these events, and this counterculture in different ways than mainstream Hollywood. Mostly, exploitation films helped to capitalize on an air of moral panic about Hippies and highlighted negative stereotypes about them. These stereotypes depicted the counterculture as hedonistic users and pushers of hard drugs, and often showed them as being violent criminals. Mainstream Hippie films often featured positive portrayals of the Hippies, though it took mainstream Hollywood a bit longer to understand Hippie style and ideology. Yet both film industries, mainstream and exploitation, approached Hippies as a barometer of cultural notions of the movement.

Pertinent Scholarship

Film

While Hippie films have been largely overlooked by the academy, they have not been wholly ignored. There has simply never been a full study on the films and their cultural reflection and impact. Still, there are several sources on Hippie films pertinent to my study. Nick Heffernan's 2015 article "No Parents, No Church, No Authorities in Our Films: Exploitation Movies, the Youth Audience, and Roger Corman's Counterculture Trilogy" uses three of Roger Corman's late-1960s counterculture films to make an argument that Corman's work represents the counterculture movement. Heffernan's article is vital, as it was one of the inspirations for this dissertation. The films discussed in Heffernan's article and my study are *The Trip* (Corman

1967) and *Gas-s-s-s*. Heffernan does close readings, comparisons between audience and critical reception of films, and analyses of the films' release patterns. He examines different aspects of counterculture addressed by each film. While my dissertation is not a study of the films of Corman, this article still holds value, as my work will analyze *The Trip* and *Gas-s-s-s*. I also look beyond Corman's work, while still incorporating Heffernan's analysis.

Two other books have addressed Hippie films, though not in the same way as this dissertation. The first is Mathew J. Barkowiak and Yuya Kiuchi's 2015 book *The Music of Counterculture Cinema: A Critical Study of 1960s and 1970s Soundtracks*. The book examines the music of films associated with the counterculture. It goes beyond looking at Hippiesploitation films to discuss films that the authors view as reflections of the counterculture movement. The book's focus is movie soundtracks, but it involves textual analysis of films and makes efforts to touch on cultural aspects of some films. Its discussion of *Gas-s-s-s* will be useful, as there is not much academic writing on the film beyond the Heffernan article, and it provides some context for the film, one of the few positive depictions of the counterculture in the Hippiesploitation cycle.

The second book is *The American Counterculture* by Christopher Gair, published in 2013. The book examines the reflection of various countercultures in American cinema, music, literature, and painting from 1945-1972. The difference between my dissertation and Gair's book is that he spends only one short chapter on counterculture film during 1964-1970. While Gair mentions a few films that I discuss, such as *Woodstock* (Wadleigh 1970) and *Psych-Out* (Rush 1968), its examination of these films is cursory. Still, this book provides cultural context for the films, as well as what was happening in Hippie artistic productions of the era. It also provides information about what came before Hippie counterculture and the films and other creative

works that were produced as reflections of what Gair views as groups that led to the birth of Hippie counterculture, including Teensploitation films. The book also discusses the Beatniks, a group that would eventually metamorphize into the Hippies, which is useful for my analysis of that subculture. My study outlines connections between the Beatniks and the Hippies in Chapter 1, which serves as a genealogy of the cultural developments from the early 1960s through 1964 that would eventually produce the Hippies.

To document these shifts, I also build on *Mad to Be Saved: The Beats, the '50s, and Film* by David Sterritt, published in 2005. Sterritt's book documents the rise of Beat culture from its origins in the 1940s to its heyday in the 1950s. It examines various cultural artifacts of the Beatniks, including literature and photography, but focuses on Beatniks' representation in film and the film industry's response to the Beat movement. The book thus provides a model for my work on cinematic representations of Hippies. Sterritt's book also touches on the transition between these Beatniks and Hippies. Sterritt explains: "The film [*The Flower Thief* (Rice 1960)] is positioned as a Beat statement, with jazz on the sound track along with verbal references to the United States as a sick society and to nonconforming citizens as troublemakers in a troubled world. At the same time, it prefigures some aspects of the Hippie movement, doing so with surprising precision, considering how early the film was made" (2005, 206-207). I come to different conclusions about certain films, such as *A Bucket of Blood* (Corman 1959), and so my work serves to complement his book.

Cynthia Miller and A. Bowdoin Van Riper's 2015 article "Marketing, Monsters, and Music: Teensploitation Horror Films" shows that exploitation played to and against standard views and fears of this new generation, and that Teensploitation movies were mostly marketed to a teen audience, with films like the *Beach Party* series from 1963-1967. They make these points

by doing textual analysis of several Teensploitation films, offering a historical survey using advertisements such as posters and trailers, and analyzing reviews of the time. They show that Teensploitation films, while intended for teen and young adult audiences, sold the idea that these films were radical departures from classic moviemaking and normative views, but that they were also encoded messages espousing the necessity of growing up. They still note that the movies attempted to be cool in order to gain a youthful audience, as Hippiesploitation also attempted. The article is one of the inspirations for my study, much like Heffernan's article and Mathijs and Sexton's book on cult cinema, whose work leaves the door open for further analysis into the Hippiesploitation cycle. Miller and Van Riper's article ends with the possibility for further research that my dissertation provides. Miller and Van Riper say the cycle ended because the young adults who viewed these films matured because of realities like Vietnam, civil rights protests, and the like. The young adults who consumed those films often matured to be aligned with the Hippie generation, or against the Hippie generation, such as the New Right. Therefore, their work is useful not only the information about Teensploitation, but also for highlighting that some teens would transition into the Hippie movement.

Yannis Tzioumakis's 2006 book *American Independent Cinema: An Introduction* discusses exploitation cinema between 1964 and 1970 and the rise of independent movies to meet the growing demands of the youth audience. It describes the transition from Teensploitation films to counterculture Hippiesploitation films. It offers an overview of the main American exploitation film studios and filmmakers of the 1950s through late 1960s, also providing information on marketing strategies. My study builds on Tzioumakis's research on the rise of independent exploitation companies such as American International Pictures and the importance of Roger Corman to counterculture cinema. My study differs from Tzioumakis's work as it is a

close study of a cycle of filmmaking, while Tzioumakis explores independent cinema well beyond exploitation filmmaking.

My work engages with many of the texts which analyze the Hollywood Renaissance, such as Geoff King's *New Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction* and Yannis Tzioumakis's *American Independent Cinema: An Introduction*. King writes, "A major ingredient of many of these films is a foregrounding of youthful alienation and/or rebellion" (2002, 15). My work examines films that explore the rebellion in their representations of Hippies. My work also deviates from King and Tzioumakis as it is focused on a single film cycle and issues of representation within various parts of the film industry. Therefore, King's and Tzioumakis's work are central because they discuss the Hollywood Renaissance, but my work is more narrowly defined.

David Lerner's 2012 dissertation, "A Taste for Trash: The Persistence of Exploitation in American Cinema, 1960-1975," focuses on exploitation films and three primary themes: sex, drugs, and money. My study expands on his chapter concerning drugs by discussing the LSD films and the cultural phenomenon that allowed those films to become popular when they did, and how they represented the interplay of counterculture with "exploitation films, drug use, and the performance of moral panic" (Lerner 2012, 83). Lerner gives a detailed history of the rise of LSD as a drug and how the fear of LSD grew into moral panic. His comprehensive study addresses counterculture pioneers Abbie Hoffman, Ken Kesey, and Timothy Leary as well as LSD's scientific creation. Lerner's research is a useful source for understanding the rise of LSD films in Hippiesploitation and how the usage of the drug is depicted on-screen.

Elaine M. Bapis's 2008 book *Camera and Action: American Film as Agent of Social Change, 1965-1975* covers almost the entire time period discussed in the dissertation. It also

directly addresses issues in American film at the time, making it a highly useful source. In particular, the chapter on *Alice's Restaurant* (Penn 1969) provides information for the dissertation's close look at the film. Bapis does not limit herself to textual analysis of the film but expands beyond it to consider Hippies as a new and emerging youth group, which is something this dissertation does in broader terms. Bapis discusses the work of Arlo Guthrie, the star of the film and the creator of the song on which the film is based. Bapis frames Guthrie's father, Woody, as a "new folk hero," which situates him as a legitimizing figure for some in the Hippie movement. Bapis sees Arlo's countercultural views as the worthy successor to his father's contributions.

Beyond the Guthrie family's connection to the Hippie movement and *Alice's Restaurant's* place in Hippie cinema, Bapis discusses industrial factors that led to the creation of the film. She discusses director Arthur Penn's attempts to get the story from the record onto the screen, while still maintaining the messages of the "Alice's Restaurant Anti-Massacre Movement," as Arlo Guthrie called it. She also discusses connections between the era's social changes and developments such as the introduction of anti-establishment films, the re-contextualization of the western, the end of the production code, and the arrival of the ratings system. Bapis's scholarship informs my discussion of *Alice's Restaurant* and the cultural and industrial contexts surrounding it and other Hippie films of the late 1960s.

Cultural Context

In addition to discussing Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films, this study examines the cultural influence of American Hippies. To discuss the Hippie movement and its reflection in films between 1964 and 1970, my research draws on several sources. Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin's 2008 book *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* studies

political movements on the left and the right during the 1960s, when talk of revolution was common. Their book's scope is wider than my dissertation, but Isserman's and Kazin's study of the Hippie movement and the rise of the New Left illustrates what made the Hippie movement so vital. Isserman in particular has insight into the movement because he was a member of the Students for a Democratic Society and was involved in New Left activism, which often brought him into contact with Hippies. Contrasting the New Left and the New Right allows for comparisons to be made and inferences to be drawn about the American national identity of the time, and the book has proven to be the most useful source for contextualizing cultural events of the 1960s. Almost every cultural moment I examine is discussed by Isserman and Kazin.

Besides Isserman and Kazin's book, John Anthony Moretta's *The Hippies: A 1960s History* is an invaluable text. Whereas Isserman and Kazin examine Hippies and the New Left in the context of larger political moments in the 1960s, Moretta's work focuses entirely on the rise and fall of the counterculture. Moretta focuses far more closely on major Hippie cultural events in the 1960s, making his book one of the most useful texts, particularly for the last four chapters of my dissertation. While Isserman and Kazin provide a more detailed look at Hip political events, such as the Chicago Democratic Convention riots, Moretta analyzes the internal cultural workings of the Hippies. He provides detailed accounts of many Hip cultural events covered in this work, such as the Human Be-In, the Summer of Love, Woodstock, and Altamont. In discussing the cultural contexts of my dissertation, the books by Isserman and Kazin and Moretta are the most indispensable.

Hippie ideology is the subject of Rebecca E. Klatch's 2002 book *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Klatch's book has a similar structure to Isserman and Kazin's, but it focuses more on the ideology of the various movements, using writings by the

Students for a Democratic Society and similar groups. The writing on the growth of the more political side of the counterculture, from the SDS to the New Left to the Weather Underground, helps to illustrate a transition from hopes for peaceful revolution to the presence of more violent radicals within the movement. The radicalization of the Weather Underground helped identify the counterculture as a violent group by the early 1970s, even though they made up an exceedingly low percentage of the movement.

One of the most useful books concerning Hippie ideology is Timothy Miller's *The Hippies and American Values* (1991). The book examines different aspects of Hippie philosophy, including their views on dope, sex, rock music, communes, and cultural opposition. Miller examines documents from the Underground Press and various Hippie publications to gain insight into beliefs on these subjects. This proves to be highly beneficial, since he is able to show trends in beliefs of the Hippies. For example, Miller says, "The use of the term *dope* here instead of *drugs* is deliberate ... Dope was good; drugs on the other hand, included both good and bad substances ... Substances that were perceived as expanding consciousness were good; things that made the user dumb were bad" (1991, 25). Miller gives voice to opposing viewpoints within the movement, including those who spoke out against "dope" and highlighted that sexual freedom focused largely on male pleasure. Miller's book offers a view of Hippie style and ideology and provides access to material from the Underground Press, all of which is pertinent to my study.

Scott MacFarlane's *The Hippie Narrative* also has value for the dissertation. The book considers the literature, rather than film, of the Hippie movement, but the narratives reveal what was occurring inside and outside that movement. The book goes beyond the scope of the dissertation, examining Hippie material from beginning in 1962, rather than 1964, because of early stirrings in the literature of Ken Kesey. As noted earlier, I begin my discussion of Hippies

in 1964 because of the aftermath of the Kennedy assassination, the increase in the Vietnam War after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and because, while groups like the Students for a Democratic Society began in 1962, their efforts and the activities that would evolve into the Hippie movement begin to ramp up in 1964 (Goldberg 2017, 80). Like MacFarlane's project, my study begins before the term "Hippie" moves into wide circulation. As MacFarlane points out, the term "Hippie" was not really applied to the movement until 1966. He explains that the term:

derives from the Beats calling the youthful newcomers to their scene in San Francisco in the mid-'60s, 'Hippies,' as in little hipsters ... The bulk of the Hippies were 'baby boomers' and born between 1945 to 1956, and, starting in late 1966, the seldom used term 'Hippie' was broadcast nationally and internationally by a mass media that was looking for an easy label to describe the hordes of young people taking part in the eruption of psychedelia in San Francisco especially. (2007, 16)

MacFarlane's book also helps me qualify the end of the Hippie movement in the conclusion. He writes: "From 1972 to 1975, young men were no longer being drafted for Vietnam, 'The Movement' had splintered ... While the so-called Woodstock Nation was shifting out of the spotlight at the center stage of American social change, the two most significant successor movements to emerge were feminism and environmentalism" (2007, 214). My research also identifies the decline of the Hippie movement and the output of mainstream, independent, and exploitation Hippie films as declining in terms of positive portrayals of the counterculture by 1970.

My research also draws on Tom Wolfe's 1968 book *Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, which examines the early Hippie movement and the use of acid by Hippies through the lens of a highly influential group in the early Hippie movement, Ken Kesey and His Merry Pranksters. It makes

connections between Hippie history and Hippie ideology, both of which need contextualization throughout the dissertation. Wolfe's book deals with the near-religious dimension of acid in the counterculture and Hippies' beliefs in the transcendental by describing Kesey touring the country performing acid tests, giving willing participants LSD, and then preaching. The book illustrates key differences between LSD gurus Kesey and Timothy Leary. It also shows the links between Beatniks and Hippies. Due to its publication date, this book is a primary source.

Critical Framework and Approach

This dissertation relies on several film studies approaches, including national cinema. As Timothy Corrigan explains, "According to this approach, ways of seeing the world and ways of portraying the world in the movies differ for each country and culture, and it is necessary to understand the cultural conditions that surround a movie if we are to understand what it is about" (2004, 90). In a national cinema study, it is important to understand the cultural context of the films being produced. My research indicates that many of the films discussed seem to be responses to events occurring in and around the counterculture. As a consequence, my analyses explore those connections and distinctions in how Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films represent the counterculture on screen. Notably, Hippiesploitation sensationalized the events while mainstream and independent Hippie films examined them more seriously and with a greater degree of sympathy to the Hippies.

The dissertation is also a materialist cultural study, discussing the disconnect between cultural developments and their representation in film. The Hippies were a new cultural group, beginning and ending with no institutional power. Institutions with power kept Hippies out of positions of financial or political power. Hippies were able to get their messages out in several art forms, including literature, music, and traditional artwork like paintings, yet these works

often conveyed the movement's messages in allegorical or abstract ways. Film, often one of the more direct ways to get messages across to the general public, was kept almost entirely out of the hands of the Hippies, with next to no films being produced by them. The commercial film companies' goals were profit-driven and often did not align with Hippie values, thereby making them targets of disparagement. Because the Hippies had no say in their on-screen depictions, the portrayals were often negative and rarely showed the counterculture in a sympathetic light.

Additionally, the dissertation discusses cultural hegemony through the work of Antonio Gramsci. Hegemony is the way in which the powerful remain in control over the masses. In the concept of hegemony, power is divided into two units: political, which is ruled by force, and civil, in which people give the power to be ruled. People in political power use the civil sphere to maintain control by having the masses give up authority to the ruling class. Those in the political sphere lead the masses to believe there are enemies or problems which only those in power can solve. Control is often maintained through cultural customs and mass media, with commercial films frequently reflecting the ideology of the dominant culture. The Hippies were a group that rejected dominant social norms as they wanted to get away from the values of mass culture. However, in order to do that, they needed to win people over to their side to get enough people to "drop out" of the U.S. corporate hegemonic system. Corporate America, among others, saw the Hippies as a threat and could not abide this, so mainstream institutions vilified Hippies. People in power profited from the moral panic about Hippies, implying they were hedonistic, had wild, irresponsible sex, were drug users, apathetic, and wanted the type of leftist, Marxist politics that could ruin the country. These qualities went against the values of many established U.S. citizens. Therefore, they saw the Hippies as misguided and naïve. Hegemonic forces kept Hippies from getting major cultural influence beyond issues of style and ethos changes like environmentalism.

Hegemonic powers are one of the reasons the Hippie movement did not succeed in the peaceful revolution for which it hoped. However, there were multiple internal and external factors which adversely affected the counterculture. My dissertation shows how those in power, particularly corporate filmmakers, were able to capitalize on the Hippie movement. It also reveals how people in power like Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon incited resentment in the dominant culture toward the counterculture. In the cultural sense, those in power stopped any major progressive social changes for which the Hippies fought. In film, dominant society presented the countercultural figures as stereotypes, particularly in Hippiesploitation films, thereby discounting the movement as a whole and maintaining the status quo of ruling class privilege. While exploitation film companies were not run by elites, they were well aware that demonizing the counterculture would be profitable. Mainstream film companies and independent filmmakers, on the other hand, tended to portray Hippies positively to reach a broad audience.

The Hippie movement was not successful due to these hegemonic practices, although the Hippies also had problems within their movement. The goal of the counterculture was a peaceful, progressive revolution, whereas those in power valued consumption. Consumerism was against the Hip ethos, so it could not work in mainstream society. While there was debate amongst the Hippies on how exactly to “drop out,” many wanted to do so in tribal communities, living free of the restrictions of modern society (Watts et al. 1967). Hippies were often branded as socialists or communists and, while some were, in the capitalist regime of the United States often vilified them as a group. They were called selfish, too young to know any better, lackadaisical, drug addicts, criminals, and all sorts of “mean, nasty, horrible” things, to use the parlance of Hippie Arlo Guthrie. The Hippies, as well as associated groups like the SDS, Yippies, and New Left also found it difficult to gain any real power in the U.S. By the mid-1970s, the counterculture

had lost enough of its members to drugs, selling out, or different political causes that the movement was largely unsuccessful. As this dissertation will show, even events remembered nostalgically, such as the Summer of Love and Woodstock, had major problems, which held them back from being culturally progressive beyond the world of popular culture.

Along with placing the mainstream and exploitation Hippie films within a larger cultural context, my study also considers the films in light of material questions of political economy. For example, I analyze how different productions made money by depicting Hippies. Most of the choices about how to portray the Hippies on-screen were financial decisions made by film companies to profit from curiosity about the movement. While this dissertation does not examine the types of audiences who went to see the films, as this information does not exist, what can often be ascertained is how decisions about depictions of the Hippies were made from a business perspective. One way in which exploitation films profited was by fueling the moral panic about Hippies, a strategy that had worked for them handling other controversial topics.

Because Hippies were presented to generate moral panic, they lost out culturally and in terms of cinematic portrayals. More often than not, when a Hippie was portrayed on-screen, they were depicted negatively, often as a freeloader, a radical, a criminal, or a number of other negative stereotypes surrounding the counterculture. While there are notable exceptions, such as decisions by independent filmmakers, left-leaning mainstream auteurs, or exploitation filmmakers such as Roger Corman, who all portrayed Hippies in a positive or sympathetic light, these are few and far between. At first, when Hippies were portrayed with any degree of sympathy, the filmmakers themselves were often so divorced from Hippie life that their depictions become little more than caricatures, undercutting the message of the film. The dissertation shows how U.S. society and commercial American cinema treated Hippies very

poorly. Hippies' inability to gain a foothold politically led to their failure as a progressive youth movement. Their inability to produce and distribute films led to their failure to create nuanced depictions in widely seen films of the era.

Given the study's focus on the politics of representation, its primary method is textual analysis of formal strategies such as narrative structure, dialogue, costuming, music, and visual and thematic elements that convey the films' messages. In each chapter, I discuss several films in some degree of depth and briefly reference other filmic representations. As a national cinema study that considers Hippie films and Hippiesploitation films in context, I examine the films to discover what they are saying about Hippies between 1964 and 1970. As a study in political economy, the analysis goes beyond the films themselves. I analyze advertisements to assess films' relevance to cultural events and developments. Pressbooks, posters, trailers, novelizations, and other film ephemera reveal how a film was marketed and sold to a general public that was often critical of the Hippies.

A model for the study is Steven J. Ross's 1998 book *Working-Class Hollywood: Silent Film and the Shaping of Class in America*, which examines labor films of the early silent era. Ross's sources include the films themselves, periodicals, labor press articles in *The Daily Worker*, FBI Files, union records, the Papers of the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures, and advertising materials. My dissertation also pulls from several non-filmic sources, particularly advertising materials, such as posters, pressbooks, trailers, radio ads, and so on, to show how the films were marketed. I examine these materials as Ross does; namely, I analyze how the materials are used to promote films, and how the materials reflect existing views of Hippies, their beliefs, and their style. Analyzing marketing materials reveals how the films were sold to the public. Additionally, I interrogate primary texts, including contemporary publications

such as sources from the Underground Press, often collected in Timothy Miller's *The Hippies and American Values*, newspaper and magazine articles, film reviews, and film pressbooks and novelizations.

This project was inspired by Nick Heffernan's article. Initially an auteur study of Roger Corman's films of the time, I soon saw the need to study other counterculture films of the era, as little work had been done on this topic. Specifically, almost no major work had been done on films surrounding the Hippies. I also wanted to consider exploitation films, because I am interested in many cycles of exploitation cinema. However, I also include analysis of mainstream and independent Hippie films to create a counterbalance. My analysis of all of these films sets aside questions of cinematic "quality" and proposes that they have a place in film and cultural history.

I cannot possibly cover all Hippiesploitation or mainstream and independent Hippie films. Therefore, I am drawing from a broad sample of countercultural Hippie films, while focusing on a handful of carefully selected case studies. I also leave out certain countercultural films as they have little bearing on the focused examination of Hippie films. For example, although bikers are often included in discussions of the counterculture and counterculture cinema, I do not discuss them because their ideology was so radically different from the Hippies.

Chapter Breakdown

My dissertation has six chapters, each dealing with a certain time period on the study's timeline. The first chapter is titled "Before Atlantis: Transitions from Teens to Beats to Hippies, 1955-1963." It provides background for the cultural and filmic developments at the heart of my study and shows what led to the Hippies, Hippie films, and Hippiesploitation films. The chapter examines three primary shifts. The first is the growth and success of the Teensploitation genre

and why it would transition into Hippiesploitation, a shift that is analyzed by a look at films such as *Beach Party* (Asher 1963). The second shift involves mainstream coming-of-age and juvenile delinquent films becoming mainstream teen and Hippie films during the mid-1950s through 1963. The first Hippiesploitation films did not come out until late 1966, with the release of Barry Mann's *Hallucination Generation*, and the first mainstream Hippie film was not released until the following year with the release of *The Happening* (Silverstein 1967). The films of these cycles led to the emergence of mainstream Hippie films and the Hippiesploitation cycle. The mainstream film discussed is *Rebel Without a Cause* (Ray 1955). This film reflects how mainstream Hollywood saw the young generation. The third shift is the first rumblings of the transitions between teenagers and Hippies and also Beatniks and Hippies. This is addressed further in the second chapter, but the first Hippies began to show up in Haight-Ashbury between 1964 and 1965, although they were not formally identified by the press as "Hippies" until 1966. The filmic representation of this shift is examined with films like *A Bucket of Blood* (Corman 1959) and *The Beatniks* (Frees 1960), both of which are exploitation films dealing primarily with Beatnik characters. In sum, the first chapter sets up the cultural and industrial conditions that would give birth to the Hippies, mainstream Hippie films, and the Hippiesploitation cycle, all of which really begin to be address in the second chapter.

The second chapter is titled "'The Times They Are A-Changin'": The Birth of the Hippies and the Move from Teensploitation to Hippiesploitation, 1964-1966." While the first film that can be called Hippiesploitation did not come about until the end of 1966, this chapter shows the changes that led to the decline of the Teensploitation cycle and the birth of the Hippie film in general and Hippiesploitation specifically. Here, two later Teensploitation films, *The Horror of Party Beach* (Tenney 1964) and *Lord Love a Duck* (Axelrod 1966), are used to show

how the cycle began to decline. Additionally, it is important to examine a mainstream counterculture film of the time, so *Dr. Strangelove, or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* (Kubrick 1964) is discussed for its commentary on fears of the atomic age and its place as a counterculture film. The chapter also examines the origin of the term “Hippie,” which was Beat speak for being a “little hipster,” and the growth of the Hippie movement, specifically in and around the Haight-Ashbury area of San Francisco. Major cultural events such as the Sunset Strip riots of 1966 are also examined, as these riots were one of the first times Hippies entered national consciousness. It also inspired at least two films released the next year, *Riot on Sunset Strip* (Dreifuss 1967) and *The Hippie Revolt* (Beatty 1967). The chapter analyzes the 1966 film *Hallucination Generation*, released in December of that year, as this may be the first Hippiesploitation film, despite its cultural crossover with Beatnik films.

The third chapter, titled “‘There’s Something Happening Here’: Hippies, Love, Drugs, and Revolution, 1967,” examines the birth of the Hippiesploitation film and covers several major cultural events for the Hippie movement, including the Summer of Love. 1967 was an important year for the Hippies, as this is when they really began to become well known not only for their lifestyle, but their ideology and their use of drugs, both of which became synonymous with the counterculture. Cultural events such as the Human Be-In, the Summer of Love, and the Hippies’ March on Washington, including the Vietnam protests, are discussed at some length. 1967 was also an important year for filmic representations of Hippies, with *The Happening* produced by a major studio, and films such as *Riot on Sunset Strip*, *The Love-Ins* (Drifuss 1967), and *The Trip* (Corman 1967) released by exploitation studios. The chapter discusses a few films in detail, as they hold great cultural significance. *Riot on Sunset Strip* is a Hippiesploitation film released mere months after the actual events in 1966, and it provides a useful window into how the older

generation was responding to the events. The film itself does not offer a realistic portrayal of the counterculture, and it portrays some of the Hippie characters as rapists. A similar case involves the late 1967 film *The Hippie Revolt*, which is an exploitation documentary that comments on the Hippies of Haight-Ashbury. Several Hippiesploitation documentaries were produced during this time to satisfy the commercial interest about the countercultures' rise to national consciousness; these films include *Mondo Mod* (Perry 1967) and *Revolution* (O'Connell 1968). The Hippie films and Hippiesploitation films of this time did not take the growing movement seriously. Most of them treated the Hippies as another youth group, much like the Teensploitation cycle did, but in a far less understanding way. Mainstream Hippie films did not understand the style of the Hippies and, while Hippiesploitation was able to capture that more readily, they also had mostly negative portrayals of the counterculture. Many of the films are anti-drug, but the chapter analyses one of the more powerful drug films of the time, Roger Corman's film *The Trip*, which gave an even-handed representation of LSD. This production is one of the first films to treat the LSD following with a degree of seriousness, yet also with a sense of understanding. The film tries to depict what an actual LSD experience or "trip" was actually like on film.

Chapter four, titled "'In Lincoln Park the Dark Was Turning': Transitional Hippie Films in the Wake of U.S. Politics, 1968," describes how Hippiesploitation and Hippie films evolved in 1968, and it identifies specific patterns that emerged in both types of films. The chapter connects the films to cultural events such as the assassinations of Bobby Kennedy and Martin Luther King, rising drug use, the attack on the Yippies by the police at the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention, and that year's U.S. presidential election. Hippiesploitation continued to give stylistically realistic portrayals of the Hippies but displayed them in ambivalent ways. Hippiesploitation films like *Psych-Out* (Rush 1968) and *Wild in the Streets* (Shearer 1968) tried

to capture various aspects of Hippie style and ideology but discounted much of the movement because of the youth involved. Other Hippiesploitation films like *The Acid Eaters* (Mabe 1968) and *Mantis in Lace* (Rotsler 1968) incited fears about LSD, one of the drugs of choice for the Hippies, and fostered moral panic about the counterculture by showing characters committing murders and going to Hell. It is important to examine these films, since after the Hippiesploitation cycle moved beyond 1968, sympathetic representations became even fewer. After 1968, only one positive Hippiesploitation film was released, Roger Corman's *Gas-s-s-s*. Meanwhile, mainstream Hippie films began to understand the counterculture and mostly displayed them in a positive way. Mainstream films like *Skidoo* (Preminger 1968) and *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas!* (Averback 1968) began to capture what a Hippie was and portrayed them on-screen in a positive way. However, most of the major characters are older, established stars who take part in Hippie activities, like taking LSD or marijuana, but are not themselves Hippies. The narrative and casting choices are in striking contrast to Hippiesploitation films, which featured mostly negative portrayals, but also highlighted a younger cast.

The fifth chapter, titled “‘They Might Think It’s a Movement’: Hollywood Embraces the Hippies and the War Comes Home, 1969,” examines Hippiesploitation films and the national feelings about the movement in the wake of the major cultural events of 1967 and 1968. There were several cultural events during this time that influenced public perception of the Hippies. Some of the key events discussed in this chapter are campus protests, the Manson family killings, the Woodstock festival, and the first rumblings of the Weather Underground during the Days of Rage. The Manson family killings spawned more Hippiesploitation movies than any other cultural event, despite the fact that Manson and his family were not Hippies. It is notable that during this time fewer Hippie films were produced by both major studios and exploitation

studios than in the previous two years, and far fewer of them were sympathetic to the movement. This chapter investigates the change in the overall tone of Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films from one of curiosity and possible acceptance to moral panic about Hippies. The mainstream films examined include *Alice's Restaurant* (Penn 1969) and Haskell Wexler's *Medium Cool* (1969), as those are some of the few films that take a positive look at the counterculture. *Medium Cool* is discussed in some detail because, like *Riot on Sunset Strip*, it directly addresses a major counterculture event shortly after it occurred, the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention protests. On the exploitation film side, the chapter discusses *Alice in Acidland* (Greer 1969), which furthered the fear of LSD, one of the drugs most commonly associated with the Hippies. *Alice in Acidland* also sexualizes the female Hippie body, condemning sex while selling it. This chapter concludes by examining Hippie director Tobe Hooper's film *Eggshells* (1969). Analyzing the film is essential because it is one of the few examples of an independent Hippie film that was made by a Hippie cast and crew.

Chapter six, titled "'Hallelujah, I'm a Bum': 1970 Films and Concluding Thoughts," discusses two 1970 films. In the chapter, I analyze the mainstream Hippie film, the documentary *Woodstock*, as it provides one of the most positive depictions of the counterculture. I also examine the Hippiesploitation film *Gas-s-s-s* (Corman 1970), which marks Corman's attempt to capture the Hippie idea of communal utopia in a country where mainstream opinions on Hippies were changing. I also briefly discuss the independent, Hippie-produced film *Gold* (Desloge and Levis 1972). *Gold* is a little-known Hippie film that is often overlooked, mainly because it had no distribution until five years after its production and was not seen by an American audience until the 1990s.

This dissertation proposes to contribute to knowledge in several ways. My main argument is that Hippiesploitation, independent, and mainstream Hippie films were a response to the Hippie counterculture movement, both culturally and for monetary gain by film companies. The project shows the cultural events and social mores reflected in productions by the exploitation film industry, Hollywood, and independent filmmaking at the time. Studying filmic representations of Hippies allows for a new perspective on how the counterculture movement was depicted in American culture. Additionally, by examining how the Hippie counterculture was portrayed in Hippiesploitation films in contrast to mainstream Hippie films, new understanding can be gained about how segments of society are portrayed in cinema, be it mainstream or alternative. By using Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films as lenses, one can gain valuable insights into how on-screen portrayals vary between productions and production contexts. I will also provide new knowledge about how both the exploitation and mainstream film industries approached filmmaking, advertising, and cultural depictions during this time. My analysis will show major differences among mainstream, exploitation, and independent New American Cinema films of the era.

My dissertation deals with the rise and fall of the Hippie movement and the concurrent Hippiesploitation, independent, and mainstream Hippie film cycles. The time in between 1955 and 1969 was a turbulent one in America. Politics shifted a great deal during this time, from the Vietnam War to the birth of the New Left. One can see patterns emerge, both culturally and in terms of film during this time. Analyzing filmic representations of Hippies is one way to describe this changing and vital time in the history of American culture.

CHAPTER I. BEFORE “ATLANTIS”: TRANSITIONS FROM TEENS TO BEATS TO
HIPPIES, 1955-1963

In the introduction to his 1999 novella *Hearts in Atlantis*, author Stephen King describes the 1960s as a lost Atlantean-like culture, sunk beneath the waves of history, a memory, gone, but not forgotten. King relates his feeling to the quintessentially 1960s Donovan song, “Atlantis” (1969). He writes,

When I try to talk about the sixties - when I even try to think about them - I am overcome by horror and hilarity ... I hear Donovan Leitch singing his sweet and stupid song about the continent of Atlantis, lyrics that still seem profound to me in the watches of the night when I can't sleep. The older I get, the harder it is to let go of that song's stupidity and hold onto its sweetness. I have to remind myself that we were smaller then, small enough to live our brightly hued lives under the mushrooms, all the time believing them to be trees, shelter from the sheltering sky. I know that doesn't make any real sense, but it's the best I can do: hail Atlantis. (149)

In many ways, the 1960s are comparable to “fair Atlantis,” and the Hippies existed as its Atlanteans, in that the period seems like a mythic time and the Hippies a lost, peaceful people. The 1960s represented a time of great horror, yet for a while, great optimism also existed. John F. Kennedy's “Camelot,” the term for the Kennedy presidency, inspired much of the youth of the 1960s, up to and past his death, suggesting that they could change the world, perhaps even through a peaceful revolution. That idea was certainly in the minds of the Hippies during the Summer of Love in 1967, while the idea of a less peaceful revolution began to emerge in 1969 with what Abbie Hoffman described as “the Woodstock Nation.” However, many cultural events of the 1960s and 1970s would soon end any of this optimism by 1969. The Hippie movement

would fracture. Some got into politics, became the New Left, and would try to change the political landscape. Some would become radicalized and join groups like the Weather Underground. Some sold out when several Yippies, a far-left political group spawned from the Hippies, became Yuppies, a culture more attuned to the capitalistic atmosphere of the 1980s. Some of them, the Atlanteans as I will call them, the “antediluvian kings who colonized the world,” as Donovan sang, kept on with their causes when the Vietnam War ended, though even these Hippies grew apart as some became affiliated with various causes, including the women’s movement and environmentalism.

Throughout some of the major cultural events of the 1960s, there were also cultural products, such as the literature and music, which were created by Hippies. Other cultural products, such as films, were most often produced by film companies, major or minor. These cultural products, films not created by the Hippies that often reflected dominant views of the counterculture include Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films. To understand Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films, one must trace the lineage of the relevant cultural and filmic cycles. Hippies evolved from teens and Beatniks, and mainstream Hippie films grew from mainstream juvenile delinquent and coming-of-age movies, while Hippiesploitation films grew out of Teensploitation. Therefore, an analysis of Hippies and their depictions in commercial films between 1964 and 1976 should begin with a look at the time before Hippies and Atlantis.

This chapter traces three significant changes between 1955 and 1963. The first is the rise of Teensploitation and mainstream teen films, which would give rise to Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films (discussed in Chapters 2 and 3). The second involves the growth and changes in the counterculture movement known as the Beatniks. An analysis of their

representation in films shows the links between these predecessors and Hippie counterculture. The last shift concerns the era's major cultural events that would motivate predominantly white teens from across the country to migrate west to places like Los Angeles, the Pacific Northwest, and the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco, and become the group known as the Hippies. Charting these changes will contextualize the birth and growth of the Hippie movement (Chapter 2) and their representations in Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films (starting in Chapter 3). The cultural and filmic representations of teens and Beatniks in the 1950s and early 1960s heavily influenced the depictions of Hippies beginning in late 1966. The movies mostly portray teens as immature children who need to grow up and Beatniks as drug users and criminals, both of which were aspects of Hippies on film.

The 1950s and the Emergence of the Teenage Audience

Though this dissertation's focus is the period between 1964 and 1976 in the United States, a filmic lineage exists as early as 1955, when America was in the aftermath of World War II and the Korean War. America had become involved in a Cold War arms race with the Soviet Union. The United States used atomic bombs at the end of World War II and the Soviet Union tested its first atomic weapon in 1949. This caused tension because the launch of a nuclear device by either side would prompt the other side to respond in kind. The unfolding of any nuclear incident had the potential to become an apocalyptic war (Grieve 2018, 2-3). The United States also had anti-communists like Senator Joseph McCarthy and the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and later groups like the John Birch Society aiming to root out Communists in the American government, military, and film industry (Doherty 2002, 18-19). These actions fostered Cold War paranoia, discussed later in the chapter. At the same time, despite some minor recessions throughout the 1950s, America experienced an economic boom

that lasted through much of the 1960s. With little competition from overseas, there was global investment in American industry. The white American middle-class got a boost during this time because of these economic events (Grieve 2018, 1).

During this time, American society recognized a new demographic, that of the teenager. In the 1950s, this age group was targeted by corporations looking for profit. Middle-class teens began to have spending money, some from their parents, some from working part-time jobs, and became a group to whom companies could sell products. One of the industries that reaped the rewards of the teenage audience was the film industry. Teens began to go to movie theaters in droves, consuming countless films, including mainstream Hollywood films and early independent exploitation filmmakers (Doherty 2002, 35-40). Yannis Tzioumakis argues, “With the teenage market proving large enough to sustain music films and many other types of films with teenage appeal, the low-budget independents found a new *raison d’être*, catering... to this new audience” (2006, 147). Because of this new market, independent exploitation companies and even mainstream Hollywood studios began making films with a teenage audience in mind (Schaefer 1999, 331).

There were several other reasons the cycle known as teen films arose. The growth of drive-in theaters was one of the most important factors in creating the expanding teen film audience. Drive-ins had existed since the 1930s but rose in popularity as the 1950s began. One estimation posits that by 1956 there were five thousand drive-in theaters across the country (Clark 1995, 43). Teens often sought out the drive-in as a date spot, as it provided the same comforts as watching a film in a theater, but added an element of seclusion, which teens could utilize for private moments not afforded to them by a regular movie theater. The drive-in was also essential for the rise of independent exploitation films. Randall Clark explains, “The

relationship between drive-ins and exploitation films was not an exclusive one. Drive-ins never played exploitation films only, and exploitation films were never shown only at drive-ins. Still, there can be no doubt that the two supported each other during a period that was important in the development of both” (1995, 45). Additionally, many of the exploitation films that played at theaters and drive-ins were made specifically for a teenage audience, a cycle of films that would become known as “Teensploitation,” but mainstream Hollywood was also making films for a teenage audience. Teensploitation and mainstream teen films of the period are best understood as film cycles because they involved “sizeable quantities of similar films . . . made and released across a relatively short period before production levels of those films” decreased or concluded (Platts 2017, 191). Cycles are similar to, but distinct from, genre as cycles occur during a short period of time.

The importance of car culture for the American teen audience attending drive-in theaters also led to the growth of the drive-in. Car culture influenced the hot rod movie, a sub-cycle of Teensploitation films. Peter Stanfield argues the hot rod sub-cycle “hit critical mass in 1956-1957, running parallel with the [Teensploitation] cycle’s peak” (2015, 113-114). Stanfield writes, “The cycle was related to the public sphere, as it was to the exploitation of the box office success of films such as *Rebel Without a Cause* (Ray 1955), which in turn were influenced by those events – but these events were contributory rather than casual factors” (113-114). Hot rod films would make up one of several sub-cycles within the Teensploitation cycle.

Without a mainstream film like *Rebel Without a Cause*, Teensploitation films might not have had the success they enjoyed over the next decade. Exploitation filmmakers were just as significant as mainstream production companies for the growing teenage audience. The Teensploitation cycle also deviated from exploitation cinema of the past. Eric Schaefer writes,

“even though this new breed of film was cheap to produce – often under the \$100,000 mark – they ranked as more polished than the classical exploitation pictures being made at the time, which, as a rule, continued to come in under \$25,000” (1999, 331). One of the most successful independent exploitation film companies to capitalize on the teenage audience was American International Pictures (AIP), founded by James H. Nicholson and Samuel Z. Arkoff. Nicholson and Arkoff were able to understand and predict audience trends with a relatively high degree of accuracy, particularly the growth of the teenage audience. As mentioned in the Introduction, Yannis Tzioumakis describes their marketing as “The Peter Pan Syndrome,” focusing on older teen males (2006, 152). This marketing strategy led to success for AIP and many other exploitation film companies. However, the exploitation film companies were not alone in reaping the rewards of selling to the teen audience. Mainstream Hollywood studios also had success in reaching this audience, as evidenced by films such as *Rebel Without a Cause*.

Mainstream Teen/Juvenile Delinquent/Coming of Age Films

Films with teenage characters predate the 1950s, as do coming of age films and movies in which teens are as juvenile delinquents. From the 1930s through the 1950s, teens would be regular figures in several series of films including the Dead End Kids, the Little Tough Guys, the East Side Kids, and the Bowery Boys.^{iv} However, none of these characters were identified as teenagers, only as young people, due to the term “teenager” not coming into widespread usage until the 1950s. It would not be until the 1950s and the emergence of the teenage audience that movies involving teenagers as a specific demographic group were produced both by mainstream Hollywood and exploitation film companies.

Just as movies about the coming counterculture fit into the categories of Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films, teen films fit into two categories: Teensploitation and mainstream

teen films. This distinction reflects how films represented teens. In addition, one can group mainstream studio-produced films into the juvenile delinquent film and the coming-of-age movie. In mainstream teen films, these two sub-cycles are often linked, because by the end of the movie, juvenile delinquent protagonists usually come of age and grow up, sometimes through tragedy.

The juvenile delinquent film focused on teenagers getting into trouble with the law and, in mainstream films, were usually an object lesson for teens and an affirmation of adult expectations. In these films, the protagonists tended to be an “essentially good kids” who got mixed up in a bad situation.^v An “essentially good kid” is kinder and a more thoughtful than others in his or her gang but is mixed-up in troublesome situations, such as being an accessory to a major crime or committing a minor crime like vandalism. Occasionally, the events would involve gangs committing petty crimes like shoplifting, racing cars or motorcycles, or vandalism, and the crimes tended to ramp up in severity before the end of the film. Often, these films would culminate in the protagonist, the “essentially good kid,” learning a lesson and getting out of the gang to conform to a more normative lifestyle, usually with a girlfriend, making up with police and parents alike. The coming of age movie also tended to feature young, angst-filled teens; however, their troubles had more to do with growing up into adulthood. Again, most of the time these films were resolved with the teen growing up and accepting their place in the normative 1950s or early 1960s (Doherty 2002, 100-101). Some teen films that follow this formula include *Rebel Without a Cause*, *Blackboard Jungle* (Brooks 1955), and *High School Confidential* (Arnold 1958).

In these films, there were also irredeemable characters, but more often than not, they were not the main characters in the mainstream teen film. Irredeemable characters were enemies

for the “essentially good kid” protagonists to fight such as Lee Marvin’s Chino in *The Wild One* (Benedek 1953) or Corey Allen’s Buzz in *Rebel Without a Cause*. Characters such as John Saxon’s Leonard in *The Unguarded Moment* (Keller 1956) also served as lessons about the kind of kid not to be. The irredeemable characters were generally secondary, either to the “essentially good kid” or to the adults trying to guide the irredeemable teens to a normative lifestyle (Doherty 2002, 107-8). I call these characters irredeemable as they usually go to prison or die before the end of the film, unlike the “essentially good kid” who learns a lesson and is able to mature. The contrast between the two types of young characters, the essentially good kid and the irredeemable juvenile delinquent, reflects the fact that mainstream films were not made merely with a teenage audience in mind. Major studios did not follow AIP’s method of targeting a teen audience but also tried to reach a broad audience that included adults. Therefore, in mainstream films troubled teens often found their way to maturity by the end of the film or died or were sent to prison if found totally unredeemable. While the mainstream teen films often did reach young audiences, they differ in several ways from the Teensploitation film.

Juvenile delinquent movies are part of the Teensploitation and mainstream teen film cycles, but exploitation films often work to utilize moral panic by presenting dangerous youths. Therefore, while teens in juvenile delinquent Teensploitation films were depicted as “cool” for their primarily teenage audience, they also reaffirmed adults’ fears of unruly teens. The films catered to fears that teens might rebel against authority, the law, God, America, and, most dangerous of all, their parents. They also played into adults’ concerns that teens could become violent, hedonistic, anti-American, and drug users, all concerns that were carried into the representations of Hippies. While the “essentially good kid” in mainstream teen films would typically find some redemption at the end, Teensploitation films often had darker endings.

“Essentially good kids” were not necessarily protected by their innate positive qualities and many suffered adverse endings because of this moral choice by exploitation filmmakers. For instance, Jack Nicholson’s first film *The Cry Baby Killer* (Addis 1958) ends with the “essentially good kid” having become a killer and hostage taker who is arrested by the police. Clark states, “while the title character ... was undoubtedly a murderer, the film did not depict him as entirely evil, and delved, albeit superficially into the psychology of a teen driven to kill” (1995, 54). These movies were also often made with a solely teenage audience in mind, so their content usually put teens more in control and allowed for them to have greater autonomy from parents, the police, and adult society.

The Teensploitation film had several different sub-types, just as Hippiesploitation would have sub-types such as exploitation documentaries or movies about LSD or Charles Manson. Teensploitation films also had more sub-cycles than mainstream teen films did. The sub-cycles included hot rod films such as *Hot Rod Gang* (Landers 1958), which featured fast cars or motorcycles; rock n’ roll films such as *Rock Around the Clock* (Sears 1956), which featured musical acts of the day like Bill Haley and His Comets, Allen “Moondog” Freed, or Little Richard; beach movies such as *Beach Party* (Asher 1963), which had rock music interspersed with scenes of cool, young actors like Frankie Avalon and Annette Funicello dancing on a beach; and teen monster films such as *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* (Fowler Jr. 1957), in which the teens either fought, or in some cases became, monsters (Clark 1995, 51). The next section of the chapter on Teensploitation looks more closely at these films; they are mentioned here to illustrate some typical differences in the mainstream and exploitation film approaches.

One of the best-known mainstream teen films made between 1955 and 1963 is the juvenile delinquent film *Rebel Without a Cause*, which reflects the idea that juvenile delinquents

should grow up. The film is often contradictory in its portrayal of its protagonist Jim, played by James Dean, though this is a plausible characterization of a teen and of an “essentially good kid.” As portrayed by Dean, Jim has great empathy and can show a depth of emotional maturity, yet he also has several moments when he is still an immature teenager. An example of this is in the first major scene of the movie. The police arrest Jim for being underage and drunk in public. In his drunken ramblings to the police detective who questions him and in his conversation with his parents he is flippant and extremely emotional, telling his parents that their fighting is “tearing [him] apart.” Despite these signs of immaturity, he is kind to others in the police station, offering his coat to a freezing young man named Plato, played by Sal Mineo, who later becomes his friend.

Throughout the rest of the movie, the audience sees more of Jim’s maturity and immaturity. His maturity, in a 1950s heteronormative sense, stems from being shown to be a stronger and more secure person than his father, played by Jim Backus, and standing up to his somewhat peevisish mother, played by Ann Doran. Jim is also able to negotiate with police for Plato’s safety when Plato is cornered and tries to take responsibility for a game of chicken that results in another teen driving over a cliff. His immaturity lies in getting into a knife fight, agreeing to take part in the game of chicken, and then running away to party in an empty mansion with his friend Plato and girlfriend Judy, played by Natalie Wood, to play house. In a way, this is a realistic depiction of a teenager who is not yet mature, but who is growing into maturity. The teen characters who cannot grow into maturity, including Buzz, played by Corey Allen, and Plato, who dies, remain teens forever. Jim grows up at the end, trying to save Plato, but is unable to enact his plan and the police kill Plato. Jim then introduces his parents to Judy, a sign of his growing up into a heteronormative 1950s relationship.

The relationship between Jim and the police, in particular his closeness with Inspector Ray Fremick, played by Edward Platt. Their relationship is far more likely in a mainstream teen film than in a Teensploitation or Hippiesploitation film, where the characters are more jaded and focused on being cool and anti-authority. Fremick is a father figure to Jim and does not see him as a juvenile delinquent. In many ways, Fremick becomes more of a father figure than Jim's weak father. The use of a policeman as a father figure is worth noting for several reasons. First, it shows a willingness of the police to work with young people in trouble to make sure they do not become juvenile delinquents. It reinforces the idea that the police are almost entirely male and patriarchal in a positive sense. The "essentially good" teen characters only need to mature. The police are that positive force helping them mature in mainstream teen films. The other reason the characterization is worth noting is it shows the police in a purely positive light. The display of a solely friendly relationship between the police and "essentially good" teens is complex at best. Such a connection between the two groups only shows their rapport as civil and fatherly. By displaying only positive relationships it erases any violent or adverse action police took towards teens or vice versa (Doherty 2002, 97-106). The relationship suggests the appeal of mainstream teen films to a broader audience, as teenager-police interactions are often portrayed in more ambiguously in Teensploitation films. By erasing the complicated relationship between teenagers, juvenile delinquents, and the police, the mainstream film erases the tension that existed between these groups.

Teensploitation

By comparison, Teensploitation films were made specifically with a teenage audience in mind. Notably, there were substantial differences between Teensploitation films and films from the golden age of exploitation designed for adults. Eric Schaefer writes, "The movies that Allied

Artists, DCA, Howco, and above all, AIP made were often referred to as exploitation films, but ... they were ‘all but indistinguishable’ from traditional B pictures. [By comparison, classic] exploitation films continued to be pitched for adults only, a policy that would have prevented a large segment of the audience for AIP movies from attending” (1999, 330-1). By the mid-1950s, exploitation studios had to adapt to this new, growing teenage market. Cynthia Miller and A. Bowdoin Van Riper write,

What [J. Edgar] Hoover failed to grasp was that Hollywood was reflecting, as well as shaping, the cutting edge of the new teen culture of the mid-1950s. The onscreen symbols of the “indecent” he decried—short skirts, tight sweaters, leather jackets, fast cars, and rock-and-roll records—were icons of the culture that the newly enriched and empowered teens of the postwar era were creating for themselves. Teensploitation producers splashed them on movie screens, and featured them in advertising, for just that reason. They signaled that the film in question was designed to speak to them—not to adults. (2015, 130)

Additionally, Teensploitation changed the mode of production for exploitation films. Rather than being created by individual filmmakers, in the way that many exploitation films were during the golden age, this new Teensploitation cycle and trend during the 1950s needed an independent studio. American International Pictures rose to fill that gap.

American International Pictures, the independent exploitation company founded by Arkoff and Nicholson, began by making Teensploitation films, and it would continue with similar fearmongering themes when creating Hippiesploitation films a decade later. Between 1954 and 1979, AIP produced or distributed some of the most famous exploitation films of the era. AIP’s first film on the production side was *The Fast and the Furious* (Corman 1955), a hot

rod movie with adult characters. AIP would go on to produce and distribute Teensploitation films, so much so that the company began primarily making films for this cycle. AIP became so intrinsically wrapped with teensploitation that they became self-referential by the time *Beach Party* was released, including references to the company within the film. AIP also either produced or distributed several of the more successful Hippiesploitation films. The company marketed their films using the Peter Pan syndrome and used marketing techniques and gimmicks known as ballyhoo (extravagant publicity), which had made earlier exploitation films successful. AIP was also closely associated with producer-director Roger Corman.

Corman is known for his short production schedules, his fostering of young talent, and, most importantly for this study, his care to promote and be sensitive to progressive youth cultures. Still alive in this 90s at the time of this writing, he has over four hundred producer credits during his sixty-five years in the film industry. During that time, Corman has had a large percentage of financial successes and has helped launch the careers of Hollywood elites such as Jack Nicholson, Robert De Niro, Francis Ford Coppola, Martin Scorsese, Jonathan Demme, and director Ron Howard. During the 1950s and 1960s, he produced and directed many Teensploitation films, often hired by or in business with AIP, including the company's first production, *The Fast and the Furious*. Throughout his career, Corman had sympathy for youths and youth movements and tried to display them sympathetically on screen, though in a sensational manner for financial gain. Discussing his politics and approach to young people in *The Wild Angels* (Corman 1965), Corman explains, "My filmmaking instincts, like my stance in politics, were growing more radical ... I'm not interested in the point of view of the Establishment ... but the outlaws', the outsiders' point of view ... I wanted to make a realistic, possibly even sympathetic, film about them" (Corman and Jerome 1990, 131-132). Though

Corman could empathize with teens and Hippies, he was not one of them and was not above making money depicting them. Corman's work, while discussed later in this and other chapters, was a crucial component of AIP offerings.

As mentioned, AIP had success with juvenile delinquent, hot rod, and rock 'n' roll movies, but some of the biggest successes were with teen monster movies and beach movies, which portrayed teens as relatable for a youth audience and as a group in need of growing up. Rock n' roll was an important aspect of teen monster movies, both as a part of the soundtrack and as a sign of youth for the teens. In many ways, characters' attachment to rock n' roll represents teen innocence, which must be left behind to "grow up" to defeat the monster. Miller and Van Riper argue, "The films, for all that they celebrate teen culture, are in fact tales of young people who 'put away childish things' and embrace—some- times temporarily, sometimes permanently— adult responsibilities" (2015, 135). The teen monster cycle included films like *The Blob* (Yeaworth 1958) and AIP films like *Earth vs. The Spider* (Gordon 1958), *Blood of Dracula* (Strock 1957), *How to Make a Monster* (Strock 1958), and *I Was a Teenage Frankenstein* (Strock 1957).

I Was a Teenage Frankenstein was a follow-up to *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*, one of the most successful and influential teenage monster movies of this period. *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* illustrates many of the points Miller and Van Riper discuss and is a film where a juvenile delinquent cannot grow up and becomes a monster instead. The movie is about Tony, played by Michael Landon, a juvenile delinquent who, after a fight, is sent by the police to see a psychologist, Dr. Brandon. Dr. Brandon is also a hypnotist and uses a drug to take a stupefied Tony back to his savage roots. The hypnotism and drugs turn him into a teenage werewolf, and he begins murdering people every time he hears a bell. At first, his human self is unaware of

what his wolf self is doing, but when he does realize he has been killing people, he goes to Brandon for help. Brandon instead induces another werewolf transformation upon Tony, resulting in Brandon's death. The police then enter the building and shoot Wolf Tony, who reverts to human form as Detective Donovan of the police laments, "It's not for man to interfere in the ways of God." This line is the film's only reference to religious morality and might have been included to gain approval from a wider audience. The film features many aspects common to teen films' depiction of youth culture and exploitation films' gritty morality, which can be summed up as enjoy your youth but be ready to grow up and accept responsibility. In the case of Tony, by becoming a monster, he cannot grow up and accept responsibility and, therefore, dies.

A factor shared by mainstream teen and Teensploitation films is how characters dress in the style typical to teenagers of the era. Tony, for example, is seen wearing a sports letterman jacket throughout the film, even when in wolf form. Tony also behaves like Jim in *Rebel Without a Cause* because he is immature, yet on the cusp of emotional maturity. When Tony is made aware of what his wolf self has done, he feels guilty and wants to make amends, but also is afraid of being arrested and sent to jail. Therefore, when he seeks out Dr. Brandon, he is looking for a father figure, even if Brandon is not worthy of such a role. The music of the film also lends to its depiction of teenagers, in that it has a rock 'n' roll soundtrack common to Teensploitation films, particularly in the song "Eeny Meeny Miney Moe" by Kenny Miller. The film's presentation of song has many of the qualities of a late 1950s rock 'n' roll film, including a choreographed number taken directly from 1950s-style dance. However, the song itself also features drumbeats similar to the bongo jazz stylings of the Beatniks. The song also has a minor tone that makes it fitting for a horror film, though the lyrics are rather silly and out of place in a Teensploitation monster movie.

What makes *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* most identifiable as a Teensploitation film is its marketing campaign, which uses strategies similar to the golden age exploitation films. Much of the marketing of Teensploitation was held over from the golden age in the 1930s and 1940s (Feaster and Wood 1999, 11), many using exploitation pioneer Kroger Babb's maxim of, "You gotta tell 'em to sell 'em" (Schaefer 1999, 135). This implied the individual theater owners should find sensational ways of marketing their films in order to make a profit. The marketing campaign for *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* includes the trailer, poster, and pressbook, which was a piece of material the distributors sent to theater owners to promote the films at their theaters. The pressbooks had advertisements theater owners could put into their local newspapers, as well as information about where to order posters and film and radio trailers. It also had advertising tips such as, "There are two methods designed to sell *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*. In one the face of the werewolf is shown, in the other it is not. We feel that in many areas the element of curiosity generated by the former will sell the most tickets. However, we also know that in some localities the outright horror approach is best" (American International Pictures 1957, "Special Note").

The film came out on a double bill with *Invasion of the Saucer Men* (Cahn 1957), so the pressbook carries advertisements for both films, the tagline calling them, "the most amazing motion pictures of our time." The bottom of the pressbook tells theater owners that the films are "a double dose of box office dynamite – book it! – exploit it! – for guaranteed profits!" (American International Pictures 1957). While this line highlights the exploitative marketing strategy, it should be noted that many pressbooks for mainstream films also had an "Exploitation" section, which suggested ways for a theater owner to market the movie to audiences.

The exploitation concept of “ballyhoo” exists throughout many of these pressbooks. Ballyhoo includes marketing gimmicks intended to sell a film. Mark Thomas McGee defines ballyhoo as “all the stuff that movie producers and publicity departments dreamed up to separate the sucker from his money” (1989, 2). Ballyhoo was generally used for promoting B-movies, exploitation films, or films that were not of the highest caliber in purely cinematic terms. William Castle was one of the premier filmmakers to make use of ballyhoo, as he seemed to have a gimmick campaign for almost every one of his films. *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*, being a Teensploitation film, had plenty of ballyhoo. In the “Seat Selling Slants” section of the pressbook, which in other pressbooks is sometimes called the “Exploitation” section, distributors encouraged at least two forms of ballyhoo. The first is, “Have an ambulance parked in front of the theatre to remove those who ‘faint’ at the show. Dress an usher in a Doctor’s coat with a stethoscope to examine patrons for weak hear[t]s. Lay someone out on a stretcher with a sign – ‘he couldn't take it.’ These gags have been used for years but they are sure-fire attention getters and have never failed” (American International Pictures 1957, “Seat Selling Slants”). This bit of ballyhoo shows AIP trying to carry on the marketing tactics from the golden age of exploitation films. Another gimmick tells theater owners, “Dress your ushers, cashiers in authentic Werewolf masks modeled after the makeup in *Teenage Werewolf*. Arrange a street ballyhoo. Have three [or] four ‘pickets’ dressed with these masks parade up and down in front of your box office with signs... ‘Unfair to Teenage Werewolfs [sic]’” (American International Pictures 1957, “Seat Selling Slants”). It then gives a location where to order such masks.

While *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* is undoubtedly a Teensploitation film that uses classic exploitation marketing tactics, by 1963 AIP had gained enough market visibility to launch the first film in the company’s beach party series, *Beach Party*. Possibly inspired by the success of

the mainstream teen beach movie *Gidget* (Wendkos 1959), the marketing of *Beach Party* involved little ballyhoo, making it unclear whether it is a Teensploitation film or a mainstream teen film. This is one of a few movies in my study where that line is blurred. On the one hand, the film is distributed by American International Pictures, which almost exclusively produced or distributed exploitation films more comparable to studio B picture than classic exploitation films. The film also has plenty of moments that are too tongue-in-cheek and self-referential for a mainstream film. For example, one character says they can sell the rights to the events in the film to American International, and later she listens to a record that has the American International record label on it. Product placement occurs not only or even primarily in exploitation films. However, such bold placement seems like an opportunistic, if not exploitative, way of trying to make ancillary profit through the film's soundtrack and other titles on the American International record label.

On the other hand, while still classifiable as a Teensploitation film, *Beach Party* almost functions more as a mainstream independent teen comedy. The movie did not feature an overly exploitative marketing campaign. There is no nudity. There are many mentions of sex, but usually in a chaste way, often in reference to eventual marriage, hinting at the characters maturing. One example is when Annette Funacello's character Dolores implies that she and Frankie (Frankie Avalon) will be living like a married couple while staying at the beach. AIP never shows anything beyond couples making out with a flash of flesh. The movie marketing features its stars, many of whom were well-known to a teenage audience, such as Bob Cummings, who had recently been on television with his program *The Bob Cummings Show* (Henning 1955-1959), Frankie Avalon, who was one of the top teen singing idols of the day with his song "Venus," and the *Mickey Mouse Club*'s Annette Funicello. The soundtrack featured

songs from one of the top beach rock bands of the period, Dick Dale and the Del-Tones. This type of star-centered marketing campaign is used for mainstream films. In addition, the *Beach Party* series, which included twelve films over four years, was not sold merely on the basis of young stars known to teens. *Beach Party* also features older actor Morey Amsterdam, who expresses confusion with the young generation. Amsterdam only appears in the first two films, but later movies in the series would feature appearances from actors like silent-film star Buster Keaton. These casting choices suggest AIP's interest in reaching a mainstream audience.

The film is a musical about Frankie and Dolores, played by Avalon and Funicello, who arrive at a beach house for the summer, but Dolores has invited their whole gang along, not ready to be with Frankie until he can see her as wife material. Meanwhile, Professor Sutwell, played by Bob Cummings, observes the group of teens from a nearby beach house with powerful viewing equipment. He is never associated with being a creep or a peeping tom, other than as a quick joke from his long-time companion Marianne, played by Dorothy Malone. Instead, he is an anthropologist studying the teens from a distance at first, then close-up after learning their particular lingo or slang and becoming nearly romantically entangled with Dolores after a fight between her and Frankie. Sutwell's study is the most problematic depiction of teens in the film. He titles it, "The Behavior Pattern of the Young Adult and Its Relation to Primitive Tribes," which Marianne shortens to "Teenage Sex." By approaching a study of teens from Sutwell's point of view, the filmmakers and Sutwell establish a distinction between teens and adults, and between the teens and themselves in their teenage years. It places the teen characters in the realm of being a "primitive" tribe, according to the film. Sutwell says the teens are "American, yes. Normal, no. Marianne, they are a true subculture. They live in a society as primitive as the aborigine of New Guinea." Such a comparison not only objectifies the teens, it echoes a similar

argument many made about the young Beatniks of the late 1950s and early 1960s and in a prescient way, just one year before they emerged as a counterculture, an argument that would be made about Hippies. Most of the teens behave in typical late 1950s, early 1960s fashion and almost all of Sutwell's thesis is based on their use of slang.

The film deals with Sutwell's firsthand investigations into the teen beach subculture. The plot is relatively predictable by about twenty minutes in. Dolores falls in love with Sutwell when Frankie shows interest in another girl, Frankie and Dolores end up together, Sutwell and Marianne end up together, and Sutwell gains a better perspective of teenage life. Though the word "sex" is thrown around somewhat liberally, the film is very chaste. The scenes featuring Big Daddy's club on the beach provide a link not only between older generations and the teens, but between teens and Beatniks. A bongo drumbeat, similar to what would have been used by Beatniks and what would be used by Hippies, introduces the character of Cappy, played by Morey Amsterdam. Cappy is an aging Beatnik, dressed in their style. He has a mini-harem of two young girls in Beatnik black leotards, does yoga, and is performative in his Beat speak, particularly his poem about Big Daddy, which purports to be cool, but fails because it is played for laughs by comedian Morey Amsterdam. He is beloved by the teens and seems to like them as well, but he tells Sutwell, "They're nuts." Cappy expresses older generation rhetoric about the problems of young people, but then goes on to make the prescient statement, "They run around, and they've got so much energy they don't know what to do with it. They need a reason, a cause." The need for a cause is part of what led to the split between Beatniks and Hippies. The Hippies found a cause, or a series of causes, with the main being the anti-war movement.

Cappy describes the character of Big Daddy, a cult-like figure who will give the kids "the word," who is revealed at the end to be Vincent Price. His character anticipates Hippie leaders

like Timothy Leary. The movie makes a point to show connections between the Beatniks and the young teen characters also the disparity between the groups. Generational conflict between the older “Silent” generation and the Baby Boomers who were teens and Beatniks would eventually give rise to a new Hippie counterculture that emerged about a year after *Beach Party* was released.

Beatniks at the Movies

Much like the Hippies, the Beatniks were usually not depicted sympathetically in films. In several films, it is also unclear just who or what a Beatnik was, much like the confusion over Hippie identity in future films. Their name was based on Jack Kerouac’s 1948 use of the phrase “the Beat Generation” (Sterritt 1998, 1-2). The stereotypic style of Beatniks included all black attire, turtlenecks, sunglasses, and berets, with the men often wearing beards, sometimes in the Van Dyke-style, as seen in Cappy’s character in *Beach Party*. Many were drawn from or into the world of Beat poetry by authors such as Kerouac, William S. Burroughs, and Allen Ginsberg. The coffeehouse scenes in places like Greenwich Village, San Francisco, and other coastal metropolises were often the hangout places for Beatniks, the air full of smoke from cigarettes and joints, the smell of coffee, the sound of bongos, and a person on a stage reading poetry (Whaley 2004, 3-8). Just as folk and especially rock music influenced Hippies, Beatniks were influenced by jazz and later folk artists who would come to play at their clubs. David Sterritt writes of the close relationship between Beatniks and jazz. He explains, “Many ’50s-era movies about jazz may be read as excursions into Beat-like territory, with or without actual Beats along for the trip” (1998, 152). Beatniks also had a slang and way of speaking, often derived from jazz jive talk. Beatniks were around from the late 1940s through the height of their popularity in the late 1950s to their decline in the mid-1960s due to the rise of the Hippies.

By the late 1950s, the Beatniks became a hot commodity for productions of popular culture, though usually as a stereotyped joke. For instance, the television program *The Many Loves of Dobie Gillis* (CBS 1959-1963) prominently featured Bob Denver as a Beatnik character named Maynard G. Krebs. Beatniks began showing up as background or side characters in mainstream films and as primary characters in exploitation films. Their depictions almost universally did not correspond with Beatnik life; however, they were lucrative portrayals for the film industry. The pressbook for the film *The Rebel Set* (Fowler Jr. 1959) told theaters owners, “Those Beatniks are box office!” implying that having Beatniks as main characters could be a significant selling point (Allied Artists 1959, [1]). However, many Beatnik movies of this time portrayed them in one of two ways; either they were lazy and shiftless, or they were criminals. Use of marijuana, heroin, and eventually, LSD were popular amongst Beatniks, as seen in the Beat novels like Aldous Huxley’s *The Doors of Perception* (1954) and William Burroughs’s *Naked Lunch* (1959), which involved the authors’ use of drugs for inspiration. Likewise, Hippies also suffered from similar stereotypes as Beatniks on film.

Films and advertisements began to coopt Beat culture and language, often in a similar way to how depictions of Hippies would inaccurately present the counterculture in subsequent years. For example, *The Rebel Set* poster identifies several types of Beatniks: “B-Guys! (The Beardniks) Living and Loving for Strange Kicks! Jet Dolls! Ready and Willing to Go into Orbit! The “Weirdies”! Nobody knows what makes them tick!” Other advertisements for the film called it a “Beatnik Jungle” where one could “Meet the drifters, the hipsters, the coffee house tramps” (Allied Artists 1959, [1]). Much like *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*, there was plenty of ballyhoo surrounding the film, including the idea of getting and publishing interviews with real police, who would supposedly have problems with Beatniks, and a member of “The Rebel Set,” an

actual Beatnik. The title of the interview that theater owners could place in their local paper was “‘Beatniks’ – A Fad or a Menace?”” Also similar to *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*, the pressbook encourages a fake picket line, this time with ushers dressed as barbers with signs reading, “‘*The Rebel Set*’ – You’ll Look Real Weird – If You Wear a Beard!” and “‘*The Rebel Set*’ is Unfair to Barbers – Off with the Beards!” (Allied Artists 1959, [10]). Perhaps most damaging to the reputation of Beatniks and later Hippies is the fact that, as many pressbooks reveal, this one uses distributor-produced advertising.^{vi} Distributor-produced advertising consists of pre-written stories, in this case by the distributor, for the theater owners to place in the newspaper to read like real news stories, but which are essentially ads for the movie. In this case, most of the distributor-produced advertising includes headlines that make Beatniks out to be criminals, such as “Big Holdup in Beatnik Film,” “Beatniks Involved in Crime in New Film Due Here Soon,” and “Beatniks Engage in Exciting Crime Binge in ‘*The Rebel Set*’” (Allied Artists 1959, [4]). Many of the crimes attributed to Beatniks in pressbooks and other forms of advertising would similarly be identified with Hippies in films just a few years later.

One of the most successful Beatnik movies, Roger Corman’s *A Bucket of Blood* (1959), emphasizes its horror-comedy dimensions while also presenting one of the most thoughtful portrayals of Beatnik subculture. The film owes much of its plot to films like the horror-mystery *Murder in the Wax Museum* (Curtiz 1933). In Corman’s film, Walter, played by character actor Dick Miller, is a somewhat bumbling busboy in a Beatnik coffeehouse. He wants to become popular among the Beat crowd but fails in every attempt. After he accidentally kills a cat, Walter covers it in clay and presents it as a sculpture. The Beatnik coffeehouse crowd then accept him as one of their own, and Walter achieves a taste of popularity, financial success, and fame. From there he works his way up to murders, at first accidental then escalating to intentional, and coats

the bodies in clay to create human sculptures. He achieves his greatest masterpiece by the end of the film when the police are closing in and he covers himself in clay and hangs himself. The humor of the film primarily comes from Walter's bumbling, his ease at being accepted into the Beat art community despite his grisly work, and his interactions as a regular person trying to ingratiate himself into Beat society.

For all its exploitative horror and over-the-top comedy, the film offers a judicious representation of Beatniks, due to Corman's care in positively portraying progressive youth cultures, as he did later on for the Hippies.^{vii} At worst, the Beatnik characters are presented as drug users, consuming narcotics such as marijuana. Marijuana use was a much larger issue in 1959 than it is at the time of this writing, but it was also an activity for which the Hippies would be criticized in most mainstream Hippie and Hippiesploitation films in the next few years. Yet even the treatment of the drug scene among the Beatniks shows a degree of care. At one point in the film, a Beatnik woman gives Walter a vial of heroin, but neither she nor Walter are presented as villainous because of her drug use and his ignorance of drug use.

A Bucket of Blood gets several aspects of Beat life correct, particularly in the dialogue and their appreciation of art; however, this accuracy is tarnished by the fact that, like Hippies, Beatniks were not producing these films. The film features a jazz-inspired score, with occasional folk songs. The costumes seem to be period accurate, including the styles other than the stereotypical all black, the somewhat nihilistic attitudes of the Beatnik characters are plausible, and the coffeehouse is about as close as an exploitation film came to a realistic portrayal of a Beatnik coffeehouse.^{viii} It even manages to get the Beat-speak mostly correct. By comparison, other Beatnik movies like *The Rebel Set* and *The Beatniks* (Frees 1960) have a Beat speak glossary in their pressbooks, though some of the definitions in the glossary are not precisely

correct or were not widely use among actual Beatniks. For instance, *The Beatniks* pressbook's definitions of Beat words like "bread" meaning "money" or "dullsville" meaning an "unpleasant place" are accurate. However, its phrases like a "George change" meaning "change for a dollar," "dildoe" meaning a "dippy dame," or "hustling Hershey" meaning "ex-lax" seem made up for the glossary (Barjul International Pictures, Inc. 1960, [2]).

A movie that is not as sympathetic to youth culture is *The Beatniks*, which is not so much a Beatnik film as a Teensploitation juvenile delinquent film marketed as a Beatnik film. The characters appear to be juvenile delinquents rather than Beatniks. Their costumes convey that the characters are non-Beatnik teens or juvenile delinquent teens. They do not listen to jazz music, but rock n' roll. One of the gang members even has dreams of being a rock singer. They use slang suited to teens of the late 1950s or very early 1960s. They do not use Beat speak, which is ironic because the pressbook has an even more extensive glossary of Beatnik terms than *The Rebel Set* and none of the supposed Beatniks in the film use those terms to any great degree. They hang out in diners, not coffeehouses. For the Something Weird Video release of the film, Harry Archer described the characters,

Beatniks? *What* beatniks? Two-bit punks, a closet rock-&-roll star, and an out-of-his-mind psycho: yes. Beatniks: no. Though *The Beatniks* was probably a last-minute title change to replace a less exploitable moniker, it didn't make much of a difference to the audiences of 1960. After all, to a world emerging from the Eisenhower era, bohemian artists and beat-generation poets were seen as little more than socially maladjusted misfits in the same category as junkies, Commies, and teenage hoodlums — or the petty-crime crackpots running loose in this fast, fun, and naively hilarious saga of an overage delinquent who becomes an overnight sensation. (Archer)

The film, about a gang of young hoodlums who rob stores and cause general mayhem, presents the supposed Beatniks as violent criminals. The characters are in their early twenties, so are meant to provide a morality lesson for teen audiences. Though there are five young men and women in the gang, only two are essential to the plot. The first is Eddie, played by Tony Travis, the supposed gang leader who is an “essentially good kid” and discovered by an agent near the beginning of the film as an upcoming singing star.^{ix} The other gang member is Moon, played by Peter Breck, who is crazy and jealous of Eddie’s success. Eddie takes the gang with him as he makes his first TV appearance, but celebrating later that night, Moon shoots and kills a diner owner, unwillingly making Eddie an accessory. The rest of the movie portrays Moon getting progressively crazier and more murderous and Eddie becoming more of a mature, upstanding citizen. Eddie calls the police on himself, and Moon shows up ready for a fight. Eddie and Moon fight, with Eddie coming out on top just as the cops show up and arrest them both. Eddie goes willingly, effectively putting an end to his dreams of being a singer, while accepting maturity.

Nothing in the plot or characterizations signal anything that could be immediately associated with the idea of being a Beatnik or teen, yet that is how the movie is advertised. Only the character of Moon even speaks or dresses anything like a Beatnik, and just barely so, occasionally dropping in a phrase. The pressbook also contain a distributor-produced advertising story in which “True Beatniks” deny the characters in the film are a part of their counterculture. The story, headlined “Producers Answer Students Beatnikism ‘Insult’ Cry” says,

Producers of the picture *The Beatniks* at first declined to answer University of Southern California students of their cry of “Insult to beatnikism.” However, after a storm of protests in which the students maintained, the producers had no right to portray beatniks from a criminal aspect, claiming “True Beatniks” exist only in the “intellectual” world of

today. Producers took a dim view of this, stoutly maintaining: “their story and characters came from actual police records” and one of the actors (playing Moon, a psychotic killer) even roved the haunts of Beatniks to acquire their dress, mannerisms and odd expressions of speech. The verbal battle still rages. (Barjul International Pictures, Inc. 1960, [5])

The reliability of this story is suspect, at best, but it seems likely the producers and distributors of *The Beatniks* were not Beatniks, nor did they consult with the subculture about the advertising of the film. Other distributor-produced headlines in the pressbook range from debating the sophistication of Beatniks (“Sociologist Says Beatnikism Maturity”) to comparing them to communists (“Russians Disclaim Beatnik Discovery!”) to supposed statements from the police (“Authorities Enter Fray on Beatnik Students Cry”). There is even a story that links Paul Newman to the film, though he had nothing to do with the film, likely to cash in on his star power appeal, the headline reading “Actor Paul Newman Says: ‘I’m No Beatnik’” (Barjul International Pictures, Inc. 1960, [5]). The ballyhoo for the film encourages theater owners to hold a “Beat the Beatniks’ Contest,” where audience members could study the Beatnik glossary provided with the advertising materials for the film and call in to local radio stations when the disc jockey uses a Beatnik phrase. If they could translate the word or phrase “into the Kings English” the listener would receive a Beatnik record, copy of the glossary, and movie passes as a prize (Barjul International Pictures, Inc. 1960, [4]). All of these distributor-produced advertising stories discredit Beatniks and make them seem like an immature and possibly dangerous subculture. Even the phrase “Beat the Beatnik” carries an adversarial quality. These are similar to marketing strategies that would be used to discredit the Hippies in later films.

Preparing for the Hippies: Cultural Events and Counterculture in the Early 1960s

Mainstream teen films, Teensploitation films, and Beatnik films are precursors of mainstream Hippie films and Hippiesploitation films. More broadly, there were many cultural trends and events that led Hippies to emerge as a counterculture in 1964. They include the vilification of teens and Beatniks in mainstream American culture, Cold War paranoia, the first meetings of the Students for a Democratic Society, and the deaths of prominent figures like Medgar Evers and John F. Kennedy.

Case studies reveal that teens were celebrated as a profitable audience, yet also infantilized or vilified in filmic portrayals, particularly of teenagers who were not “essentially good kids” in films like *Rebel Without a Cause*, *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*, and *Beach Party*. Film such as *The Beatniks* and *A Bucket of Blood* exploited the visibility of Beatniks, while at the same time denigrating the characters on-screen. According to dominant culture, teens and Beatniks were immature and prone to crime and violence. Miller and Van Riper write, “Teenagers, to mid-twentieth-century America, represented both problem and possibility. Perceptions that rebellious youth were tearing at the moral fabric of society led FBI director J. Edgar Hoover to describe juvenile delinquency as a threat to the American way of life equivalent to communism” (2015, 130). Likewise, Beatniks, even outside of filmed representation, were often characterized as lackadaisical, shiftless, and possibly criminal (Marca 2013, 3).

The reasons Beatniks were maligned in film have to do with Cold War paranoia and the beginnings of the culture wars, which led to Beatniks having the type of negative image later associated with Hippies. The Cold War began after World War II as tensions rose between the United States and the Soviet Union. This time was characterized by distrust and blacklists in the United States. Mainstream paranoia of communists lying in wait to bring down America and

American capitalism was used by the House Un-American Activities Committee, which carried out hearings that ruined the lives of many Americans in government, the military, and in the film industry between the late 1940s through the 1970s. Many would be convicted in the court of public opinion due to rumors and innuendo (Smith 2014, 1-4). Beatniks were candidates for this treatment. The Beats of the late 1950s and early 1960s were often left leaning, in favor of causes like desegregation, and had economic politics that were more nihilistic than capitalistic or communistic (Whaley 2004, 1). Mainstream perception of the Beatniks seemed to imply they were slothful, criminals, communists, or some combination of the three, qualities also associated with the Hippies. Such culture war politics would lead to the formation of groups like the New Left and, eventually, the Hippies.

Cold War paranoia also influenced the era's teens and how society perceived them. The generation known as Baby Boomers had grown up post-World War II, steeped in fear of the U.S.S.R., communists, and fellow travelers. Discussing such fears, Rebecca E. Klatch writes, "The Cold War represented nuclear annihilation rather than Soviet expansion, the deterioration of civil liberties witnessed by the McCarthy period, not the loss of American power" (1999, 31). In a time when nuclear war and a potential end of the world seemed possible, such fears would undoubtedly affect a youth culture, particularly those youths who had learned little more defense than "duck and cover." Depictions of many teens on and off-screen were generally infantilized. Many Teensploitation and mainstream teen films capitalized on the moral panic around young people, for fear that they might become anti-American. This fear carried over into depictions of Hippies in Hippiesploitation films.

Later in the 1960s, politics would be divisive along generational, class, and ideological lines. Some American youth who embraced Cold War paranoid rhetoric would go to the New

Right. Many of these young adults were in favor of segregation and the Vietnam War, as these stances helped slow the march of communism in the minds of the New Right. Those who would grow up into groups like the New Left and the Hippies, however, marched in opposition to those causes and many more. They had seen the damage paranoia could cause and, by changing a system they viewed as broken, they hoped to create a better world. These youths took up causes like peaceful revolution that would end up being wishful thinking. Yet the future New Left and Hippies would grow to have first idealism about and later righteous indignation with a system that fostered paranoid fears (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 178-182). Discussing a 1960 article by Columbia University sociologist C. Wright Mills that encouraged youth groups to rise up and take leftist power, Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin write, “For a truly ‘new’ Left to thrive, radicals were going to have to ‘forget Victorian Marxism’ and accept the world of the late twentieth-century, [because] it was young people who were the ‘real live agencies of historic change’” (2008, 172). These were the thoughts that would begin to circulate amongst the New Left and the Students for a Democratic Society.

By 1962 and 1963, a confluence of events led to the emergence of Hippies in 1964. In October of 1962, the Cuban Missile Crisis began. Through a combination of diplomacy and negotiations, President Kennedy and Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev were able to calm this thirteen-day scare, which would be the closest the Cold War came to nuclear annihilation. Also, in 1962 the Students for a Democratic Society began to evolve into a more influential organization. Led by future New Left leader and Chicago Eight defendant Tom Hayden, the group started to ramp up its meetings, releasing the Port Huron Statement in 1962, which called for disarmament, reorganization of the Democratic Party, and university reform, all of which would become causes of Hippies just a few years later. Klatch argues, “Beyond critiquing

American society, the Port Huron Statement is also a call to arms, meant to rouse youth from complacency” (199, 27). It called for non-violent civil disobedience and for a return to American freedom for all, love in the brotherhood of man, and idealism. One passage directly addresses fears of the Cold War. It reads,

Theoretic chaos has replaced the idealistic thinking of old--and, unable to reconstitute theoretic order, men have condemned idealism itself. Doubt has replaced hopefulness--and men act out a defeatism that is labeled realistic. The decline of utopia and hope is, in fact, one of the defining features of social life today. The reasons are various: the dreams of the older left were perverted by Stalinism and never re-created; the congressional stalemate makes men narrow their view of the possible; the specialization of human activity leaves little room for sweeping thought; the horrors of the twentieth century symbolized in the gas ovens and concentration camps and atom bombs, have blasted hopefulness. To be idealistic is to be considered apocalyptic, deluded. To have no serious aspirations, on the contrary, is to be “tough-minded.” (Students for a Democratic Society 1966, 5-6)

The document, which was subtitled an “Agenda for a Generation,” articulates the problems created by Cold War paranoia *and* anticipates the “tough minded” rhetoric would be leveled by critics of the idealistic Hippie movement (1966, 3).

In 1963, the year before Hippies would first appear in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco, two more blows would fall on an idealistic generation. On June 12, 1963, a white supremacist shot Medgar Evers outside his home in Jackson, Mississippi. He was certainly not the first or last civil rights leader to die for the cause of social justice, but his death affected some of the youth of America. Isserman and Kazin write, “On June 23 [1963] the streets of downtown

Detroit filled with purpose. Some 200,000 people, black and white, marched to protest the killing of Medgar Evers and to show that the civil rights movement was flourishing in the industrial North” (2008, 94). To add to the United States’ sorrow, on November 22, 1963, “the day they blew the dreams away” as songwriter John Stewart would later sing (“I Remember America” 1995), an assassin killed President John F. Kennedy in Dallas. The assassination was one of the most noteworthy moments of the twentieth century and, in a decade that would become marked by its assassinations of social justice leaders, this one stood out as one of the most disquieting and prescient for things to come. Kennedy had been a symbol of American youth and idealism. His assassination not only shocked and appalled the youth of America but older generations as well. The famously stoic Walter Cronkite shed tears on-air in announcing the death of President Kennedy. The assassination of Kennedy would mark a change in American history. In recalling John Kennedy’s enjoyment of the musical *Camelot* (Lerner and Lowe 1960), Jacqueline Kennedy would say in an interview with *Life* magazine, “Don’t let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief, shining moment that was known as Camelot. There’ll be great presidents again ... but there will never be another Camelot” (White 1963, 159). These lines spoke to the lost innocence of the United States and most of all spoke of a loss to the country.

The death of President Kennedy signaled a changing time in the history of the United States. Groups like the SDS and the New Left were on the rise. Many young people looked west for hope and idealism.^{xi} Some found that hope in Haight-Ashbury as the soon-to-be Hippies began migrating at the end of 1964 and the beginning of 1965. They carried with them the dominant cultures’ negative views on their youth and coming counterculture.

CHAPTER II. “THE TIMES THEY ARE A-CHANGIN’”: THE BIRTH OF THE HIPPIES AND THE MOVE FROM TEENSPLOITATION TO HIPPIESPLOITATION

On January 13, 1964, singer-songwriter Bob Dylan released his third album, *The Times They Are A-Changin’*. The album’s title song would become one of Dylan’s best-known protest songs of the 1960s, along with “Blowin’ in the Wind.” Moreover, these songs would become two of the most representative protest songs of the 1960s (Sounes 2011, 150). Jim Moran notes that the hallmark of a good protest song is its ability to be relevant beyond the time of its writing (2012). “The Times They Are A-Changin’” is among the songs that have retained their relevance.

Certain years seem to be pivotal in American politics. The 1960s had several of these years. The Cuban Missile Crisis made 1962 an important year. The assassinations of Medgar Evers and John Kennedy made 1963 pivotal. For the U.S., 1964 may be one of the most seminal years of the 1960s and the twentieth century. Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as president in late 1963 and began enacting his policies throughout 1964. Kennedy represented youthful idealism and the hope of a New Frontier with his Camelot presidency. Johnson’s presidency, on the other hand, did not have the optimism of Kennedy’s, despite its signature initiatives (the Great Society and the War on Poverty). He also signed the Civil Rights Act in 1964, a significant victory for social justice in the U.S. The legislation would also come with racist backlash. Johnson’s term in office contrasts with Kennedy’s largely because it is known for its visible escalation of the Vietnam War. In 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin incident, discussed in more detail below, caused greater U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

This chapter examines cultural shifts between 1964-1966 which shaped the growing Hippie movement. Some major cultural events discussed include the Gulf of Tonkin Incident, the

rise of counterculture figures Ken Kesey and Timothy Leary, 1966's Love Pageant Rally, and the Sunset Strip "riots." The chapter charts the birth of the Hippies in Haight-Ashbury as well as their growth throughout the country during this time. Additionally, the chapter analyzes what it meant to be a Hippie in terms of style and political affiliation. Future chapters' analysis of Hippiesploitation and Hippie films is predicated on understanding what a Hippie was and how well filmmakers understood the movement. Filmmakers often gave depictions of Hippies which did not correspond with reality because they could not comprehend what the counterculture was about and what they believed in.

While focusing on what was happening with the Hippies culturally, the chapter also analyzes what was going on in the world of film between 1964-1966. Teensploitation and mainstream teen films began stagnating at the box office. An example of the decline in new ideas is *The Horror of Party Beach* (Tenney 1964), a Teensploitation monster beach movie. The film adds far too many narrative devices and, therefore, signals a similar decline in the cycle. The mainstream dark comedy teen film *Lord Love a Duck* (Axelrod 1966) does much the same, though it tries to parody the decline of teen and beach movies. Countercultural films like *Dr. Strangelove, Or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* (Kubrick 1964) emerged, commenting on fears of nuclear annihilation, but well after the Cuban Missile Crisis was over. In 1966, *Hallucination Generation* (Mann 1966) was released and serves as one of the earliest examples of a Hippiesploitation film and one of the later Beatnik films. The films which were released between 1964 and 1966 illustrate several attempts by filmmakers to understand the growing youth culture. However, the films are rarely topical to what was actually going on with teens and the growing Hippie movement, further illustrating a frustrating disconnect which carried over into the Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie film cycles.

1964-1966 are key dates in the present study because by the end of 1964 and the beginning of 1965, the counterculture group known as the Hippies would emerge in the Haight-Ashbury area of San Francisco. Fueled by youthful idealism and, eventually, righteous indignation at the war in Vietnam, this group would be founded on a compilation of contrasting styles, ideologies, and social and religious practices. If the Vietnam War is the event that most represents the 1960s, the Hippies are the group most associated with that era. 1964 was a moment of great violence and of great hope. By 1966, the Hippies became national figures due to the Sunset Strip “riots.” It was the time of Ken Kesey and his Merry Pranksters. It was the time of rock n’ roll, LSD, and other mind tripping psychedelics. It was the moment of the Hippies.

The Gulf of Tonkin and the Escalation of the Vietnam War

The Gulf of Tonkin incident is one of the cultural events that shaped the remainder of the 1960s. It occurred on August 2 and 4, 1964, when United States destroyer USS Maddox was supposedly fired upon in open waters by Viet Cong torpedo boats. This event was fabricated mainly by United States Naval intelligence, the CIA, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy, and President Johnson himself. Initially viewed as a mistake on behalf of Navy intelligence, Johnson declared the attacks unprovoked, and the Gulf of Tonkin Incident became one of the reasons the United States became involved in active fighting in Vietnam. The main problem with the Gulf of Tonkin incident was that it barely occurred, certainly not enough to result in a war as catastrophic as Vietnam. The attack on August 2 resulted in one bullet hole in the side of the USS Maddox, and the August 4 attack never happened at all (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 118-120).

Because Johnson was up for election against Republican rival, Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater, the event was widely covered by the media, with the fans flamed by the Johnson

administration. Goldwater, a far-right conservative, conveyed his extremist anti-communist policies, saying, “I would remind you, in the defense of liberty, extremism is no vice” (Goldwater, 1964). Despite his campaign slogan of “In Your Heart, You Know He’s Right,” many were afraid of Goldwater’s extremist policies, including the possibility that he might use nuclear weapons against East Asian communists (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 224-225). Johnson needed to win the presidency while also distinguishing himself from his predecessor John Kennedy. He needed to look like the more grounded candidate while still being tough on communism. The Gulf of Tonkin incident gave Johnson a way to secure the presidency. He responded to the alleged attack by escalating the Vietnam War, while still holding back from using nuclear weaponry, as shown in one of the most controversial political ads of all time.

The political ad shows a little girl picking flowers, then a nuclear countdown, and a bomb going off. Johnson’s voice is then heard saying, “These are the stakes. To make a world in which all of God’s children can live... or to go into the dark. We must either love each other... or we must die.” An announcer then states, “Vote for President Johnson on November 3rd. The stakes are too high for you to stay home.” The controversial “Daisy ad” only aired once on September 7, 1964, during *The NBC Monday Movie*. It was seen as an attack on Goldwater, despite his name never being mentioned.

Along with the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the ad helped to ensure Johnson the presidency (Mann 2011, 62-82). His election fostered an environment in which the Hippie movement emerged in opposition to Johnson, Vietnam, and later Richard Nixon. Johnson’s escalation of the Vietnam War became one of the rallying cries for Hippies as they would later chant slogans like, “Hey, Hey, LBJ, How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?” His involvement in the Vietnam War seems to overshadow the progressive policies of his presidency including his War on Poverty,

the Great Society, his conservationist policies, and his signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. To the Hippies and many subsequent Americans, Lyndon Johnson would be remembered as the one who escalated the Vietnam War, and it began with his involvement in selling the lie that was the Gulf of Tonkin incident (Bernstein 1996, 408-410).

The Hippies Make the Scene

Around the time that young people who would become known as the Hippies began arriving in San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district, another major counterculture event was taking place in the summer of 1964. Ken Kesey, who had published two major counterculture novels, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) and *Sometimes a Great Notion* (1964), began to tour the country with several of his friends who would become known as the Merry Pranksters. Kesey would later consider himself a bridge between the Beatniks and the Hippies, as he and his Merry Pranksters would conduct "Acid Tests." While high themselves on LSD and touring the country, Kesey began to share his acid and love of the drug with many people across the country (MacFarlane 2007, 2-3). Inspired partially by counterculture icon and LSD aficionado Timothy Leary, who would become an even bigger name as the 1960s progressed, Kesey's acid tests paved the way for Hippies and their embrace of acid as a form of "good dope." In Hippie culture, dope was distinguished from drugs because dope expanded one's mind, while drugs constricted it. LSD, mushrooms, peyote, and marijuana were dope, whereas speed, methamphetamines, Quaaludes, and heroin were drugs that altered perception in ways Hippies saw as negative (Miller 1991, 13). Kesey's travels with the Merry Pranksters were immortalized in Tom Wolfe's book *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (1968).

Kesey's "Acid Tests" anticipate and nurture the counterculture sentiments that would drive the Hippie movement. Kesey toured the country with the Pranksters performing Acid

Tests, filling a punchbowl and dissolving LSD in the drink, usually some type of Kool-Aid as the Wolfe book indicates. The tests were done entirely with the knowledge of those taking part. Kesey explains, “I never dosed anybody. I never gave anybody drugs without telling him. It’s rape. You can’t violate a person like that. I have been dosed by people trying to impress me. I can’t tell you how much I hate it” (Lehndorff 1989). Acid Tests were designed to expand participants’ consciousness so they could create a new view of the world. While Kesey was the leader of the Merry Pranksters and the one who helped organize the Acid Tests when they were legal, he also had a charismatic quality about him. The attraction people had to him was not quite the same that would later surround Timothy Leary, where followers viewed Leary’s experiments with acid as a form of religious enlightenment. Kesey’s following was interested in forming a sense of community, although religious experience was undoubtedly part of it. Wolfe writes,

Gradually the Prankster attitude began to involve the main things religious mystics have always felt, things familiar to Hindus, Buddhists, Christians, and for that matter Theosophists and even flying-saucer cultists. Namely, the *experiencing* of an Other World, a higher level of reality. And a perception of the cosmic unity of this higher level. And a feeling of timelessness, the feeling that what we know as time is only the result of a naïve faith in causality—the notion that A in the past *caused* B in the present, which will *cause* C in the future, when actually A, B, and C are all part of a pattern that can be truly understood only by opening the doors of perception and experiencing it... in this moment ... this supreme moment... this *kairos*— (Wolfe 1968, 127, italic in original)^{xii}

Kesey was critical of Leary’s method of introducing LSD to the public and of using religion and intellectual language. They had differences in their way of getting people involved in LSD. Kesey discussed Leary with his following saying, “Don’t say stop plunging into the

forest. Don't say stop being a pioneer and come back here and help these people through the door. If Leary wants to do that, that's good, it's a good thing and somebody should do it. But somebody has to be the pioneer and leave the marks for others to follow" (27). This quote highlights one of Kesey's chief concerns about Leary. Kesey was still helping "people through the door" by conducting the Acid Tests but claimed he was a pioneer. Leary had no such illusions and was simply more upfront about his reasons for the wider usage of acid. He wanted to safely turn as many people on to LSD as possible, believing it would open a wider group consciousness. The chief difference between Kesey and Leary, beyond how they promoted LSD usage, was that Kesey wanted to be a Hippie leader and guru, while Leary did not want individual leaders in the Hippie movement. Kesey was unaware of this difference, believing he was a "pioneer" while he was still helping people through the door. This dichotomy between Leary and Kesey raises an issue that pertains to other so-called Hippie leaders. While much of Hippie culture was about throwing off the older generation, some of their early leaders were older. Kesey was one of the first people to encourage the Woodstock generation to rebel. However, Hippie "elders" like Beatniks Allen Ginsberg and Alan Watts and other people like Leary who were older but new to the counterculture also spread the word.

Kesey and the Merry Pranksters created a variety of sayings that captured the spirit of the Hippie counterculture. Wolfe chronicled these phrases, explaining, "There is no use in his indulging in a lifelong competition to change the structure of the little environment he seems to be trapped in. But one could see the larger pattern and move with it—*Go with the flow!*—and accept it and rise above one's immediate environment and even alter it by accepting the larger pattern and grooving with it—*Put your good where it will do the most!*" (127).^{xiii} Other Kesey phrases like "You're either on the bus or off the bus" (74) and "We blew it" (367) became

emblematic of the Hippie lifestyle. “We blew it” even ending up in the film *Easy Rider* (Hopper 1969), which was a biker film rather than a Hippie film, but still was a part of counterculture cinema.

Kesey would begin his Acid Tests in 1964 and continue through 1966 when LSD was criminalized. The criminalization of LSD, discussed later in the chapter, would affect mainstream perceptions of Hippie ideology and lifestyle. The Acid Tests stopped because Kesey was arrested and sentenced, not for his LSD parties, but for possession of marijuana, for which he spent six months in jail. Kesey “got off the bus,” as did some of the other Pranksters, most notably Beatnik turned Hippie Prankster Neal Cassidy, who died on February 4, 1968, of unknown, but likely drug-related, causes (Wolfe 1969, 368-369). Kesey later said about the Acid Tests, “There was a lot of other stuff going on in the same consciousness expansion area... this was part of a movement that was happening in the 60s, but not the main part of the movement... I think it was the beginning of a real, true revolution that’s still going on” (Kesey 1981). Though Kesey and the Merry Pranksters would “get off the bus” early in the lifecycle of the Hippie, their influence is without question. Beyond making LSD a part of the Hippie lifestyle, they also formulated many ideas, spiritual and otherwise, that would be picked up by the Hippie counterculture. They helped shape the psychedelic nature of the Hippie lifestyle. The Merry Pranksters also introduce one of the most popular Hippie bands of all-time, The Grateful Dead.

During this same time, Beat-poet-turned-Hippie Allen Ginsberg and LSD advocate Timothy Leary began a partnership promoting psychedelics that would influence the perspectives of the Hippie movement. Ginsberg is perhaps best known for his poem “Howl,” which was famous amongst Beats and Hippies alike. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Ginsberg began experimenting with mind-altering drugs such as LSD, mushrooms, and peyote, as well as

with Eastern philosophy and mantras (Connors 2010, 35-53). All of these lifestyle choices would become part of his public persona and be associated with Hippies. Ginsberg could, like Leary or Kinsey, be considered a “Hippie elder” because he was there at the beginning of the movement, involved in mentoring some of the original Hippies moving to Haight-Ashbury. He would continue to be associated with the Hippie movement, which made him a peculiarity, as most Hippies were a part of the under-35 crowd.

Ginsberg’s interest in psychedelics was furthered by meeting Leary in 1960, which began a lifelong friendship between the two Hippie elders who influenced the early trajectory of the movement. Ginsberg believed that everyone should try psychedelics. On his first meeting with Leary, he consumed mushrooms and saw a future partnership with Leary. Leary did not yet have the reputation that was associated with Ginsberg. At the time, Leary was known as a Harvard psychology professor who was simply experimenting with the newly discovered LSD. Therefore, Ginsberg believed Leary was a person of influence who could get people more involved in mind-altering substances. Peter Connors writes,

As Allen saw it, the solution was sitting right across the table from him: Dr. Timothy Leary. Or, more importantly, everything that Timothy Leary represented. Leary was an ivy-league academic, a certified Ph.D., a well-respected psychologist, a clean-cut unknown with – and here was the kicker – access to mass quantities of psilocybin. On the other hand, Ginsberg was a known Beatnik poet with a history of drug use and mental illness. He wasn’t just famous, he was infamous. (90)

Over time, Leary would become just as infamous as Ginsberg and perhaps even more so, with Richard Nixon calling Leary, “the most dangerous man in America” (Mansnerus 1996). In 1960, Leary was employed by Harvard University doing experiments with psychedelics like

LSD and psilocybin. Leary was fired by Harvard in 1963, for not fulfilling his duties as a lecturing professor and for his growing infamy as a proponent of LSD. He began his experiments anew at the Mellon estate in Millbrook, New York. At the estate, which became known as Millbrook, Leary would play host and psychedelic spiritual guide to guests seeking mind expansion and spiritual enlightenment, including one visit from Kesey and the Pranksters. This meeting did not end well; Leary was ill but the Pranksters thought he was being aloof.

Kesey, Leary, and Ginsberg were vital to the beginnings of the Hippie movement, because they, along with Beats like Alan Watts and Gary Snyder, laid the groundwork for what would become the counterculture of the 1960s. By 1964-1966, Ginsberg was well into the counterculture protest scene, and Leary would soon join him. Indeed, while Leary's drugs and philosophy influenced Ginsberg, Leary was just as much influenced by Ginsberg's activism, calling their partnership "The White Hand Society." Ginsberg and Leary's infamy would continue to grow throughout the rest of the 1960s, as would their social influence (Connors 2010, 187-198).

Leary's sayings, such as "think for yourself and question authority" and "turn on, tune in, drop out" would become anthems for the Hippie movement. The latter phrase implied that one should "turn on" by becoming sensitive to various levels of consciousness, "tune in" by interacting with the world around them, and "drop out" by relying on oneself and likeminded people rather than established society. Leary, Ginsberg, and many Hippies valued an informal tribal lifestyle, which relied on oneself and a small group of others, rather than formal societal grouping. Leary later writes, "Unhappily, my explanations of this sequence of personal development are often misinterpreted to mean 'Get stoned and abandon all constructive activity'" (1983, 253). The Hippies were about far more than getting stoned.

The group that would become known as the Hippies arrived in Haight-Ashbury in late-1964 and early-1965, although it is difficult to gauge when the counterculture transitioned from Beatnik to Hippie. Hippies were a loosely knit counterculture group of individuals joined together by similar styles and ideologies. The term “Hippie” was used in popular culture several years before it became associated with the new counterculture. When young counterculture people arrived in San Francisco, they began to use the type of tribal support system that Leary, Ginsberg, and “Hippie elders” like Snyder and Watts proposed. Watts said, “what we need to realize is that there can be—shall we say—a movement, a stirring, among people which can be organically designed instead of politically designed. It has no boss, and yet all the parts recognize each other in the same way as the cells of the body all cooperate together” (Watts et al. 1967). The Hippies of Haight-Ashbury began to assist one another in this way, helped by a group called The Diggers.

The Diggers are a sub-culture within the counterculture, because they belonged to the Hippie movement, but were not the main part of it. Their involvement is similar to how the Yippies or Weather Underground were part of the Hippie counterculture while still existing in their separate spheres. The Diggers, Yippies, and Weather Underground all started as Hippies until, one way or another, each sub-group developed their own forms of political participation outside the larger Hippie sphere. The Diggers were a community action group, involved in various Bay Area theater movements, who would help newly arrived Hippies find food, clothing, and lodging. They organized free concerts, and by 1967, the year of the Hippie, opened up the famous Free Store and Free Clinic, which provided goods and services to Hippies and like-minded people in need without charge (Miller 1991, 105-106). The Diggers received a good deal of the media attention that began to be directed to Hippies in 1966. For instance, there is a

reference to them in the marketing material for the 1967 Arthur Dreifuss film *The Love-Ins* (Columbia 1966). Many others would be associated with Hippies, including Ram Dass, Ken Babbs, Tom Hayden, and Wavy Gravy.

Although enclaves were beginning to form in Berkley, Los Angeles, and New York, one of the first significant Hippie gatherings outside of Haight-Ashbury was the Red Dog Experience. The Red Dog Experience occurred over the summer of 1965 in the Red Dog Saloon in Virginia City, Nevada, just across the Northern California boarder. While Ken Kesey was conducting Acid Tests all over the country to the tunes of the Grateful Dead, and Timothy Leary and Allen Ginsberg were taking acid and other psychedelic drugs at Millbrook, Hippies would take trips from Haight-Ashbury to Virginia City to participate in a series of parties where psychedelics like peyote and LSD were consumed and music was played. Audiences mingled with the folk and psychedelic rock groups like The Charlatans and Big Brother and the Holding Company who appeared on stage. The Red Dog Saloon became a place of experimentation with drugs, music, Native American beliefs, and the frontier spirit of a B-western (Perry 1985, 7-11). The Red Dog Experience did not garner much media attention but represented the first time the group of Hippies who lived in Haight-Ashbury began to spread out, though other cities had their own Hip scenes.

The first mention of Hippies as members of a distinct counterculture occurred in a September 5, 1965 article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* by Michael Fallon titled “A New Haven for Beatniks” that describes the Panhandle (a park) in Haight-Ashbury. In 1966, Hippies and especially Diggers would fight the city of San Francisco to preserve the Panhandle from being turned into highway lanes. Between 1965 and 1966, more references to the emerging counterculture crop in the San Francisco newspapers. Noted columnist Herb Caen, who is

credited with coining the term “Beatnik,” began to write about the new counterculture using the term “Hippies.” Neighborhoods of Hippies appeared across the country as word of the group began to spread. By 1966, Hippies were established in San Francisco, Virginia City, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and New York. Christopher Mele writes,

The influx of middle-class youth and the accompanying changes in the built environment drew increasing local and national media attention. Consequently, by 1966 the area [the East Village] once characterized as a working-class ethnic ghetto was reputed to be the center of the hippie avant-garde on the East Coast. But unlike the Beats’ or the earlier bohemians’, that reputation did not circulate only among an elite set of devotees or a slightly larger set of curious onlookers or sympathizers. Awareness of the hippie phenomenon had reached international proportions, and national magazines, such as *Time* and *Newsweek*, were devoting pages of coverage to the movement and its capitals Haight-Ashbury and the East Village... If the growing popularity of the counterculture shocked or offended the bourgeoisie that had produced suburbs, country clubs, and the Vietnam War, the hippies were keen to oblige. (Mele 2000, 166)

It is difficult to comment on Hippies in Haight-Ashbury between 1964-1966, because there was not much reporting on the group until 1966. Yet there was something happening in the United States between 1964-1966, and the times were undoubtedly a-changin’. When news coverage occurred, the term Hippie became a sign of the times. With Hippies in major cities as early as 1964, Los Angeles became the place where Hippies made their first appearance in national culture due to their protests of curfews on Hollywood’s Sunset Strip in 1966. These protests sparked media coverage, and the Sunset Strip “riots” as they were known are discussed later in the chapter.

How to Identify a Hippie

An understanding of the core beliefs and styles of the Hippies is imperative to an accurate analysis of their depictions on film. It shows how film's portrayals of Hippies often did not correspond with the countercultural lifestyle. Additionally, sympathetic filmic portrayals of the movement tended to capture the look and feel of the movement and did not portray the group as monolithic, but as individuals with common goals and opinions. The Hippies were an extremely loose collective of people and cannot be easily categorized. Yet there are enough parallels in ethics, manner, and what Dick Hebdige calls "style" to draw some comparisons amongst the group as a whole. Most Hippies were young, under 30 to 35 usually, middle class, and white. There is evidence that there were Hippies of color who were readily accepted by the white counterculture, but they more often found their way into political groups like the Black Panthers (Miller 1991, 15-16). The Panthers and the Hippies were copasetic as they were working for many of the same goals and ideals, including racial tolerance and the end to the war in Vietnam. In an issue of the *Black Panther* magazine, one Panther writes, "Black brothers stop vamping on the hippies. They are not your enemy. Your enemy, right now, is the white racist pigs who support this corrupt system... WE HAVE NO QUARREL WITH THE HIPPIES. LEAVE THEM ALONE. Or – THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY will deal with you"^{xiv} (Anon. 1968b, 10). The Hippies' connection to the Panthers would continue. In 1968, Black Panther Bobby Seale was arrested with Yippies in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial; in 1970 the Hippie LSD group The Brotherhood of Eternal Love hired the Weather Underground to break Timothy Leary out of prison, and the Weathermen handed Leary off to the Black Panthers in Algeria (Connors 2010, 237-238).

During the formation of the Hippies, Malcolm X was assassinated on February 21, 1965, which was important because the Hippies had an affinity for Malcolm X as an opposition to capitalistic cultural hegemony. Timothy Miller writes, “Although the hippies were mainly white... they were cultural outsiders, renegades who deviated from the American Way of Life. Black Radicals (Malcolm X, W.E.B. duBois) were countercultural heroes because they refused to compromise with the white and prosperous Establishment” (Miller 1991, 6). As “renegades who deviated from the American Way of Life,” many members of the counterculture came from privileged middle-class backgrounds. Most threw off these trappings to live in a state of near poverty, attempting to live outside the capitalistic society in which they were born. At the same time, Hippies tended to be primarily male-lead and patriarchal, which would lead to a schism with the Women’s Movement. Many women left the Hippie movement throughout the 1970s (Miller 1991, 16).

When it came to the Hippie’s style, their clothing, hairstyle, and overall look were in direct opposition to so-called “straight” society. Their clothing, like many of their religious beliefs, was influenced by Pan Asian design and philosophy, with some influence of western culture. For instance, many of the beads and shirts, such as tie-dye, worn by the Hippies had a Hindu design, while cowboy boots, jeans, jean jackets, and leather vests showed American influence. Hippies, including men, tended to wear their hair long, which was an annoyance to the older generation who believed men should have short hair. Beards were also commonplace among the men, but not the nicely trimmed beards of the so-called Silent Generation. Hippie beards were frequently wilder and freer, much like their hair and lifestyle. Clothing and accessories influenced by psychedelics, like tie-dye t-shirts, and by rock stars, like John Lennon glasses, were also favored. Women wore love beads and pants like jeans and bell-bottoms, rather

than fitted skirts and dresses. In general, they gravitated to clothing that was loose and flowing (Miles 2004, 91).

When it came to their slang Hippies created terminology of their own. They were responsible for adding new terms to the English lexicon. For instance, borrowing the term “groove” from Beatniks, the Hippies coined the idiom “groovy.” Other phrases originated on counterculture shows like *Rowan & Martin’s Laugh-In* (1968-1973), such as “bet your sweet bippy” and “sock it to me.”^{xv} Other phrases bloomed from the counterculture, including Timothy Leary’s “turn on, tune in, drop out” and the Diggers’ “do your own thing.” Anti-war signs and chants became slogans like “Hey-Hey LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?” and “make love, not war.” A phrase associated with Hippies in the summer of 1968 in Chicago was “the whole world is watching” (Moretta 2017, 16).

The Hippies’ political beliefs tended to be left leaning. They were more leftist than liberals of the day like Lyndon Johnson, although many Hippies did not take part in political action. Groups within the Hippie community like the Diggers, the Yippies, and those involved in the New Left were more politically active than the average Hippie who wanted to escape the confines of society. The Yippies, or Youth International Party, was a sub-group of the Hippies involved in direct political action, participating in stunts such as nominating a pig named Pigasus for president. Yippie leaders, including Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman were arrested and tried in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial after the demonstrations at the 1968 Democratic Convention. Hippies were pro-dope, pro-civil rights, and lived lives that tried to throw off the shackles of capitalism. While many Hippies were in favor of women’s rights, the movement was still largely patriarchal.

The most common political cause for the Hippies, besides dope, was their extremely anti-Vietnam War stance. They viewed the Vietnam War and war in general as wrong. Perhaps the most famous of anti-war protests occurred at the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, which singer and Yippie Phil Ochs would claim to be the place where America, or at least the concept of it, died (“William Butler Yeats Visits Lincoln Park and Escapes Unscathed” 1991). A handful of Hippies, such as the Weather Underground, became radicalized by the early 1970s and would break from the Hippie ideal of peaceful protest. However, non-violent demonstrations were the main way Hippies protested. Taking pages from the books of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi, Hippies generally protested peacefully and in a lawful manner. Their manners were not always civil during these protests, often performing chants, holding up signs, and wearing buttons and other ephemera that some in the older generations saw as inflammatory. Chants, signs, buttons, and ephemera included the phrases “killing for peace is like fucking for virginity” and “where’s [Lee Harvey] Oswald now that we need him” (“Hippie Button Collection” 1964-1976). A generational divide and oppositional viewpoints often led to skirmishes between police and Hippies. Their protests were often called riots, an inaccurate term, since the police were more often on the violent side of the protests.

While Hippies held strong ideological beliefs and many protested, the New Left was the group that handled most of the actual protesting work. Christopher Gair writes, “the hippie community saw politics as a ‘drag’ while those in the movement appeared to be both fascinated and appalled by the activities of the Diggers, Yippies and other groups who utilised performance and spectacle to draw attention to their demands” (Gair 2007, 8). Led by Tom Hayden and the Students for a Democratic Society, the New Left was more directly involved in political action following their Port Huron Statement of 1962. Also, around this time, similar left-wing political

action groups began to appear. During the 1964-1965 academic year, the Free Speech Movement began protesting and working for students' rights to academic freedoms (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 176). Throughout the 1960s, many more groups like the Diggers and the Yippies began popping up as social, political action groups often tied to and occasionally spun off from the Hippies. Both the Diggers and the Yippies owe part of their roots and success to the larger Hippie movement, but it should be noted that without political action groups like the SDS, little political progress would have been made against what known as "The Establishment."

When Hippies first began emerging as a counterculture in 1964 and 1965, they took their style from a variety of sources. Style, in the way Dick Hebdige defines it, can go beyond simple interruptions of the "mainstream" by the counterculture and does not merely refer to clothing, but also to how a subculture wears their hair, the drugs they take, and how they express themselves. Style can refer to how groups express themselves sexually, which in the case of Hippies often occurred in a performative, polyamorous way.

Understanding Hippie views on sex and drugs is crucial as most of their filmic depictions, positive or negative, focused on these aspects of Hippie life. Besides opposition to the Vietnam War, two of the more central Hippie perspectives are their views of sex and drugs, both of which many Hippies shared freely. Sexually, Hippies were as open to one another as their approach to dope, which was "good" drugs (Miller 1991, 25). Miller writes, "Hippies were among the first to occupy turf of sexual liberation" (55). Like their relationship with dope, the Hippies mantra grew to be "If it feels good, do it." This idea was included with ideas of consent as well, however. Just because one could feel good doing something did not imply that they could push their sexuality or drug usage on another without consent. That would go against many Hippie principles. Leary often spoke of the importance of consent in both dope and sex. Leary

said, “the number one commandment in our religion: Nobody has a right to change my consciousness, I have no right to change your consciousness” (Leary 1968). While their performance of polyamory could be regressive in some ways, being largely patriarchal, by no means did that mean that their sexual practices were not also progressive and responsive to one another’s wants and needs.

Many of the Hippies, particularly those in the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco, and particularly during the Summer of Love in 1967, began to practice Free Love and polyamory.^{xvi} They believed that, while marriage absolutely could happily occur, a marriage contract was irrelevant to the need and enjoyment of sex (Moretta 2017, 181). In the age of sexual revolution, the Hippies were often seen as the public face of sex and Free Love, so much so that one of the nicknames applied to young adults of that time was “the Free Love Generation.” Hippies’ sex could be very performative, used in protests where they appealed to “make love, not war.” Miller writes the “hip spirit of liberated sex was one of spontaneity, not sex with as many partners as possible” (1991, 66). Sex could be outdoors and in public and did not need to be confined behind locked doors (Miller 1991, 65-66). However, due to shaming and a stronger desire for a life away from what many Hippies viewed as the corrupt society of American culture, many went on to practice their sexual and spiritual beliefs away from the world in communes (Miller 1991, 87). However, while many Hippies left cities behind for communal living and communal relationships, many stayed in major cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York to keep up the battle for progressive policies, both political and sexual.

Hippies often had mixed feelings about gay relationships. On the one hand, “Hip tolerance of sexual activity contributed to the atmosphere in which the gay revolution could

emerge” (Miller 1991, 57). Additionally, Miller sees five major arguments about queerness and homosexuality in the underground press, including “Homosexuality is natural and good ... A person has the right to free sexual choice ... One should not have to hide his or her sexual preferences ... All private acts between consenting adults should be legal ... Social discrimination against homosexuals should end” (57-58). This openness towards the gay community is related to Hippies’ belief in polyamorous relationships. However, Christopher Gair writes, “Both the SDS and the counterculture... tended to be overtly sexist in their replication of gender roles, and the latter, in particular, was overwhelmingly homophobic” (Gair 2007, 9). This discrepancy about Hippie views reveals that Hippie beliefs were not monolithic. In addition, Miller’s research reflects underground press sources while Gair’s synthesizes observations about patterns of behavior.

The patriarchal beliefs of men in the Hippie movement are part of what led many women to leave the movement and join the women’s movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. While Hippie sex at the forefront of the sexual revolution, it was by no means entirely progressive. Writings in the underground press note that while the idea of a more open and fluid sexuality was something to be lauded, most of the pleasure was centered around male pleasure. Vivian Estellachild writes at the time, “The talk of love is profuse, but the quality of relationships is otherwise ... The idea of sexual liberation of the woman means she is not so much free to fuck as get fucked over” (1970, 40-41). In 1970, when a group of radical feminists took over the New York *Rat*, leader Robin Morgan wrote a manifesto piece published in the new version of that underground press entitled, “Goodbye to All That” (Miller 1991, 68). Morgan writes, “Goodbye to Hip Culture and the so-called Sexual Revolution, which has functioned toward women’s freedom as did the Reconstruction toward former slaves – reinstated oppression by another

name” (1970, 6-23). Radical feminist groups such as SCUM, the Society for Cutting Up Men, and WITCH, Women’s International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell, began to promote the idea that women did not need to comply with compulsory heterosexuality. For example, Peggy Persephone and Robin of Arc write, “Maybe after the revolution, people will be able to love each other regardless of skin color, ethnic origin, occupation, or type of genitals” (1968, 15-28). Many women in the Hippie movement began to move to the women’s movement due to their progressive beliefs. The criticisms by feminists were fundamental to the continuation of both the women’s movement and the sexual revolution.

Hippies also used dope actively and Hip ethics promoted its use. Miller writes, “Dope was good; drugs, on the other hand, included both good and bad substances... Substances that were perceived as expanding consciousness were good; things that made the user dumb were bad. But each individual made his or her own choices. There was no universally accepted line dividing between the two categories” (1991, 25). A majority of Hippies were in favor of the legalization of several drugs, most notably marijuana, though some wanted them to stay illegal to keep their revolutionary status. Stephen Gaskin, who ran one of the preeminent Hippie communes, The Farm, said, “We believe that if a vegetable [marijuana] and an animal [people] want to get together and come be heavier together than either one of them alone, it shouldn’t be anybody else’s business” (1974, 57). Some feared the capitalistic practices that could be fed by the legalization of marijuana (Miller 1991, 31).

There was also a touch of religion in taking drugs, and religious aspects surrounded self-styled philosophers like Timothy Leary. While the various Hippie religion practices that cropped up around this time incorporated eastern and Native American religious values and rituals, Hip religions generally involved the use of drugs like marijuana and peyote. Drug use was, of course,

not the focus of Native American religions, but a small aspect of certain tribes' beliefs about getting in touch with nature and one's traditions. Major religious Hippie drug groups included Leary's League for Spiritual Discovery, Chief Boo-Hoo's Neo-American Church, John Aiken's more conservative Church of Awakening, and many smaller factions throughout the country. Most of their beliefs focused on drugs as a religious sacrament used to expand psychedelic consciousness (Miller 1991, 31-34).

There were many reasons Hippies used dope as a way to expand one's mind or cope with what was seen as wickedness in American culture (34). Ram Dass explained, "Drugs break patterns, that's all they do. When patterns are broken, new worlds can emerge" (Kupferberg 1967, 4-10). Other Hippies saw dope as a way of communing with nature. Still others saw it as a way to increase interpersonal relationships, including the idea that dope like LSD led to better sex (Miller 1991, 40-41). Many Hippies viewed dope as fun and harmless. Miller writes that the counterculture believed "it was not dangerous to normal people – or at least not more dangerous than the drugs which society was generally infatuated, such as nicotine, alcohol, amphetamines, barbiturates, and so forth" (42-43). A Hip belief about dope such as marijuana was later proved to be accurate; namely, its medicinal aspects could be used to treat illnesses such as glaucoma and pain caused by cancer treatments. Drugs were also popular among the Hippies because of their belief that drugs caused an upturn in creativity. It was true that many Hippie icons from actors like Dennis Hopper and Jack Nicholson to musicians like Jimi Hendrix and Janis Joplin to artists like the Brotherhood of Light and the Art Farm, all famously used drugs. Allen Ginsberg said of his work, "Drugs were useful for exploring perception, sense perception, and exploring different possibilities and modes of consciousness... and useful for composing, sometimes, while under the influence. Part II of 'Howl' was written under the influence of peyote" (Lipton 1968).

A minority of Hippies opposed drugs. Some thought the high one achieved through psychedelics should be achieved through one's own state of mind, through mantras and Eastern religious enlightenment. David Crosby would later say of Ravi Shankar that he could be high even without using drugs, which was the ideal. More politically active Hippies and those on the New Left opposed drugs because they were both a product of capitalism and could distract one from rebellion and revolution (Miller 1991, 49).

Music was also vital in shaping Hip ethos and featured prominently in identifications with the counterculture both on and off-screen. The primary forms were folk, rock, folk-rock, and psychedelic rock. Each had its appeal for Hippies. Folk music has been used for protest throughout the twentieth century. From people like Joe Hill to Lead Belly and Woody Guthrie to Pete Seeger, people in the United States have used folk as a progressive way of speaking out against injustices. When the 1960s arrived, Joe Hill and Lead Belly were dead, Guthrie was dying, and Seeger existed on the blacklist, while still trying to make a difference. Throughout the early 1960s, the United States went through a folk music revival. While many groups like The Kingston Trio and The Limelickers tried to remain politically neutral to appeal to the broadest audience, others like Bob Dylan, Joan Baez, The Chad Mitchell Trio, Tom Paxton, Phil Ochs, and Woody's son Arlo Guthrie began to write and sing political folk music. The Hippies embraced their style of music and would build on it.

Rock n' roll was more important to the counterculture than any other style of music, though because many Hippies had a background in folk music, that would include folk-rock as a style of music. About this shift, Miller writes, "Folk was the music of cultural rebellion until around 1966 or even later, when the Beatles began to take on mythic significance as interpreters of culture, new specifically hip rock bands (The Grateful Dead, for example) began to appear,

and Bob Dylan incorporated rock into his previously folkish music” (1991, 73-74). Rock soon was as crucial to the Hippies as sex or dope. Rock was fun and served as a form of shared cultural language, as well as a source of protest. Folk-rock groups like Buffalo Springfield, The Byrds, and Crosby, Stills, Nash, and Young would write relatable easy-rock songs, while more psychedelic bands like Big Brother and the Holding Company, Jefferson Airplane, The Doors, and The Jimi Hendrix Experience offered fast-paced and politically revolutionary music. Rock festivals and concerts became sources of salvation for the Hippies, serving as almost a religious site. If sex was a way of sharing fellowship, and dope was sacramental wine, then festivals like the Human Be-In, Monterey Pop, and Woodstock would serve as church. Even though a lot went wrong at Woodstock, as will be discussed, it is still seen as a success for Hippies. *Rolling Stone* reporter Andrew Kopkind would write, “Woodstock must always be our model of how good we all feel after the revolution” (1969). Many more identifying traits of Hip lifestyle and ethics emerged and shifted as the 1960s continued.

It is possible to see how certain cultural events and developments contributed to the emergence of the Hippie movement and the identifiable aspects of Hippie ideology and style. By comparison, while the counterculture was on the rise, filmic depictions of youth groups such as teens, Beats, and various left-leaning groups portrayed teens and the counterculture as needing to grow up or as dangerous. Films with characters would not make their appearance until the end of 1966 but studying films from a few years earlier clarifies how the Hippie cycle began by showing the connections that link teen and Beat films to Hippie films. Patterns in filmic representations of teens and other youth groups emerge, and they are replicated in Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films, which present young people as dangerous, often more even pervasively than in Teensploitation and teen films.

The Decline of Teensploitation

Mainstream teen movies and Teensploitation would eventually give rise to Hippie films and Hippiesploitation, which is why analyzing their patterns and character portrayals is so vital. Though the teen film phenomenon would continue into 1967, its decline became visible in 1964. Just a year after *Beach Party* (Asher 1963) gave rise to teen beach movies, 20th Century Fox moved into the exploitation field, distributing the Teensploitation monster movie *The Horror of Party Beach*.^{xvii}

The Horror of Party Beach is about Hank, played by John Scott in his only film credit. Hank attends a beach party when nuclear waste is spilled over the side of a boat. It lands on the skeletonized corpses of a fishing boat crew that had sunk a few weeks earlier. The waste somehow mixes with the human skeletons and fish around it to make hideous fish-man-monsters who attack and brutally murder the beach-going teens. While this is happening, scientist Dr. Gavin, played by Allan Laurel in his only film credit, tries to find a way to destroy the monsters. The characters finally destroy the monsters using pure sodium.^{xviii} Exploitation director Tim Sullivan said, “You have this regular teen beach movie... and then, on the other hand, you have all these kids getting mutilated in really violent ways for the time. It’s almost like if Herschell Gordon Lewis did a black and white teen beach movie” (Johnson 2018). *Blood Feast* (Lewis 1963) had come out a year before and while that film took violence to an extreme and was in color, as opposed to *The Horror of Party Beach* black and white palette, the films are similar in the sensational violence portrayed.

The Horror of Party Beach is indicative of Teensploitation’s waning power, in part because the narrative ignores the real-world challenges people need to face. The film discloses problems inherent in the teen film cycle, the beach movie, and Teensploitation monster sub-

cycles. As Cynthia Miller and A. Bowdoin Van Riper point out, many teens of the era were seeing the need to grow up. Yet the mainstream teen films and Teensploitation films largely ignored the often grim realities of the growing teens. Though Teensploitation films would continue for another three years or so, teen films in general did not address issues that teens were facing. The whole cycle was stagnating; for example, despite having different plots, there is little discernable difference between *Beach Party* and *How to Stuff a Wild Bikini* (Asher 1965) released two years later. *The Horror of Party Beach* is indicative of the stagnation of the Teensploitation cycle, as it stacks gimmicks upon gimmicks. It is not just a teen movie, but a teen-beach movie. And it is not simply a teen beach movie, but a teen-beach-monster movie. Rather than trying to make a film that was new, unique, or which actually addressed teen issues, the filmmakers decided to combine more cycles that had previously worked. The film does not adequately reflect the time in which it was made by not addressing any major teen issues besides the standard maturing angle which was popular in teen movies.

During this time, many cultural problems became more apparent to teenagers, who were quickly growing up in a world fraught with dangers, including the Cold War and the Vietnam War. Miller and Van Riper write, “The years 1964–65, the peak period of the monster-rock cluster, also saw the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the first large-scale antiwar protests, the assassination of Malcolm X, and race riots... American youths’ growing awareness of and engagement in an increasingly turbulent world... engendered a serious outlook at odds with cinematic tales of hot rods and beach parties” (2015, 140). In the world of Teensploitation, these issues did not exist, and they were not featured until counterculture movies began to appear in 1966 with the release of the Hells Angels biker film, *The Wild Angels* (Corman). Stephen King

describes producers' disinterest in social problems in his 1981 book on the horror genre, *Danse Macabre*:

The producers of *The Horror of Party Beach* never sat down, I'm sure (just as I'm sure the producers of *The China Syndrome* did), and said to each other: "Look—we're going to warn the people of America about the dangers of nuclear reactors, and we will sugar-coat the pill of this vital message with an entertaining story line." No, the line of discussion would have been more apt to go like this: Because our target audience is young, we'll feature young people, and because our target audience is interested in sex, we'll set it on a sun-and-surf-type beach, which allows us to show all the flesh the censors will allow. And because our target audience likes grue,^{xix} we'll give them these gross monsters. It must have looked like boffo box-office stuff: a hybrid of AIP's most consistently lucrative genre pictures – the monster movie and the beach-party movie. (King 1981, 156)

A lack of social awareness is perhaps the biggest limitation of the Teensploitation genre, a problem that would carry over into Hippiesploitation films with stereotypical representations of the movement. *The Horror of Party Beach* is marked by its blithe indifference to social realities, choosing instead to add gimmick upon gimmick. It was not just a teen movie, but a beach movie and a monster movie and a musical and briefly a biker film.

The Horror of Party Beach was released on a double bill with *The Curse of the Living Corpse* (Tenney 1964), which was also directed by Del Tenney. The film had a "fright release," much like the earlier films of William Castle that patrons would sign before entering the theatre to indemnify the management in case the viewer died of fright while watching the movie (Twentieth Century Fox 1964, [1]).^{xx} This was all ballyhoo as neither *The Horror of Party*

Beach nor *The Curse of the Living Corpse* were sufficiently frightening to elicit anything more than a gasp or a titter from the audience. The primary marketing angle focused on the false claim that the film was the “first horror monster musical.” The film did well at the box office. The night the film debuted at a drive-in, it beat out mainstream competition films like *Move Over, Darling* (Gordon 1963) and *PT 109* (Martinson 1963). There were several tie-ins to the film (Griffith 2017). One was a proposed but, as far as I can tell, unreleased album to the film, which featured Del-Aires’ non-hits like “You Are Not a Summer Love” and “The Zombie Stomp.” These songs were released online and as singles years later. The film was the subject of a photobook magazine published by the popular sci-fi/horror fanzine *Famous Monsters of Filmland*, which called itself “A new kind of magazine! All about teenage romance, mystery and excitement!” (Wood and Jones 1964). Stephen King perhaps best summed up *The Horror of Party Beach*’s place as a teensploitation movie and a monster movie, calling the film “an abysmal little wet fart of a picture” (1981, 155). The film is indicative of the fact that Teensploitation was winding down as a cycle and needed extra gimmicks heaped upon it to have any box-office success.

Teensploitation would be lambasted in the 1966 mainstream film *Lord Love a Duck*, which was a black comedy and parody of teen films. *Lord Love a Duck* itself is only tangentially a mainstream teen film. Director George Axelrod made the film not to compete with the Teensploitation and mainstream teen films of the day, but to illustrate how the cycle was stagnating. The film is about Alan “Mollymauk” Musgrave, a high school senior played by a 37-year-old Roddy McDowell, and his bizarre Svengali-like association with Barbara Anne Greene, played by Tuesday Weld. Throughout the film, Barbara Anne desires things such as cashmere sweaters, a relationship with a handsome man, and a role in an upcoming beach movie. Using his

superior intelligence and hypnotic skills, Mollymauk provides all of these things to her. If read as a critique of the Baby Boomers at the time, the film depicts the selfishness of young Boomers. The film also presents an odd examination of sex between the swinging Boomer and the more uptight Silent Generation. One of the more awkward scenes in the film, the infamous sweater scene, explores the topic of sex between the generations. Barbara Anne tries to persuade her father to buy her twelve cashmere sweaters so she can join a club on campus. The scene comes off as less of a guilt trip and more of a younger woman seducing an older man, which is problematic since the older man is her father. She seductively calls out sweater names like “Grape Yum-Yum,” “Papaya Surprise,” and “Periwinkle Pussycat” as they both make lecherous sex noises and faces. Rather than show the younger generation breaking down the sexual barriers of the older generation, the scene comes off as incestuous. In the documentary *American Grindhouse* (Drenner 2010), film historian Kim Morgan refers to the scene in a discussion of Teensploitation movies and jokingly refers to it as a “masterpiece.” However, the documentary does not indicate that *Lord Love a Duck* is not a Teensploitation film, but a critique of the cycle.

As Morgan’s comment implies, *Lord Love a Duck* is far from a masterpiece, though it does capture the absurdity of the Teensploitation cycle at the time. The film is marketed as a dark teen comedy. Several scenes become exceedingly dark for a teen film, such as the scene where Barbara Anne’s mother drinks herself to death. The scene was odd because, according to the announcer for a promo piece, the film was “a cross between *Love Finds Andy Hardy* (Seitz 1938) and *Dr. Strangelove* (Kubrick 1964)” (Anon. 1968a). There are several scenes in the film that critique beach movies and beach culture. Mollymauk and Barbara Anne arrive at a beach party and proceed to save the life of a beach party movie director. He is trying to decide on a name for his next beach film before the script is in its final stages, with one being *I Married a Teenage*

Bikini Vampire, a title that mocks most of the sub-cycles of Teensploitation. After his life is saved, the director picks Barbara Anne for his next leading lady, with some prodding by Mollymauk, who has enjoyed his other works, *The Thing That Ate Bikini Beach* and *Cold War Bikini*. After a bizarre series of events, including Mollymauk murdering Barbara Anne's eventual husband and most of the faculty at his high school, Barbara Anne is cast in her first teen movie, *Bikini Widow*. The film critiques the entire beach party sub-cycle of films with which American International Pictures was most successful. It also criticizes how the beach party cycle was starting to add more gimmicks to their stories, as evidenced by *The Horror of Party Beach*. By adding a monster, the film was not saying anything new about the cycle. It was just adding a gimmick to the film. This phenomenon also showed up in the Universal monster series, where filmmakers eventually added new creatures to every film, rather than innovating new stories. One of the main critiques of society *Lord Love a Duck* does well is the commentary of how stagnate the beach party sub-cycle had become. That being said, like other teen films, *Lord Love a Duck* also does not address issues of teens, nor of the growing counterculture.

An issue with *Lord Love a Duck* is that it provides an overabundance of criticisms, so much so that each critique is watered down by moving from one topic to the next. It also focuses on characters who are largely unlikeable and unrelatable, which also adds to the confusion on how the film is making fun of certain topics. The film's marketing seems to back up the idea of critiquing multiple subjects, using as one tagline, "This motion picture is against teenagers... their parents... beach movies... cars... schools... and several hundred other things. It's about a guy living in this insane world who suddenly goes stark, raving sane and commits a mass murder. It's a comedy" (United Artists 1966, [1]). The film also uses distributor-produced advertising in its pressbook, including promoting the film as George Axelrod's first as a director.

Another distributor-produced article discusses Roddy McDowell and Tuesday Weld playing teenagers. The pressbook highlights that Weld was 22 and no longer a teenager at the time of the film but makes no mention that 37-year-old Roddy McDowell plays a teenager. Its ballyhoo includes ideas about promoting the record with the title song and holding a dance contest for a new dance called “the Duck,” a dance that has no significance in the film. Another bit of ballyhoo suggests having “pretty girls in ‘duck’ costumes tour the streets as walking ballys and carry[ing] signs reading: **1965 Was the Year of the Pussycat! 1966 IS THE YEAR OF THE DUCK!**”^{xxi} (United Artists 1966, [10]). At no point in the film does anyone dress as a duck, nor are any ducks given any prominence in the film. Though *Lord Love a Duck* denounces the beach and teen movies, its ballyhoo promotion calls for riding the wave of beach movies, including contests at the beach such as “bathing beauty contest, bathing suit fashion parade, prize awards for the best couple performing ‘The Duck,’ (a new dance ‘inspired by the picture’) etc., while a hot combo gives out with Neal Hefti’s title song from the picture!” (United Artists 1966, [11]). All this advertising seems to indicate that, even though Teensploitation was on its way out, as the last AIP teen movie would be released the following year, even movies that were trying to parody the cycle followed the Teensploitation marketing model. However, the films were reaching fewer teen audiences, who wanted more originality but were presented with older stars and silly films like *Dr. Goldfoot and the Bikini Machine* (Taurog 1965). Exploitation filmmaker Fred Olan Ray says,

I’m not sure how many people went to see the *Beach Party* movies because when I was a kid, we thought they were square. I think they were aimed at adults. Because Sam Arkoff was the guy. Sam said, ‘no, no, it’s a teenage market. We don’t need money in these old, tired stars.’ Well, you get Buster Keaton. All of a sudden, the *Beach Party* movies, they

were supposed to be aimed at kids, they started bringing silent film stars out of retirement. Please! What kid would go see that? But my father might! (Drenner 2010)

Because of a lack of originality or anything new to say, the beach movie cycle ended by 1967, with the Teensploitation cycle following soon after. That year, AIP would produce its last beach movie, *Thunder Alley* (Rush 1967), with Fabian and Annette Funicello. Yet a different kind of youth-oriented film was starting to appear as early as 1964. These films addressed the interests of the rising counterculture, and several of them had a more profound message. By 1967, the first Hippy films and Hippiesploitation movies began to appear, but even before that, the counterculture was slowly seeping into filmic representations.

The Rise of Counterculture at the Movies

Countercultural messages appeared in films throughout the 1960s, but perhaps the first film to indicate the rise of the Woodstock Generation was Stanley Kubrick's *Dr. Strangelove, Or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. Coming on the tail of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the film treats the thought of impending nuclear annihilation with the same irreverent humor and lack of respect for authority that would become a mainstay of Hippy life. While Kubrick might not have foreseen the emergence of the Hippies movement, counterculture figures in the early 1960s were already questioning authority, which makes this film prescient of things to come. *Dr. Strangelove* is one of the few films to address genuine concerns of the era in a frank and intelligent way. Because the film openly discusses topical issues, it stands the test of time as not only one of Kubrick's best films, but of one of the best films of all-time.

The film is about General Jack D. Ripper, played by Sterling Hayden, who orders a nuclear strike on the USSR, unknown to U.S. President Merkin Muffley, played in one of three roles by Peter Sellers. Ripper's reason for doing this is three-fold: he has gone insane, which

prompts his desire to protect the “precious bodily fluids” of the American people against Communist fluoridation of water. Third, as Ripper puts to Lt. Mandrake (Peter Sellers), loosely cites former French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau: “war [is] too important to be left to the generals. When [Clemenceau] said that, 50 years ago, he might have been right. But today, war is too important to be left to politicians.” Revising the statement to say that war is too important to be left up to anyone but the people, it sums up Hippiess’ belief about the Vietnam War.

While Ripper is barricaded on his military base, in the War Room, President Muffley, along with General Buck Turgison, played by George C. Scott, attempt to call off the planes before war occurs. They manage to stop all but one, piloted by Major Kong, portrayed by Slim Pickens, that will reach its target and drop the bomb, setting off the Russian “Doomsday Device,” which will end the world. A solution is proposed by the former Nazi Dr. Strangelove, the last of Sellers’ three roles. Strangelove proposes that the members of the War Room and others go live in a mine shaft for one hundred years. The women will outnumber the men ten-to-one, so as to keep up the population. The movie ends with bombs going off around the world to the tune of “We’ll Meet Again.”

The film was initially scheduled to be shown to the press on November 22, 1963, but when President Kennedy was assassinated, Kubrick pushed back the release and altered a line of dialogue by Major Kong. Listing military supplies for making their way on foot back to friendly territory after dropping the bomb, Kong initially stated, “Shoot, a fella could have a pretty good weekend in Dallas with that stuff.” The city name “Dallas” was replaced with “Vegas” before the film’s release to avoid any association with Kennedy’s assassination in Dallas.

Discussing *Dr. Strangelove*’s relationship to the counterculture, Rick Worland explains, “its success indicated a larger trend – a stylistically innovative Hollywood movie in which the

basic American social and political system appears deeply flawed, with authorities and social institutions of all kinds befuddled, oppressive, corrupt, or even insane. This was the shape of the future” (Worland 2018, 125). The film exposes the failings of “The Establishment,” as the SDS called them, which the Hippies, the New Left, and their allies would be railing against in the coming years. The film dark comedic carried an allegorical message about Cold War paranoia, which perhaps America’s escalating involvement in the Vietnam War. Cynthia Baron writes, “*Dr. Strangelove*... might have been one of the factors that led to collective action against the Vietnam War, a more narrowly defined and thus less formidable problem than mutually assured destruction in the atomic age” (2012, 135). It is not clear how the burgeoning Hippie population interpreted the film, but the countercultural allegory was there for audiences to consider.

The film was not a box office success, but it was a critical success, earning four Academy Award nominations for Best Picture, Best Director, Best Writing, and Best Actor for Peter Sellers. Sellers would become a counterculture figure as the 1960s wore on. Baron writes, “with his counterculture credentials established by the anarchical humor of ‘The Goon Show,’ Sellers was prized by Hollywood because he appealed to hip American audiences that had grown tired of films designed to satisfy established ‘pressure groups of the United States’ like the Catholic Church” (2012, 118-119). Sellers was painted as a counterculture actor and would go on to star in several films with a Hip message, including the Hippie film *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas!* (Averback 1968). Baron argues, “Sellers’s instant stardom makes sense in the light of this cultural moment... it gave [the American audience] the feeling that they were breaking with conformity at the same that it satisfied their desire for sophisticated consumer objects” (2012, 133). In other words, Sellers’s image allowed a counterculture audience to enjoy his work while still being paying to go see his films as consumers.

Roger Corman is another figure who contributed to counterculture films in the 1960s, because he was one of the few exploitation filmmakers to present youth movements in a positive light. Throughout the mid-to-late 1960s, Corman was sympathetic to the counterculture. His 1962 film *The Intruder* communicates a strong pro-civil rights message. In 1966, Corman directed the first of what Nick Heffernan calls his “counterculture trilogy,” *The Wild Angels*. In this film, Corman gives voice to the Hell’s Angels, a counterculture group maligned in the press. Much like his later Hippie films *The Trip* (1967) and *Gass-s-s* (1970), *The Wild Angels* presents the Hells Angels’ lifestyle and values in a frank and open manner. Corman explains, “For certain stories, you have to go where the action is, as the saying goes. And you have to take people with you who understand what you’re going after” (American International 1966, [4]). In this case, the other people were the Hells Angels and the film’s counterculture actors Peter Fonda and Bruce Dern, who would both later appear in Hippie films and be integrally linked with the Woodstock Nation. Corman is also relevant as he made a movie that was actually topical, authentic, and addressed an actual youth movement in a balanced film.

The Wild Angels articulates a Hippie mantra, as Peter Fonda’s character Heavenly Blues exclaims, “We wanna be free! We wanna be free to do what we wanna do... And we wanna get loaded. And we wanna have a good time. And that’s what we are gonna do. We are gonna have a good time... We are gonna have a party” (Corman 1966). The pressbook for *The Wild Angels* made use of ballyhoo, as would most of Corman’s films, but several marketing schemes involve working with rather than avoiding motorcycle clubs, even fear of their dangerousness was also part of the marketing. One tagline for the film reads, “Their credo is violence... Their God is hate... The most terrifying film of our time!” (American International 1966, [7]). While the film gives the Hells Angels’ side of the story, Corman does not elide the problematic nature of their

group, including the violence associated with their valorization of Nazi symbolism, which was endemic of biker films of the era.^{xxiii} It paints a fairly even-handed look at the Angels, just as *The Trip* would attempt to do concerning LSD. By doing so, Corman acknowledges the counterculture and topical youth movements, which made the film relatable.

The Hippies began to receive national media attention late in 1966, so much so that by December, *Hallucination Generation*, the first film to reference the Hip counterculture debuted. The film is a mix between a Beatnik and a Hippiesploitation film, as the characters are called Beatniks, but the characterizations feature traits more commonly associated with Hippies, including LSD usage, longer hair, an affinity for San Francisco, and a character who very much resembles Timothy Leary. The film is one of the earliest to reference both LSD and the growing Hippie counterculture. *Hallucination Generation* is a drug scare film recalling earlier movies like *Reefer Madness* (Gasnief 1936), *Marihuana* (Esper 1936), or *The Cocaine Fiends* (Parker and O'Connor 1935). However, instead of creating moral panic over cocaine or marijuana use, its subject is LSD and the dangers of the counterculture.

The film is an example of how Hippies were presented in a bad light throughout the Hippiesploitation cycle. Like *Riot on Sunset Strip*, it fosters fear of Hippie drugs and the Hippie counterculture as a whole. *Hallucination Generation* opens with the title crawl, "In the middle of the nineteen-sixties, while billions were being spent to send a manned capsule into space, many people discovered for very little money another type of capsule could be bought that would take them equally far out, although these often turned out to be one way trips" (Mann 1966). The story is about two young American Hippies, Denny and Bill, living in Spain. To make money, they meet up with Eric, a figure reminiscent of Timothy Leary, who promotes LSD and other drugs like marijuana. Like Leary, Eric enjoys a cult of personality. Unlike Leary, this cult of

personality is more sinister, and Eric is a drug pusher who doses people unknowingly. (As noted earlier, both Leary and Kesey were against giving dope to people who were not ready for it and they were vehemently opposed to dosing people unknowingly.) The film is the first of several Hippiesploitation films that would have dastardly Leary-like figures.

The film is also dismissive of young people, much like certain Beatnik films that presented that subculture as lazy and associated with crimes worse than drug use and peddling. The film's negative characterization of Hippies is lifted directly from earlier teen and Beatnik movies, which portrayed their countercultural groups as violent criminals. For example, late in the film, while high on LSD, Denny and Bill commit a violent murder during a robbery. In addition, Denny and Bill are essentially interchangeable characters who do not allow for audience identification or sympathy for characters who are supposed to be representing the Hippie movement. Because no deference to the Hippies exists within the film, it gives a one-sided portrayal of the counterculture. Unlike Corman's example of *The Wild Angels*, *Hallucination Generation* continues the morality of juvenile delinquent teen movies, suggesting the kids need to grow up. Those who cannot grow up, like Denny and Bill, are the same type of irredeemable characters who are offered up as a societal example of what is wrong with the youths, in this case those involved in the counterculture.

Still, *Hallucination Generation* sometimes presents Hippies in ways they would identify with. At one point, Eric describes Hippies saying, "Everything everybody else believes in, they don't" (Mann 1966). While this is a reasonably accurate description of how Hippies would try to distance themselves from mainstream American life, most of the film's characterizations of the counterculture are negative stereotypes. For example, Eric also says of the Hippies in the film, "they're the next generation and what they represent is nothing. They don't believe the world

they happen to live in, but they're going to put an end to it... call it passive resistance to life" (Mann 1966). While "passive resistance to life" might describe Hippie values, to say the young people "represent nothing" is completely dismissive. The quote presents the notion that Hippies were nihilistic, which is far from the truth. If anything, the early counterculture was idealistic. By the end of the film, Bill has gone to a monastery to confess his sins. The monastery brothers, breaking the seal of confession, call the police on him. In response, Bill says, "I'm not going anywhere, and neither are they" (Mann 1966), as it shows images of Denny and the other Hippie-like youths in the film. The line's double meaning, that Bill will passively turn himself into the police and that Hippies are going nowhere, once again frames Hippies as worthless people, likely headed for prison. The ending completely dismisses any possibility that Hippies potentially had something new to say and share with the world.

The depiction of taking acid in *Hallucination Generation* shows how Hippiesploitation films often presented drug scenes and Hippie's interest in drugs. The film is in black-and-white except for the acid trip scene, which is in bright, vibrant, albeit frightening colors. Eric also breaks the fourth wall when talking to Bill while on acid, implying the audience is taking the bad trip with Bill. LSD is tied to bad trips in most Hippie and Hippiesploitation films that feature drug use. Rarely do they show acid in a positive light. For example, Bill takes LSD for the first time at a pot party. His psychedelic visions are shown in a somewhat frightening way. Later, after having taken only one dose of LSD, Bill begins experiencing LSD flashbacks (or LSDTs as Bill refers to it) and when he and Denny perform the robbery, Bill commits murder. Henry David Abraham, a researcher who has studied LSD flashbacks, otherwise known as Hallucinogen Persisting Perception Disorder (HPPD), explains, "I think the majority of people could trip relatively safely, but there's a discrete percentage...Maybe one person in 20 will develop

serious, continuous problems related to the hallucinogenic experience, but that's true of every drug" (Ferro 2013). Yet the film implies that one dose of LSD could cause flashbacks disturbing enough to drive a person to become a crazed murderer, thus echoing *Reefer Madness*'s message about marijuana use.

Marketing for *Hallucination Generation* promotes the film much like an earlier teen juvenile delinquent film or a Beatnik movie, characterizing the group as dangerous. The tagline for the film tells the audience, "You are invited to a 'pill party.' You will experience every jolt... every jar of a Psychedelic Circus... The Beatniks... Sickniks... and Acid-Heads... and you will witness their ecstasies, their agonies and the bizarre sensualities... You will be hurled into their debauched dreams and frenzied fantasies!" (Trans American 1966, [1]). This statement tells audiences that they will get to know this despicable counterculture and their drug use *and* take a trip without having to risk the dangers of consuming acid. The term "Sickniks" implies there is something dangerously wrong and deranged with the people portrayed in the film. Distributor-produced advertising stories in the pressbook likewise hype the dangers of acid *and* the wonders of creating a filmic LSD experience, with headlines reading, "Terrifying LSD Experience is Vividly Recreated in AI's 'Hallucination Generation,'" "Lurid Color Photography Features LSD Scenes in 'Hallucination Generation,'" and "'Hallucination Generation' Proves LSD Frightening Threat to Society" (Trans American 1966, [3]). Yet of course the film "proves" nothing other than its ability to represent one idea about what is involved in a bad acid trip.

The pressbook contains ballyhoo marketing gimmicks that seem to be directed at a younger audience, which perhaps suggests that the film was designed to scare young people away from a Beatnik or Hippie lifestyle. Some of the ballyhoo includes "a special advance screening for the 'wiggy set' who attend in Mod dress," which includes a "Mod contest" and a

film screening “at 2:00 a.m. or other odd hour” (Trans American 1966, [11]). Another ballyhoo involves using a lighting rig in the theater to recreate the LSD experience in the film. Marketing that combines “Mods,” teens, Beatniks, Sickniks, Acid-Heads, and Hippies reveals this 1966 film’s connection to Beatnik films and makes it the first film in the Hippiesploitation cycle. By combining all youth groups under one umbrella, the marketing further indicates the film’s lack of understanding about what was going on in the world. What the marketing team could not have predicted was that this movie premiered during the so-called Sunset Strip “riots,” one of the most important events of the early Hippie movement.

“Riots” on Sunset Strip and Events Leading to the Emergence of the Hippies

The year 1966 featured cultural events for Hippies in Haight-Ashbury, many of which would be influential in shaping mainstream perception of the counterculture. On January 3, 1966, the first head store, The Psychedelic Shop, opened, selling then still-legal LSD and marijuana under the table. The Trips Festival attracted several thousand people to Haight-Ashbury between January 21-23 to attend a music festival with music by the Grateful Dead and Big Brother and the Holding Company and spiked acid punch to drink. Several thousand Hippies were reported living in the Haight by the summer of 1966. The underground press, the *San Francisco Oracle*, debuted in the fall of 1966, collecting many counterculture beliefs into one publication, though many more would show up throughout the rest of the 1960s. The Diggers began planning their Free Stores, which would prove successful in the 1967 Summer of Love (Goldberg 2017, 25).

Thus, Hippies were riding a wave until October 6, 1966, when California criminalized the Hippie sacrament of LSD and dealt a major blow to the burgeoning counterculture. To protest the criminalization, Allen Cohen and Michael Bowen, founders of the *San Francisco Oracle*, organized the Love Pageant Rally. Janis Joplin and the Grateful Dead played at the event for

free, and Ken Kesey and the Merry Pranksters made an appearance. The event drew several hundred to well over a thousand people. The Love Pageant Rally served as a testing ground for the Human Be-In, one of the most important early Hippie gathering, which would take place in San Francisco in January of 1967. After the Love Pageant Rally, police raids in search of drugs increased (Anthony 1980).

While Haight-Ashbury was undoubtedly the place where the Hippie counterculture was born and where it got its first media attention, it was in the summer and fall of 1966 on the Sunset Strip Hollywood that the Hippies first made their mark as dissidents during events that became known as “The Sunset Strip Riots.” Calling them riots is a stretch, because the protests were non-violent. However, Mike Davis refers to them as “massacres,” because they involved police brutality against peaceful demonstrators (Davis 2007, 201). The problems began when officials placed a 10 p.m. curfew on the Sunset Strip in Los Angeles. This ordinance was a problem for Hippies who were as young as 14 and 15-years-old and wanted to see bands like the Byrds, Bob Dylan, the Doors, the Mamas and the Papas, and Buffalo Springfield, who would later immortalize the Sunset Strip riots with their song “For What It’s Worth.” Several young Hippies, called initially “teeny-boppers” by the press before Hippie became the official term for the counterculture, began protesting the curfew. At first, these protests were innocuous enough. Most sign-carrying protestors were quietly arrested and handed off to parents. Then business owners and adults on Sunset Strip became annoyed with having to deal with protestors and modern rock music if they walked past clubs like Pandora’s Box, a popular Hippie nightclub. The protests grew more heated as police brutality began to occur more and more frequently. In an article for *The Guardian*, Woody Haut writes,

On 12 November, the Fifth Estate coffee house... printed and passed out flyers that read, “Protest Police Mistreatment of Youth on Sunset Blvd. – No More Shackling of 14 and 15 year olds”... That night about 3,000 teenagers showed up carrying signs with slogans like “Cops Uncouth to Youth” and “Give Back Our Streets”. Also in attendance was a smattering of hip Hollywood, such as Jack Nicholson, Dennis Hopper and Peter Fonda. (Haut 2016)

Fonda himself was arrested along with twenty-seven other protestors that night. Bob Denver, former Beatnik character Maynard G. Krebs on *The Many Loves of Dobie Gillis* and star of *Gilligan’s Island* (CBS 1964-1967), was shocked at the violence he saw police use on the peaceful protestors (Davis 2007, 208). Protests would continue throughout 1966 and well into 1968 as the young “teeny-boppers,” soon to be called Hippies, protested for their right to be on the Strip. Several gay nightclubs in the Silver Lake district were also raided by police. Davis writes, “In L.A. history, this was the less dramatic counterpart to the Village’s Stonewall Riot, the birthdate of an activist gay rights movement” (210). The protests and raids occurred within miles of each other and reflected a generational divide and a schism between young people and police. Rather than side against the persecuted gays, Hippies and Black and Chicano groups began to join together. Davis argues, “The self-concept of the Strip movement was shifting from an amorphous ‘happening’ to an all-embracing coalition of outcast and police-persecuted street cultures” (210). The protests would end on September 28, 1968, the day after Black Panther leader Huey P. Newton was sentenced to prison. Protestors surrounded police and, according to Davis, showed “superb courage and good humour. In the end, everyone simply walked off, back into the rock-and-roll night, while some of the girls threw kisses to the thoroughly vexed and

defeated sheriffs” (212). Though the protests were over, the mainstream media coverage of the “riots” manipulated an image of the young Hippies as violent radicals.

The mainstream press aligned its stories with the police perspective, which is how peaceful protests became known as “riots.” The reporting had several consequences, all of which would influence the 1960s. First, newspapers gave a name to the Hippies in national news stories. Soon, even more young people were flocking to Hippie havens in Los Angeles, Greenwich Village in New York, and Haight-Ashbury. Second, the press portrayed Hippies not as the peaceful group they were, but as an antagonistic force that must be battled by the older generation and decent young people who believed in law and order. Such news stories illustrate it was not just filmmakers who did not comprehend what was going on with youth culture. Most of the U.S. still did not understand the Hippie counterculture. Newspapers also gave Hippies enough press to prompt the production of *Riot on Sunset Strip*, the first Hippiesploitation film based on the protests.

CHAPTER III. “THERE’S SOMETHING HAPPENING HERE”: HIPPIES, LOVE, DRUGS,
AND REVOLUTION ON FILM, 1967

The Sunset Strip “riots” produced at least two major cultural artifacts that would last far beyond the protests themselves. The first is *Riot on Sunset Strip* (Dreifuss 1967), one of the first films to address the counterculture as Hippies, and one of this chapter’s case studies. The second artifact is the Buffalo Springfield song “For What It’s Worth,” which was recorded on December 5, 1966, at the height of the “riots” and was released on December 23 of the same year. The song reached number seven on the Billboard Hot 100 during the spring of 1967, right around the time *Riot on Sunset Strip* was released. The song would prove to be one of the most popular protest songs of the long 1960s, so much so that it has overshadowed the protests that inspired it and has been associated with other events, such as the Kent State shootings (Arthrell 1988, 94). The song’s lyrics capture young people’s concerns at the end of 1966 and the beginning of 1967, when the Hippies became widely recognized as a form of counterculture in the United States. The song expresses distress about the generational divide that was leading the “Silent” and “Greatest” generations to enact violence upon the young baby boomers. “For What It’s Worth,” which calls for young and old alike to “look what’s going down” as “there’s battle lines being drawn,” encapsulating the cultural moment in 1967 when the Hippie movement fully emerged.

This chapter examines cultural events of 1967, “The Year of the Hippie,”^{xxiii} and compares those events to filmic representations of Hippies. It first looks at the moment Beats became Hippies, the Human Be-In, a concert gathering and collective rejection of LSD’s criminalization. The chapter also analyzes “The Summer of Love,” when mainstream America’s acceptance of the Hippie movement reached its apex. It also examines the “Death of the Hippie” funeral and the Hippie March on Washington, which both marked the end of the Summer of

Love. Life in Haight-Ashbury during the Summer of Love would become the basis for several Hippie and Hippiesploitation films throughout the next several years.

The chapter then focuses on the rise of Hippiesploitation and Hippie films, with close examinations of *Riot on Sunset Strip*, *The Happening* (Silverman 1967), the LSD film *The Trip* (Corman 1967), and the exploitation documentary *The Hippie Revolt* (Beatty 1967) and what they have to say about the counterculture. These reveal that the filmmakers were still trying to figure out what a Hippie was and how to portray the counterculture on-screen. The Hippiesploitation film *Riot on Sunset Strip* and the mainstream Hippie film *The Happening* would both portray Hippies as criminals but in different ways. Unlike other drug exploitation films, *The Trip* attempted to destigmatize LSD and its users due to Roger Corman's empathy with the Hippie movement. *The Hippie Revolt* and other Hippiesploitation documentaries of the era gave an equal voice to those in and out of the counterculture. These films show documentary footage of Hippies, often accompanied by contrasting interviews with those in the counterculture and citizens of San Francisco and Los Angeles who were anti-Hippie. While the nonfiction films largely captured the Hip ethos, analyzing the fictional representation of Hippies in 1967 reveals that commercial film producers and distributors framed the Hippie movement in a negative light. There was something happening here in 1967, what it is the chapter will make clear.

Hip Cultural Events of 1967

While the Hippies were a tribal counterculture, desiring to exist in small groups rather than large clusters, community organizers felt that if the less-politically motivated Hippies of Haight-Ashbury and political organizations like the New Left were going to gain any cultural capital, they had to unite in a common get together. The Human Be-In proved to foster that joining of forces. Hip community organizers, empowered by the Love Pageant Rally in the fall

of 1966, looked to capitalize on its success. At the same time, the Hippie community was witnessing the start of its struggles with law enforcement. The police arrested the “dropouts” of Haight-Ashbury for possession of the now criminalized LSD, and protestors in Berkeley became increasingly involved in evermore radical political causes that drew the attention and ire of both the police and public-at-large. Like people throughout America, Hippies of the Bay Area were also aware of the Sunset Strip “riots” that began at the end of 1966.

The building momentum of the Hippie movement and the pushback by mainstream America led Michael Bowen and Allen Cohen of the *San Francisco Oracle* to organize the Human Be-In, one of the first meetings of the various groups that made up the Hippies. While media coverage of the event was not as widespread as reporting on the Summer of Love, the alternative press was an integral part of the Human Be-In. The *Oracle* was one of the most successful and influential publications of the Hippies’ underground press. In their fifth issue, the *Oracle* published an article “A Gathering of the Tribes for a Human Be-In,” which called for a gathering similar to the Love Pageant Rally and a uniting of people who identified as Hippies or New Left. Cohen recalled the need for the Be-In saying,

We were concerned about the philosophical split that was happening in the youth movement. The anti-war and free speech movement in Berkeley thought the Hippies too disengaged and spaced out. Their influence might draw the young away from resistance of the war. While the Hippies thought that the movement was doomed to endless confrontations with the Establishment, leading to violence and fascism. Michael [Bowen] and I decided to strengthen the youth culture, we had to bring the two poles together. We felt that the two factions could stand on the pillars of peace, love, and transcendental vision. (Cohen 1995)

Bowen and Cohen were hoping to create a happening, and that is precisely what the event became. On January 14, 1967, the Human Be-In occurred on the Polo Fields in Golden Gate Park near Haight-Ashbury. The *Oracle* told people “to bring costumes, blankets, bells, flags, symbols, cymbals, drums, beads, feathers, flowers [and to] begin in joy and embrace without fear, dogma, suspicion, or diabolical righteousness” (*San Francisco Oracle* 1967, 2). After the Be-In, Beat poet Ed Sanders argued that this event is where the Beatniks became the Hippies (Hemmer 2015, 244). The event lasted until 5:00 pm, though there is little doubt that after-parties occurred throughout the night. Notable events occurred throughout the day. Run as a concert, the event included The Grateful Dead, Blue Cheer, Big Brother and the Holding Company, and Jefferson Airplane. Activists such as Alan Watts, future Yippie co-founder and Chicago co-conspirator Jerry Rubin, and Timothy Leary made speeches between the bands’ performances. It was at the Be-In that Leary first used his slogan “Turn on, turn in, drop out.” Allen Ginsberg and Ram Dass performed Hara Krishna mantras. The Diggers helped provide food for everyone. The Hells Angels worked security after someone sabotaged an electrical cable; in contrast to their disastrous security measures at the Altamont Free Concert in December of 1969, they did their job without incident. Counterculture chemist Owsley Stanley provided jugs of LSD. A man parachuted from the sky like an angel. John Anthony Moretta sums up the events of the day writing, “The Be-In *was not* a political rally or protest but rather the celebration of an alternative culture; thousands came to simply *be* there; it was after all, a *Be-In*”^{xxiv} (2017, 122). The connection between New Left protestors and Hippie dropouts would be tenuous even after this event. However, from the Be-In through the Summer of Love and into the Hippie march on the Pentagon in October 1967, there was a real unity between the two groups, so much so that they were inextricably linked in the press and the popular imagination during this time.

At the Human Be-In, people openly consumed LSD and, while it was criminalized in California by this point, there was little interference at the Be-In by the police. In fact, despite having over twenty thousand attendees, the San Francisco police only sent two mounted patrolmen. The only time they interfered all day was to bring a lost child to the stage. Attendee and social worker Helen Swick Perry would later write, “The air seemed heady and mystical. Dogs and children pranced about in blissful abandon, and I became aware of a phenomenon that still piques my curiosity: The dogs did not fight and the children did not cry” (1995, 314). The Human Be-In was a success.

The Be-In was one of the first Hippie events to gain national media attention in the United States, besides the Sunset Strip “riots.” The reviews of the Hippie gathering were generally favorable, which became rarer as the long 1960s wore on. *Newsweek* published an exposé in their February 6, 1967 issue. *San Francisco Chronicle* music critic Ralph Gleason published a summary of the event in the paper, writing, “No fights. No drunks. No troubles. Two policemen on horseback and 20,000 people. The perfect sunshine, the beautiful birds in the air, the parachutist descending as the Grateful Dead ended a song. Saturday’s gathering was an affirmation, not a protest. A statement of life, not death, and a promise of good, not evil” (Gleason 1967). When the Be-In ended for the day, “[Allen] Ginsberg turned towards the setting sun, led a Buddhist chant and asked attendees to practice ‘a little kitchen Yoga’ by picking up their trash. City officials later declared that it had been decades since so large a gathering had left so little refuse in the park” (Moretta 2017, 123). The goodwill achieved at the Be-In made it one of the most successful single events for the Hippie movement.

Yet in the years following the event, Hippies would rarely experience the harmony and tolerance present at the Be-In. That momentary rapport became divided along generational and

political lines. For example, Republican California Governor Ronald Reagan, a constant enemy of the counterculture, said a Hippie was someone who “dresses like Tarzan, has hair like Jane, and smells like Cheetah” (Sutherland 2008, 109). Reagan’s demeaning, reductive, and dismissive views were shared by many members of the older generations and served to widen the generation gap. In response, “don’t trust anyone over 30” became a popular Hippie phrase.

The impact of the Human Be-In on the growth and formation of the “real” Hippie movement cannot be understated. As Be-In organizer Allen Cohen believed, “Soon there would be Be-Ins and Love-Ins from Texas to Paris and the psychedelic and political aspects of the youth culture would continue to go hand in hand everywhere” (1995). The Be-In did spin-off into similarly titled Fly-In, Sweep-In, Yip-In, and various Love-Ins. Love-Ins were essentially Hip protests where people made love, performed music, and openly consumed drugs. The Be-In phenomenon eventually culminated in two major cultural touchstones: John Lennon and Yoko Ono’s *Bed-In* and *Rowan and Martin’s Laugh-In* (NBC 1968-1973), which took their titles from the Be-In and all the Love-Ins. The Love-Ins were the titular inspiration for the film *The Love-Ins* (Driefuss 1967), released later that year. The Human Be-In was also significant because it served as a testing ground for one of the cultural events most associated with the Hippies, the Summer of Love.

Scheduled after the Human Be-In in February 1967, the Houseboat Summit promised to close the generational divide because most of the participants were older Hip “elders” or gurus. The informal meeting held on the houseboat of Berkeley political activist and professor Alan Watts helped to shape and inform Hip ideology through a discussion of the Be-In, the Sunset Strip “riots,” and what those involved hoped for the upcoming generation. The guests included Allen Ginsberg, Timothy Leary, and Beat poet Gary Snyder. The event was hosted by Allen

Cohen of the *San Francisco Oracle*, who was in attendance but did not actively participate in the discussion. Watts, by then 57-years-old, was a far-left thinker and philosopher who sought to keep up with and help shape the new generation. To show his Hip credentials, at the beginning of the Summit Watts mentioned Cohen and the *Oracle*, calling it “our new underground paper, far-outer than any far-out that has yet been seen” (Watts et al. 1967). The middle-aged men, Snyder being the youngest of the four main speakers at 37-years-old, used Hip speak throughout their hour-long conversation.

Their discussion was important, as it outlined the ethos of Hippie life. Yet many in the “Silent” and “Greatest” generations who read about the meeting paid attention only to the superficial meaning of their words. For instance, Leary had introduced the phrase, “Turn on, tune in, drop out” at the Be-In, which at the time he said meant to “Drop out of high school. Drop out of college. Drop out of graduate school. Drop out of junior executive. Drop out of senior executive” (Cohen 1995). Notably, Leary clarified his statement at the Houseboat Summit explaining, “You have to drop out in a group. You drop out in a small tribal group” (Watts et al.). The idea of dropping out into a tribe or commune was central to Hip ethos. The Hippie elders discussed the idea of turning on one’s mind to what is beyond immediate grasp, tuning into the problems of society, and then, as a group, dropping out of that corrupt society to form a tribal group or multiple tribal groups. The idea that communal living in small groups offered a superior lifestyle became fundamental the Hippie movement. Leary and Ginsberg also discussed the Human Be-In as an example of how this way of living could be achieved:

Leary: I would say that the Human Be-In was a tremendously important thing in the consciousness of San Francisco. Now, that thing could happen in every large city in the

country. And again, the beautiful thing about the Be-In was: it had no leadership, it had no big financing, it would just grow automatically.

Ginsberg: Yeah, but *we're* accused of being leaders. What are we doing up on the stage?

Leary: There were 50 people on that platform; every one of them was a leader. So were the people in the audience. The reason was that nobody came out and said *we* are the leaders. (Watts et al.)

This discussion and the rest of the Houseboat Summit revealed two core aspects of Hip ideology. First, while Leary, Ginsberg, Watts, and Snyder might enjoy being gurus and elders in the Hippie movement, but they did not want to be considered its leaders, because everyone and no one was a leader in the movement. Second, the Houseboat Summit conversations illustrated that Hippies saw their potential for social change if their beliefs became more widespread. Yet people outside the movement never seemed to understand or embrace these ideas. The gap between Hippies' values and outsiders' sense of them is reflected in most Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films, which often feature some sort of Hippie leader and rarely focus on Hippies' interest in peaceful revolution.

The elders involved in the Houseboat Summit knew that agents of hegemonic power like the police would work against their movement becoming widespread. At the Houseboat Summit, Ginsberg referenced the Sunset Strip "riots" to acknowledge Hippie fears of police intrusion and abuse. Ginsberg said, "they're [Hippies] afraid that there'll be some sort of fascist putsch. Like, it's rumored lately that everyone's gonna be arrested. So that the lack of communicating community among Hippies will lead to some concentration camp situation, or lead—as it has been in Los Angeles recently—to a dispersal of what the beginning of the community began" (Watts et al.). In a prescient way, Ginsberg discusses the idea that police and other agents of

hegemonic powers would seek to destroy what the Hippies were starting. However, while the elders certainly expressed concerns at the beginning of the Summit, their topics of discussion quickly turned towards issues facing the Hippie movement. Most of their points throughout the rest of the conversation spoke towards ideas of “dropping out,” communal living, and the problem of traditional vs. polyamorous relationships within the movement. The elders at the Houseboat Summit expressed their concerns about challenges to and within the burgeoning movement. Their conversations revealed their hope and idealism about what could happen if Hippies or the New Left gained national backing by a receptive and supportive citizenry.

Hippies found support from the Black Panther Party, which was working concurrently or in conjunction with Hippies on progressive causes. Founded by Bobby Seale and Huey Newton, the Black Panthers sought to facilitate black liberation and protect black people from police brutality and an unfair justice system. While race and different organizational structures separated the Hippies and the Panthers, they had common aspirations, goals, and enemies. Consequently, the Hippies and the Panthers often found themselves united in political causes. The parallel histories of the Panthers and the Hippies reveal that similar hegemonic forces that kept both movements from achieving greater success. Yet hegemonic forces were even more violent and oppressive to the Panthers. Todd Gitlin describes the forces against the Panthers and the Hippies as a “national apparatus of repression” (1980, 174). This repression apparatus was both racist and anti-progressive.

Huey Newton’s imprisonment was one of the first significant blows against the Panthers. Newton and Seale had previously organized Panther rallies in Oakland, including a protest in favor of carrying unconcealed weapons. Their protest on May 2, 1967, which included bringing rifles into the California state capitol, gained them national press attention. Gitlin writes, “Their

eagerness to face off against the police gave them high visibility and ghetto youth appeal, but precisely that visibility generated gunplay” (1989, 348). On October 28, 1967, Newton was stopped by police and became involved in a gunfight with officers Herbert Heanes and John Frey. During the shootout, Heanes was injured and Frey was killed. Newton was convicted of voluntary manslaughter and sentenced to two to fifteen years in prison. He would be released in 1970 after a national “Free Huey!” campaign organized by the Panthers and supported by the Hippies (Morgan 2014, 143-148).

After the Be-In and the Houseboat Summit, the Hippies and New Left of the Bay Area received national attention as the Summer of Love, a mass youth migration to Haight-Ashbury, began in 1967. Over one hundred thousand people came to the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood, which was not large enough and did not have the municipal resources to take care of them. San Francisco Police Chief Thomas Cahill and Mayor John Shelly warned people not to join the Hippies in the Summer of Love. Standing against San Francisco’s municipal powers were the Diggers, who tried to make the Summer of Love a success. What the Diggers wanted was two things: first, they wanted to make sure all those coming to San Francisco had adequate food, lodging, and drugs. Second, the Diggers wanted the Summer of Love take place not only in Haight-Ashbury, but around the country and exist as a concept by which to live. In the end, their efforts would fall short of extending the Summer of Love beyond the confines of Haight-Ashbury. However, their work protecting and caring for the young, Hip emigrants to San Francisco is why that summer is remembered so fondly.

During the Summer of Love, the Diggers protected teenage runaways, some as young as 13-years-old. They did not let people take advantage of the teens, but they also did not stop them experimenting with dope and sex. Describing Police Chief Cahill’s problem with the Diggers,

one news article explained, “When advised the Diggers were behind the request for ‘food, clothing and money,’ Chief Cahill cited the fact the Diggers have repeatedly provided a haven for teenage runaways of both sexes, and added: ... It is pretty evident where the Diggers stand in this matter” (Harland 1992, 28). Differing views about sex and drug use caused the Diggers and others in the Hippie movement to clash with police and other officials throughout the summer.

Tensions were rising as the Summer of Love began, and not just between the Hippies and the “straight” community, but also amongst the Hippies themselves, who saw a potential for disaster if the projected one hundred thousand people did show up. The Diggers’ Free Store was running short on supplies, as was their ability to feed the young people coming to Haight-Ashbury. Moretta writes, “by July, despite the best of intentions of all concerned, the sheer numbers of young human beings pouring into the Haight simply outstripped the community’s ability to provide for their needs... portions of the neighborhood... looked like a Third World slum” (2017, 171). Life for many Hippies was difficult during the Summer of Love, especially after Chief Cahill stopped people from sleeping in Golden Gate Park, which became something of a sideshow, with tourists coming to view Hippies through the windows of tour buses (Dolgin and Franco 2007).

Young people got by and enjoyed living in the community before the conditions became intolerable in late summer. Scott McKenzie had released his psychedelic pop song “San Francisco (Be Sure to Wear Flowers in Your Hair)” in May 1967, just as new people were coming to join the Hippies. For a few months, Hippies and Diggers were able to live a communal lifestyle in a big city and exist as a tribal community before the tribe became too large to live in a small place. They celebrated the summer solstice on June 21 in Golden Gate Park. They made

love, smoked marijuana, and dropped acid in the park. However, drug use and a rise in STIs became a problem. Hippie Mary Ellen Kasper said,

Things were getting tougher. The attitudes were getting tougher. There were people who were coming who were just coming for the drugs, who weren't coming for, say, a spiritual awakening or for a sense of community or to be a part of something bigger than themselves. If the Be-In was the bringing together of all that energy from the previous years, it was the high point and the Summer of Love was the beginning of the end. (Dolgin and Franco 2007).

By the end of the Summer of Love, many Hippies left Haight-Ashbury. Kasper believes that was a good thing because everyone could, "Bring the revolution to where you are" (Dolgin and Franco 2007). Some did go to other areas to begin the revolution; Jerry Rubin left the Bay Area and met up with fellow radical Abbie Hoffman. The next year they formed the Youth International Party, the Yippies, to protest the 1968 U.S. presidential election. Some went back to school or home to straight-laced jobs. However, for many young people, the Summer of Love turned them on to the Hippie movement for the first time. The Council for the Summer of Love had hoped to create a spiritual awakening by attracting religious leaders from all over the world. They had promised there would be "large festivals, such as the Festival for the Summer Solstice, for Midsummer's Day, the Tolkien Festival of Elves and Hobbits... Festivals of Christ, and festivals of Krishna, festivals of the young and festivals of the old, festivals of brothers" (Cohen 1991, 235). Most of these events did not take place.

While Hip community organizers like Bowen and Cohen did not meet all their lofty goals, the Summer of Love nevertheless left an indelible mark on American culture, both on-screen and off. Films contemporary to the era and later have depicted the Summer of Love. Like

Woodstock, the Summer of Love is one of the more positive events associated with Hippies. Memories of the Summer of Love are so positive that many forget about the poor housing, the bad drugs, and the constant police presence. Its most salient significance is that for one summer young people got together and lived a “free” lifestyle. For mainstream America, that meant a hedonistic lifestyle worthy of condemnation.

Perhaps the most joyous event to come out of the Summer of Love was the Monterey International Pop Festival. The concert, held June 16-18, 1967, also marked a shift in American music, with folk and rock n’ roll giving way to psychedelia and rock music.^{xxv} Moretta writes, “By the summer of 1967, psychedelia and rock and roll music had fused, creating a rock culture with its own unique sound; an amalgam of many of rock’s previously most innovative strains that created for listeners the auditory experience of an acid trip” (2017, 198). Hippies would ride this musical acid trip throughout the Summer of Love.

The Monterey International Pop Festival was enormously successful from a creative and a cultural standpoint. The event’s performances influenced American popular music, and it served as a template for Woodstock, one of the most influential musical festivals of all-time. Hippie bands like Country Joe and the Fish, Canned Heat, Jefferson Airplane, The Mamas and the Papas, and The Grateful Dead received some of their first national exposure. The singing of Janis Joplin on “Ball and Chain” during the performance by her group Big Brother and the Holding Company is particularly noteworthy as a feminist anthem (Moretta 2017, 208). Jimi Hendrix, dressed in white Hippie attire, famously lit his guitar on fire after a cover of The Troggs’ song “Wild Thing.” The event was also the high point of the Summer of Love. Moretta writes, “for hippie true-believers, Monterey represented that magical moment in time when they believed that it would be possible to redirect and reframe the nations’ popular culture because

enough youthful minds trusted the inherent power of goodness and community” (209-210). Such a positive feeling amongst the Hippies would rarely occur again until Woodstock in 1969.

Like Woodstock, its most famous successor, The Monterey International Pop Festival was captured in a documentary titled *Monterey Pop* (Pennebaker 1968), which influenced some of the style of *Woodstock* (Wadleigh 1970). In *Monterey Pop*, Hippies are relegated to the background because the film is primarily a record of performances at the concert. On the other hand, in *Woodstock*, the Hippie audience is as crucial as the musical acts themselves. The only major scene in *Monterey Pop* where the Hippie audience has any real importance is the opening scene accompanied by Scott McKenzie’s “San Francisco.” Still, just as the triumph of the Monterey Festival made Woodstock possible, the success of *Monterey Pop* led to *Woodstock*, one of the most important Hippie films of the period.

Two Hippie-led events rounded off the Summer of Love: the “Death of the Hippie” funeral held by the Diggers and the Hippies March on Washington, both occurring in October 1967. The Diggers had held a performative funeral for the Death of Money in 1966, in preparation for their Free Store, their distribution of free food, and the opening of a free clinic in Haight-Ashbury. They burned fake money while chanting and carrying a coffin down the street. The 1967 “Death of the Hippie” event conveyed their view of what had become of the term “Hippie.” They no longer approved of the term and were actively trying to refute the image of the Hippie fostered by the media. Thus, on October 6, 1967, one year after the criminalization of LSD and the Love Pageant Rally, the Diggers held what they called, “The Death of the Hippie” funeral. It was a performative act to end all use of the term “Hippie.” In discussing performative funerals, Jack Santino writes, “Performative commemoratives – spontaneous shrines – invite participation, unlike the funeral procession one happens to run across. They also invite

interpretation” (2004, 368). In this case, the Diggers wanted to invite several types of interpretation, mostly that the term “Hippy” was passé. In the press release, the Diggers wrote,

MEDIA CREATED THE HIPPIE WITH YOUR HUNGRY CONSENT. BE
SOMEBODY. CAREERS ARE TO BE HAD FOR THE ENTERPRISING HIPPIE. The
media cast nets, create bags for the identity-hungry to climb in... the reflections run in
perpetual anal circuits and the FREE MAN vomits his images and laughs in the clouds
because he is the great evader, the animal who haunts the jungles of image and sees no
shadow, only the hunter’s gun and knows sahib is too slow and he flexes his strong loins
of FREE and is gone again from the nets... YOU ARE FREE. WE ARE FREE. DO NOT
BE RECREATED. BELIEVE ONLY YOUR OWN INCARNATE SPIRIT. Create,
Be.....Do not be created.xxvi (Diggers 1967)

The press release was written to be confusing to mass media entities, whom the Diggers and some Hippies had begun to view as an enemy. The distrust the Diggers and Hippies felt towards the press reflects the counterculture’s growing concern about mainstream society, and Hippies’ increased desire to escape into communes. To begin “The Death of the Hippy” funeral, the Diggers held a wake at All Saints Church and then carried a coffin with a Hippie lying in it through the streets. They stopped at the corner of Haight and Ashbury for a “kneel-in” before taking the coffin to be “buried” in Buena Vista Park. There, the eighty or so Diggers and Hippies in attendance burned Hippie and media symbols such as Hippie-style clothing, as well as “copies of daily newspapers and the *Barb*, beads, [and] reputed marijuana” (Perry 1985, 244). Those in attendance reportedly chanted, “Hippie met its ugly death; In Buena Vista Park; Buried with the smack and meth; With candles in the dark; Vietnam the only trip; That had the people in its grip” (Wester 2012). A sign in The Psychedelic Shop featured labor leader Joe Hill’s famous slogan

“Don’t Mourn for Me, Organize.” Another read, “Nebraska Needs You More,” implying the movement needed to move beyond Haight-Ashbury, the Bay Area, New York, and Los Angeles. The “Death of the Hippie” funeral showed that the Hippies were ready to change, with some dropping out into communes, and many going into politics as the 1968 presidential election loomed. Yet the “Death of the Hippie” event did not end police harassment. Charles Perry writes, “That afternoon the police began daily sweeps of Haight Street to pick up runaways. Any man without a draft card was presumed to be either minor or a draft evader” (1985, 244). Continuing the many police run-ins over the course of the Summer of Love, police action in fall 1967 foreshadowed the hostile relationship between law enforcement and the counterculture. 1968 would prove to be an exceptionally turbulent year, culminating in the violent events at the Chicago Democratic Convention when “the whole world was watching” (Gitlan 1980, 186-189).

The Summer of Love did not end with the “Death of the Hippie” funeral, nor did it end in Haight-Ashbury, but instead closed in the U.S. capitol with the Hippies’ March on Washington on October 21, 1967. The event was organized in part by Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, who co-founded the Yippies, the Youth International Party on December 31, 1967 (Moretta 2017, 258). Like the Diggers, the Yippies used performative strategies, but were far more involved in national political action at events like the Chicago Democratic Convention. Rubin, Hoffman, and others organized the march to “exorcize” the Pentagon in an effort to end the Vietnam War. The march ended at the Pentagon, with soldiers pointing rifles fixed with bayonets at the Hippies. In one of the most famous images of non-violent protest of the 1960s, demonstrators put flowers into the barrels of the guns pointed at them. These were the so-called “Flower Children,” as Allen Ginsberg coined the term in 1965 (Mandeville-Gamble 2007, 3). Hoffman promoted “Flower Power” and promised,

We will dye the Potomac red, burn the cherry trees, panhandle embassies, attack with water pistols, marbles, bubble gum wrappers, bazookas, girls will run naked and piss on the Pentagon walls, sorcerers, swamis, witches, voodoo, warlocks, medicine men and speed freaks will hurl their magic at the faded brown walls. We shall raise the flag of nothingness over the Pentagon and a mighty cheer of liberation will echo through the land. (Mettler 2019)

None of that would come to pass. What the Hippies, and the future Yippies, did do was protest, chant, carry signs, sang, ask the soldiers to join them, and burn draft cards. Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin write, “As dusk arrived, the marshals moved in with clubs and tear gas, and nearly 700 people were arrested” (2008, 194). Robert McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, who had become disillusioned about American involvement in Vietnam, observed the protest at the Pentagon, and his son, Craig, would himself become involved in the anti-war movement (Isserman and Kazin, 2008, 194-195). As 1967 came to a close, it was clear that a war was coming, but not the Vietnam War, which was still raging, rather the war between Hippies and the Establishment. Tensions between the people in power and a loose coalition of Hippies, the New Left, the soon-to-be-founded Yippies, and other anti-war protestors would come to a head in 1968. The Summer of Love was over and the war was beginning.

Hippies at the Movies

In March 1967, the first two films to reference the Hippie movement were released: the Hippiesploitation film *Riot on Sunset Strip* and the mainstream Hippie film *The Happening* (Silverstein 1967). Both films represented the counterculture to some degree, but neither one captures an image of the Hippies grounded in the reality of countercultural life. These early films reveal uncertainty about Hippie language, culture, and style. They are also transitional in terms

of film cycles, as *Riot on Sunset Strip* has Teensploitation film aspects, and *The Happening* uses mainstream teen movie conventions. These films highlight the growing cultural awareness of the Hippie movement, but reflect mainstream society's lack of understanding and general befuddlement about what Hippies were and how they behaved. The films also illustrate the significant differences between Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films.

Riot on Sunset Strip was released just five months after the actual protests on the Sunset Strip began to occur, and it was the first Hippiesploitation film to identify the group as Hippies. The movie tells the story of Andrea, or Andy as she is called, played by Mimsey Farmer, who is a teenager interested in the growing counterculture and the rock scene on the Sunset Strip. When the curfew arrests begin, she is picked up by her father, a police officer named Walt Lorimer, played by Aldo Ray. They had become estranged after Walt divorced Andy's mother. Andy blames Walt for the failure of her parents' marriage and has not seen him in some time before her arrest. She and her friends are quickly let go because the police are good people who are only trying to make sure that business on the Sunset Strip stays strong. The police, including Walt, are also supportive of the Hippie leaders, who converse with the police in civil, friendly, and intellectual language. The police recognize the young people's right to protest if they file the proper paperwork with the city and if there are no large-scale incidents. The Hippie leaders agree to this.

Meanwhile, Andy is invited to a Hippie pot party. The people who invite her are not "good" Hippies like the ones who communicate well with the police, but "bad" Hippies who do drugs. Within minutes of arriving at the party, Andy smokes marijuana, and the "bad" Hippies, seeing an opportunity, dose her on LSD and gang-rape her. When Andy is dosed with the acid, she simply dances in slow motion for a few minutes until the "bad" Hippies take her upstairs to

gang-rape her. The LSD scene stands out for its lack of stylistic ingenuity. Many acid films showed bad trips, most showed some creativity in attempting to replicate acid's psychedelic effect. For example, *Hallucination Generation* went from black-and-white to color to convey the characters' experiential change, and *The Trip* (Corman 1967) used several different visual effects to depict acid trip experiences. Even extremely low-budget acid films like *Mantis in Lace* (Rotsler 1968) used psychedelic lighting. However, *Riot on Sunset Strip* only shows slow-motion dancing from a third-party perspective.

Following her rape, Andy is taken to the hospital after neighbors call the police to break up the noisy Hippie party. There, she makes up with her father who goes after and attacks the Hippies who raped his daughter. This leads to actual riots occurring on Sunset Strip, though the police are depicted as being generally even-handed in how they arrest people. One Hippie leader even thanks Walt for his fair treatment in the arrests of the "good" Hippies. The end of the film shows more Hippies and young people arriving on the Strip to protest as a narrator says, "You can close down their clubs, impose curfews, arrest them, punish their neglectful parents, but one fact remains; soon half the world's population will be under 25 years of age. They must go somewhere. Where will they go? What will they do?" The narrator's tone makes the questions ominous, as though the rapists, not the "good" Hippies, were the future.

There is little information about the film, so it is difficult to know how the film appeared so soon after the actual Sunset Strip "riots." Despite being titled *Riot on Sunset Strip*, little of the film is about the actual "riots" because the focus is on the relationship between Andrea and Walt. It seems possible that the movie was intended to be a mainstream melodrama, and that the addition of scenes concerning the LSD-induced rape and culturally relevant and sensationalized Sunset Strip "riots" transformed it into an exploitation film, setting off the Hippiesploitation

cycle.^{xxvii} The film was distributed by American International Pictures. Their advertising presented it as a racy Teensploitation movie when in actuality it plays more like *Beach Party* (Asher 1963) meets *Peyton Place* (Robson 1957).

The film portrays “bad” Hippies as drug users, pushers, and gang rapists. As noted from earlier examples from Kesey and Leary, dosing and raping people was antithetical to the Hippie ethos. As noted earlier, Hippies explored sexual experimentation and open relationships, and while these arrangements often focused on male pleasure over female satisfaction, rape was vilified in Hippie communities. Hippies were also against dosing anyone on any drugs. While Hippies experimented with various types of dope and encouraged others to do so, Hippie elders argued against changing anyone’s mental state without their express permission. For sex and drug use, the Hippie community believed in consent. *Riot on Sunset Strip* does not reflect those values. In addition, the film presents Hippie characters as divided between the “good” Hippies who politely talk with the police and the “bad” gang-rapist Hippies. Therefore, the Hippie characters in general and the “bad” Hippies in particular are one-dimensional and unsympathetic, leading to the film’s generally poor depictions of the counterculture. The film does have its end-of-the-movie moralizing about young people having to go somewhere, but it seems to exist to exploit a sense of moral panic in the older generation. The generational divide, so apparent in teen, Teensploitation, and Beatnik movies, is thus carried over into the first Hippiesploitation film.

Riot on Sunset Strip does not effectively capture Hippies’ language and style. Its cinematic misrepresentation of Hippies reflects mainstream society’s ignorance about the counterculture. Its unrealistic depiction also presents Hippies in a less than positive light, especially when one considers the actors’ dialogue, dress, and mannerisms. Christopher Sharrett

writes, “the central-casting actors are about ten years too old to be plausible teenagers. The “kids” are too well-coiffed, their clothes more like arbitrarily-bought costumes than anything most of us can remember about the hippie era. [The film’s] idea of turning an actor into a hippie is to give him/her love beads, a fur jacket, and a cardboard protest sign reading ‘Be Nice’” (2011). Besides not knowing how to dress or cast the Hippies, the Hippie dialogue also sounds artificial. The “good” Hippies who organize the protests not only have a friendly relationship with the police, they speak to them like good, Christian, ROTC, college students with no sign of any friction between the two groups. When the film shows the “good” Hippies, they appear more favorably than the adversarial business owners. Sharrett writes, “There is a nice, basic point here, although it’s largely lost to the film; power resides with business interests, with the cops merely their henchmen” (2011). The real villains of the film, the “bad” Hippies who dose and rape Andrea, use Hippie slang like “groovy” and “that’s your bag, baby,” but the actors clearly have no experience with the language, because the lines sound stilted and forced. They did not have the easy speech patterns of well-known Hippie speakers like Tom Hayden, Timothy Leary, or Abbie Hoffman. The music is general rock n’ roll music, and while change was happening in the music field, the soundtrack does not have any of the psychedelic sounds of bands playing the Sunset Strip clubs like The Doors, The Byrds, or Buffalo Springfield.

American International Pictures marketed the film to a younger, Hip audiences, but also sought to generate unease among older audiences who might see the film. The main tagline signals this generational divide, because it calls the film “The most shocking film of our generation!” and promises patrons they would “Meet the Hippies... the Teenyboppers with their too-tight capris and the Pot-Partygoers – out for a new thrill... a new kick!” (American International Pictures 1967, [1]). Such taglines could be read differently by the different

generations. To the older “Silent” and “Greatest” generations, this advertising highlighted the frightening problem of society gone wrong. For younger Boomers, these taglines were designed to evoke feelings of excitement and adventure. Sampling the Hippie lifestyle in the safety of a movie theater would grant them a vicarious thrill and let them see if the Hip lifestyle was something they might enjoy. Another advertisement, directed toward the older generations, shows the generational and cultural divide explicitly:

Parents note: If you don't dig the following ask your kids... They can explain it to you. They used to call it maryjane... now it's grass, hop, muggles, pot or tea, and you really do need to make the scene – at a blanket party. This sugar cube is a ticket for a certain kind of trip... The kids say “it's the only way to fly!” Kids used to get hung up on booze, but now it's ‘acid’... the quickest way to make the scene! See for yourself in... *Riot on Sunset Strip*. (American International Pictures 1967, [7])

This advertisement implies that parents would only be able to understand the slang used in the film by having a discussion with their children and that if their children knew the lingo, they might be using these drugs.

Riot on Sunset Strip was the first Hippiesploitation film distributed by American International Pictures, whose films and marketing would consistently depict Hippies in a negative light. The exploitation marketing co-opts Hippie lifestyle, image, and style for commercial benefit, which also goes against the counterculture philosophy. Hippies were not making AIP-distributed films, nor were they consulted. The distributors' generational misunderstanding of Hippies, their style, and their speech is reflected in the distributor-produced news headline that reads, “Authenticity Assured for ‘Riot on Sunset Strip’ as Films Aides Mix With ‘Longhairs’ During Riots” (American International Pictures 1967, [3]). The article implies

that a man and his wife who were working on the film dressed like Hippies and went down to where the actual “riots” were happening and tried to blend in with the young people. They did not seem to do their job well, however. Describing how the two people supposedly blended in with the Hippies, the story reports, “The film’s representative wore black boots, 3 ½ inch wide belt, snug trousers, while his wife sported more eye makeup than is customary for a Beverly Hills socialite.” The comment about the wife’s makeup points to a generational divide as well as a class divide.

The advertisements also tapped into an air of moral panic about the Hippies. One calls for mock Hippies to stage a demonstration outside the movie theater to coincide with *Riot on Sunset Strip*’s marketing campaign, “Can it happen here?” This plan incites fears that not only could Hippies show up in any town, but they could cause the type of trouble they did in Los Angeles and San Francisco. Another exploitation marketing tactic sensationalizes Hippie views on sex, a particularly cynical choice since the only sexual act in the film is a gang-rape. The marketing idea calls for theater owners to put a personal ad in the local newspaper with a phone number and a message reading “Are YOU out for kicks?” When someone would call, a taped message would say, “Hi, Honey, wanna make the real scene with me??? I’m out for any kind of a dangerous thrill as long as it’s new, different and dangerous. See me in ‘RIOT ON SUNSET STRIP’” (American International Pictures 1967, [11]). The copy suggests that the woman is Andy, an especially troubling insinuation considering what happens to her in the film.

Arthur Dreifuss, the director of *Riot on Sunset Strip*, and Sam Katzman, the producer, released another Hippiesploitation film in July 1967 entitled *The Love-Ins*, which is similarly problematic. The film is dismissive of the Hippies’ lifestyle and features a plot about a Timothy Leary-like figure becoming a drug messiah to a cult of Hippies. He is eventually assassinated and

martyred for the Hippie cause. By 1967, the United States had endured three of the five major assassinations of the 1960s, and thus the film's fictional assassination is highly sensational. The film depicts Hippies as followers of a cult-like leader, and sustains the mainstream idea that Hippies and their leaders could be adversarial and dangerous. The marketing of the film does explicitly mention the Diggers and, like earlier Beatnik movies, includes a Hippie glossary of terms, including some incorrect information suggesting that "mellow yellow" meant smoking banana peels (Columbia 1967).

The Hippiesploitation film *Riot on Sunset Strip* was released just a few weeks before the first mainstream Hippie film, *The Happening*, which also does not seem to understand the style or the ideology of Hippies. *The Happening* is only tangentially a Hippie film, as Hollywood's misunderstanding of Hippie culture is clearly visible in the film's main characters, Sureshot, played by Michael Parks, and Sandy, played by Faye Dunaway in her last film role before her breakout performance in *Bonnie and Clyde* (Penn 1967). Similar to *Hippies*, Sureshot and Sandy have a combative relationship with the police, an open sexual relationship verging on Free Love, and performative speech and behavior. Their attitude is also similar to the Hippie philosophy of, "if it feels good, do it." However, they lack the style that makes up most of the Hippie counterculture. Their clothing represents average teens rather than Hippies, and Sureshot's hair is not long, but rather a blond pompadour that is more in keeping with a teen beach movie. Additionally, the characters' slang is reminiscent of Hippies but could more accurately be attributed to average teens of the time. Sureshot and Sandy's capitalistic desire for money and material goods clashes most directly with Hippie ideas. Therefore, while *The Happening* is the first mainstream Hippie film, its main characters lack the style and core values of Hippie counterculture.

The Happening portrays Hippies as criminals out for kicks, which situates the film into teen and heist genres, as well as the mainstream Hippie genre. The film opens with Sandy and Sureshot running from police after waking up together at a beach love-in. They meet up with Herby (Robert Walker, Jr.), a one-dimensional teen sidekick, and Taurus (George Maharis), more juvenile delinquent than Hippie, despite his name. Through a series of misadventures, the teenagers kidnap retired mobster Roc Delmonico (Anthony Quinn) and try to ransom him to his wife (Martha Hyer), business partner (Milton Berle), and former mob boss (Oscar Homolka). Angered that all three refuse to pay the \$200,000 ransom, Delmonico takes over his own kidnapping. The teenagers each participate for their own reasons – Taurus wants money and status, Herby simply follows the group, and Sandy and Sureshot are looking for a good time. With Delmonico as their leader, the group blackmails Delmonico's wife, his business partner, and multiple mob bosses. The remainder of the film plays like a comedic heist movie, culminating in the arrest of the villains as the main characters escape with over \$3,000,000. Taurus threatens the others with a gun while they try to divide up the money, but Delmonico takes the gun, burns the money, and walks away sadly. Only Sureshot and Sandy, who found the good time they were looking for, happily leave in search of another, with Herby trailing behind.

Compared to *Riot on Sunset Strip*, *The Happening* has better acting, higher production values, and a more cohesive story, and it casts Hippies in a better light. These details are important because they would become indicative of a consistent criticism of Hippiesploitation films when compared with mainstream Hippie films. Style is the only Hippie characteristic that *Riot on Sunset Strip* depicts more realistic to countercultural life than *The Happening*. Unlike Sureshot and Sandy's Hippie-adjacent style, the Hippies in *Riot on Sunset Strip* are clearly identifiable by their hair, clothing, music, speech, drug use, and protest involvement. However,

The Happening more accurately conveys the Hippie ethos by depicting Hippies as fun-loving kids with whom audiences can identify emotionally. By making the two main characters relatable, engaging, and likeable, the film casts its Hippie characters in a positive light, despite their criminal behavior. Most of Sureshot and Sandy's crimes are committed against other criminals, making them seem more like rascals than juvenile delinquents. Like Dunaway's character in *Bonnie and Clyde*, Sandy and Sureshot are "cool" criminals, but unlike Bonnie and Clyde, they do not commit murder or harm any innocent characters. A scene in which Sandy and Sureshot outsmart two police officers at a roadside stop is played more for fun and laughs than as a reproachable criminal act. While both *Riot on Sunset Strip* and *The Happening* portray Hippies as criminals, only the mainstream film portrays Hippies as likeable characters with sympathetic motivations.

An exchange in *The Happening*'s trailer displays the generational divide within the film, as well as Hippies' perception of themselves and their behavior. Delmonico says, "What are you kids? I try to talk and it's like you're out in space or something. All this jazzy talking and jokes. It's all a game to you!" to which Sureshot replies, "That's right! And just when you get with it, baby, we change the rules." The film's marketing focuses on two major aspects of the film: the actors and the soundtrack.^{xxviii} The trailer includes countercultural references, promotes the title song, sung by The Supremes, and shows parts of the opening scene in which police break up the love-in and Sureshot and Sandy escape (Columbia Pictures 1967, *The Happening Theatrical Trailer*). The film's radio spot also emphasizes the theme song - in the minute-long spot, more than thirty seconds are devoted to discussing and playing the song. The radio spot names the director and the cast, declares that the film is about, "a mobster, a chick, and three young guys on a wild \$3,000,00 caper," and invites the audience to "wake up to *The Happening*" (Columbia

Pictures 1967, *The Happening Radio Spot*). The only countercultural reference in the spot is the Hippie lingo in the last line, further emphasizing mainstream film's failure to understand the movement. Like many mainstream films of the time, *The Happening* received a novelization, which also showed the Hippies in a generally positive light. The book's cover used Hippie language in its tagline, "It's a new bag! Today's generation really turns on at The Happening." The back cover calls the Hippies "Rebels with a cause"^{xxix} and references LSD, although no acid is used in the film (Curry 1967). *The Happening* was the only mainstream Hippie film released in 1967.

By 1967, several Hippiesploitation films focused on one particular aspect of Hippie life: LSD use. Exploitation film companies often used LSD as a plot point, in order to attack the Hippie movement and induce moral panic. Several Hippiesploitation films dealt with this theme explicitly, including *Hallucination Generation*, *The Acid Eaters* (Mabe 1968), and *Mantis in Lace* (Rotsler 1968). One of the most successful and widely known Hippiesploitation acid films is Roger Corman's 1967 *The Trip*. The film was the second in Corman's "counterculture trilogy," after his film *The Wild Angels*. Nick Heffernan writes, "If *The Wild Angels* presents the biker gangs as both terrifying embodiments of otherness and pathetic losers, *The Trip* represents a distinct shift in tone and mode of address in the treatment of a countercultural subject" (Heffernan 2015, 8). Although the film was marketed as an anti-drug exploitation film, Corman had higher aspirations for the film. He hired countercultural stars and crew, including, "Peter Fonda to star, Dennis Hopper to support and direct the second unit, and Jack Nicholson to write the script... they eschewed the classic exploitation strategy of staging a titillating spectacle of otherness within a framework of more or less overt moral condemnation" (Heffernan 2015, 8). Corman wanted to make a commercial film that experimented with audio and visual techniques

to simulate an LSD hallucination. He said, “I think that one of the reasons that the audience came in such large numbers was out of curiosity. They didn’t really want to take LSD, but the reviews and comments said this came somewhat close to an LSD experience, so they could take it without taking it” (Carson 2003a). Because of this, *The Trip* was a massive commercial success for Corman and American International Pictures, grossing around \$6 million (Corman and Jerome 1990, 153) from an estimated \$300,000 budget (Carson 2003a).

The Trip offered one of the era’s most objective screen portrayals of LSD and its users, in part because Corman tried LSD himself. Corman said, “I did a great deal of research in preparation for *The Trip*, which is what I do on all of my films. I read Tim Leary’s book, I talked to a number of people, and I determined I could not really do a picture on LSD without trying it” (Carson 2003a). Corman had a good trip and decided to depict something not seen in most acid films of the time: a balanced and neutral look at the drug. Corman’s efforts demonstrate that he was one of the only exploitation filmmakers who portrayed Hippies in a decent light. Corman said:

I wanted the picture not to be a pro-LSD picture and not to be an anti-LSD picture because my trip was very good, I had no bad effects in my trip at all. It was wonderful. Yet I felt I really shouldn’t be accused of proselytizing for LSD and at the same time I knew people had had bad trips, so I was trying to be neutral and I had to ask people what had happened on their bad trips and incorporate some of what they had experienced into it to make it neutral. (Carson 2003a)

Corman’s focus in *The Trip* was experimenting with lighting and cinematography, rather than constructing an elaborate plot. The film’s protagonist is Paul Groves (Peter Fonda), who directs commercials and is a stand-in for Corman, a commercial film director. Paul is given acid

by John (Bruce Dern), who guides Paul through most of the acid trip, which includes both good and bad experiences. At some point, Paul has a bad reaction to the drug and runs away from John's house. He explores the city while hallucinating, and he eventually comes down from his trip safely. Corman experimented wildly with various audio and visual stimuli not present in his other works, thus creating a film experience that closely resembles an actual acid trip.

Most importantly, *The Trip* gives a balanced view of the acid experience and, unlike other Hippiesploitation films, does not seek to fuel a sense of moral panic about LSD. It does not demonize the drug or its users, nor does it promote the drug's recreational or therapeutic use. Paul is a character with depth who, while not always likeable, is a real person to whom audiences can relate. John is a kind and understanding character who helps Paul through the trip. By focusing on individual, sympathetic characters rather than demonizing the drug and generalizing its users, *The Trip* casts Hippie counterculture in a more positive light. By showing both negative and positive elements of acid use, Corman created one of the first realistic film portrayals of Hippies. Neither overtly positive nor negative, *The Trip* provides a view of the counterculture through the eyes of Corman and his countercultural crew of screenwriter Jack Nicholson and stars Peter Fonda and Dennis Hopper.

The Trip gained commercial success as well as positive reception by at least one underground press publication. Coverage of Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films in the Underground Press was rare. Gene Youngblood, a contributor to the *Los Angeles Free Press*, wrote, "I never thought I'd be moved to praise a Hollywood film with the wholehearted enthusiasm I feel for this one" (1967). Several major film critics also praised the film as an art film, rather than an exploitation film. Kevin Thomas of the *Los Angeles Times* wrote, "There hasn't been such textural richness on the screen since the heyday of Sternberg ... the most

unabashed art film ever to come out of Hollywood ... a ‘Marienbad’ for the masses, Ingmar Bergman for the teeny-boppers” (1967).^{xxx} Such positive reviews motivated AIP head Sam Arkoff to comment, “I think Roger could be, if he really wanted, a really great director – if he had the patience” (di Franco 1979, ii). However, not all reviews were positive. Many viewed the film as pro-acid, despite Corman’s intentions. While he personally had a positive experience with LSD, he deliberately included scenes where the trip goes badly so as to remain neutral (Heffernan 2015, 9-10).

This authenticity of *The Trip* is essential to understanding why the film was so vital as a part of the acid film sub-cycle of Hippiesploitation. Corman created one of the most realistic LSD trip experiences on film and did so with the idea that people should know more about the effects of the drug, rather than just the scare tactics. Heffernan writes, “The film’s elliptical narrative, visual inventiveness, and philosophical seriousness were closer to European art cinema than American exploitation fodder” (2015, 10). Despite fearmongering over LSD use depicted on the poster and elsewhere in the marketing materials, the pressbook promoted the authenticity of Corman’s filmic acid trip experience. Distributor-produced advertising headlines declared, “‘The Trip’ Authentic Portrayals of LSD Hallucinations” and “Corman ‘Fog’ Trademark Used in ‘The Trip’” (American International Pictures 1967, [3]). Other films before and after would portray acid use, but Corman’s understanding of acid trips and attention to detail when crafting of the special effects resulted in notable authenticity.

Despite the film’s neutral take on LSD, the marketing played up the era’s moral panic, similar to anti-drug exploitation films *Reefer Madness* (Gasiner 1936) and *Marihuana* (Esper 1936). *The Trip*’s tagline reads, “A **L**ovely **S**ort of **D**eath.” According to David Lerner, AIP marketing agent James Raker’s, “earlier iterations of the same concept ranged from pure pleasure

(‘**L**ove **S**ex **D**elight’) to camp-levels of drug panic (‘**L**oneliness **S**orrow **D**epravity’), along with a strange, experimental option (‘**M**olested’). A typo in Raker’s notes indicates the extent of his confusion as to the film’s intentions, when he accidentally refers to ‘mods’ as ‘mobs’” (2012, 104). Due to AIP’s marketing and release changes, Corman left AIP to create his own independent production company after an abortive release of *Gass-s-s* three years later.

The pressbook also illustrates one of the significant differences between mainstream Hippie films and Hippiesploitation at the time: *The Trip* had a better understanding of Hippies and promoted its young, countercultural cast. This casting illuminated a stark difference between Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films, as Hollywood routinely used older, more established stars to promote their Hippie films through 1968. Hippiesploitation helped build interest by capitalizing on its younger cast, who were often more aware of or involved with the counterculture than older stars. 1967 was the beginning of the Hollywood Renaissance, which Yannis Tzioumakis describes as, “Combining a mixture of exploitation strategies, art-house filmmaking techniques and an emphasis on distinctly American themes within not always clear-cut generic frameworks, the Hollywood Renaissance films can be seen as the product of a new marriage between independent film production and the majors” (2006, 170). While the success of the new filmmaking movement and subsequent New Hollywood films were not all direct successors of independent exploitation filmmaking, Corman had a significant impact by fostering young actors and directors through his unofficial “Corman School” (Gray 2004, 242). Additionally, independent filmmakers understood this change in filmmaking styles earlier than the Hollywood studios. Corman said, “More and more pictures were being made independently and independents seemed to understand the beat, as it were, of young people more than the bureaucracies at the major studios” (Carson 2003, “Tune In, Trip Out”). It is no coincidence that

many members of *The Trip*'s cast and crew, including Dennis Hopper, Peter Fonda, and Jack Nicholson, would go on to make one of the most essential films of the Hollywood Renaissance, countercultural biker film *Easy Rider* (Hopper 1969).

In 1967, several more Hippiesploitation acid films would be released, which were universally anti-drug and anti-Hippie, often with no sense of relatability to the counterculture. In *The Acid Eaters*, Hippiesploitation merged with sexploitation and anti-drug genres. The film largely lacks plot, focuses on acid as an excuse to show explicit sex on screen, and includes a moralizing scene in which the Hippies go to Hell because of their acid use and fornication. The characters are easily interchangeable, lack redeeming qualities or character arcs, and are not relatable or likeable beyond how they look and how well they have sex.

William Rotsler's Hippiesploitation acid film, *Mantis in Lace*, also known as *Lila*, incorporates aspects of horror and explicit sexploitation genres, and it similarly casts the Hippies in a bad light. The film stars Susan Stewart as a young stripper and sex worker named Lila. She takes LSD once, becomes addicted, and seeks satisfaction in acid-induced sex sessions. While she has sex, she trips on acid and kills all of the men, first with a screwdriver, then with a hatchet. The film chronicles her descent into madness and murder as she is hunted by the police.^{xxxix} The film develops only three characters to any significant degree: Lila and the two police officers pursuing her. The characters' portrayal encourages audiences to identify with the officers and to condemn Lila as a drug-addled Hippie murderess. *Mantis in Lace* is an example of a case where focusing in on one Hippie character hurts the depiction of the counterculture, much like the Manson movies did in the next decade. *The Acid Eaters* had unrecognizable characters who went to a literal Hell but depicting the one Hippie character in the film as a murderess was far more damaging.

Like *The Trip*, *Mantis in Lace* uses colored lighting gels to help simulate the acid trip, but without the budget, the film lacks groundbreaking special effects. Special effects are vital to an honest portrayal of acid trips and to audiences' understanding of LSD's effects on behavior. Both *The Acid Eaters* and *Mantis in Lace* portray LSD use as a gateway to Hell or murder.

Like acid, sexploitation, and horror films, Hippiesploitation continued to have sub-cycles within the larger cycle of the long 1960s. The connection between these cycles became cemented as films continued to exhibit anti-Hippie sentiments by portraying Hippies as drug users, sex addicts, or literal murderers, as in the Manson films. Beginning in 1967, one sub-cycle was the intersection between Hippiesploitation, Mondo films, and exploitation documentaries. This sub-cycle was somewhat fairer in its representation of the counterculture. Exploitation documentaries, which were more explicit than mainstream documentaries, were incorporated into the Mondo cycle. Erin Wiegand writes that in Mondo films, "clips of documentary footage taken from around the world are edited together to highlight exotic, unusual and shocking scenes, often juxtaposing Western European cultures with those of Africa and Asia" (2019, 15). The Mondo cycle began with the international success of *Mondo Cane* (Cavara, Jacopetti, and Proserpi 1962). Soon after, several Mondo films were released, and various films that would otherwise have been called exploitation documentaries began to include the word "mondo," Italian for "world," in their titles. Wiegand writes:

In contrast to the globe-trotting travelogues of the initial *Mondo Cane* cycle, American exploitation documentaries tended to turn the camera's gaze inward, examining locations and topics closer to home. In particular, it is possible to identify a trajectory of exploitation documentary in this period that spanned several smaller cycles, moving from

an initial emphasis on sex work and the business of sexploitation filmmaking (1963–66) to an exploration of the burgeoning ‘hippie’ countercultural scene (1966–69). (2019, 16)

Hippiesploitation documentaries contained more realistic depictions of the counterculture because they incorporated interviews with actual Hippies. Unlike many fictional Hippiesploitation films, which generalized the counterculture, Hippiesploitation documentaries included multiple short interviews with real people with whom audiences could identify. One of the first Hippiesploitation documentaries was *The Hippie Revolt*, also known as *Something’s Happening*. The film consists of B-roll footage of the counterculture in Haight-Ashbury and Los Angeles during the Summer of Love, overlaid by jam music and Hippies discussing their beliefs and style. *The Hippie Revolt* is an important film that captures the events of the Summer of Love, and it was soon followed by Hippiesploitation documentaries *Revolution* (O’Connell 1968) and *Like It Is* (Rotsler 1968). Wiegand notes that exploitation documentaries “were all connected with ‘mondo’ despite the fact that none of the films employ the global scope, editing style or sardonic commentary of the European mondo cycle” (2019, 20). *The Hippie Revolt* provides a useful window through which a viewer may examine authentic Hippie life in 1967, although it lacks discernable style and was not well-received critically. One critic in the then-right-leaning *New York Daily News* wrote, “The Hippies come across as a searching lost generation. They make a show of rejecting modern culture, creating one of their own that appears backwards. They group together like sheep... Social workers may have an answer to the hippie revolt. The film does not” (Guarino 1967, 221). Despite its lack of critical success, *The Hippie Revolt* was a financial success, marketed with a \$35,000 pre-opening in New York (Anon. 1967a, 1).

The Hippie Revolt was in competition at the box office with a similarly open-minded Hippiesploitation documentary, *Revolution*. Due to the competition, *The Hippie Revolt* was

released over Christmas of 1967 and *Revolution* in early 1968 (Anon. 1967a, 1). Compared to other Hippiesploitation documentaries, *Revolution* has a more formal documentary style, while still being marketed as a Mondo film (Wiegand 2019, 20). *Revolution* is stylistically more professional than *The Hippie Revolt* and comprises direct interviews with Hippies and people involved with the movement. One standout interview features religious members of several dominations, including a priest, a nun, and a Protestant reverend, discussing their support for Hippies while sitting in Golden Gate Park. Lou Gottlieb, a former member of the popular folk trio The Limelites, is also interviewed at his Hippie commune, The Morning Star Ranch. These interviews demonstrate that the counterculture had positive mainstream allies.

Revolution received a soundtrack album, which lends credence to the idea that they tried to give voice to the Hippie movement by selecting appropriate music and having countercultural liner notes. The soundtrack contains songs by Hippie rock groups Mother Earth and The Quicksilver Messenger Service, an early record appearance by The Steve Miller Band, and liner notes by Yippie co-founder Paul Krassner. Krassner writes that members of the counterculture, “panhandle and sell[s] underground newspapers with an equal sense of absurdity” and believe “napalm is more dangerous than LSD” (Krassner 1968). Krassner makes his most revolutionary statement in the liner notes:

Long-haired students are threatened with expulsion by Christians who worship long-haired Jesus Christ and by Americans whose original battle for independence was spear-headed by long-haired Thomas Jefferson. But Christ was a virgin and Jefferson was a slaveowner. And they're both yesterday. For now, in the Second American Revolution, Jesus would be taught that celibacy is a sin against God, and Jefferson would be taught that it impossible for a free man to own another. (Krassner 1968)

This statement clearly supports both countercultural youths and railing against older generations, which illustrates *Revolution's* role in elevating countercultural voices.

Other Hippiesploitation documentaries focused on sexual aspects of Hippie life and featured nudity and sex, like Hippiesploitation sexploitation documentary *Like It Is*, directed by *Mantis in Lace* director William Rotsler. This depiction is far more biased than some Hippiesploitation documentaries, once again classifying Hippies as a group of sex fiends. The pressbook backs this up with a photograph of a fully nude woman alongside the caption, "there is complete nudity in 'LIKE IT IS' [sic] because, quite frankly, there is no other way to tell the story of today's Now Culture without nudity. 'LIKE IT IS' [sic] is multi-faceted: breathtaking beauty... shocking reality... arousing erotica... a fascinating probe of the hedonistic love cult" (Lima Productions 1968, [2]). By calling the Hippies a hedonistic love cult, the pressbook affirms the film's eroticized depiction of Hippie youth as perverts.

Perhaps the most popular Hippiesploitation documentary is *Mondo Mod* (Perry 1967), a Mondo film that equates the Hippie movement with other youth cultures in the United States. *Mondo Mod* stands apart from other Hippiesploitation documentaries because Hippies are only part of the film's focus. There are scenes of general youth culture, including drag racers, mod clothing designers, surfers, and bikers. Like many Mondo films, the movie features a narrator, popular Los Angeles disc jockey Humble Harve. The film was distributed by Boxoffice International Pictures, which primarily distributed adult films. However, *Mondo Mod* was made with the idea that it would be seen by both adults and younger audiences. The pressbook advertises trailers, with a message reading, "Each one is designed to sell to a complete viewing audience with a special emphasis on the 13 to 25 year old age group." It also has youth-oriented ballyhoo which advised theater owners to, "stage a *Mondo Mod* fashion contest, and present the

winner on stage just before the premiere showing of *Mondo Mod*” (Timely Motion Pictures, Inc. 1967, [3]). In a further attempt to capture the youth market, the poster lists the cast simply as “The Youth of the World” and advertises the record for the title song by The Gretschmen. It does attempt to attract adult viewership as well with the tagline, “Parents: If you don’t understand your children see this motion picture!” ([1]) Such marketing further illustrates that distributors tried to reach the widest possible audience and often capitalized on generational conflict to achieve that goal.

Some of the most edifying scenes of *Mondo Mod* show footage from the Sunset Strip “riots.” The footage shows the peacefulness of the protests while demonstrating the militant tendencies of the police towards the young Hippies, particularly underage kids supposedly breaking curfew. The film shows the Fifth Estate Coffee House on the Strip, where teens and Hippie elders planned the protests that would become the “riots.” The walls of the coffee house are adorned with Hippie graffiti and slogans reading, “Beware of the Brain Police,” “End Police Brutality,” and “Big Brother is Watching (So’s Mom).” Fifth Estate owner Al Mitchell says, “I think what we have had occur here in Los Angeles is a confrontation where the older, more moneyed generation tries to kick out the youth of America... and it failed... and the entrenched power people realize very shortly, very quickly that they simply could not, even with the instance of the police force, drive the element out from the Sunset Strip area” (Perry 1967). Even though *Mondo Mod* was released over half a year after the “riots” began, it reflects the growth of the generation gap.^{xxxii}

The connection between exploitation documentaries and Hippiesploitation functions as a broader inquiry into an underexamined, concurrent exploitation film cycle. It is fitting for a discussion of 1967 Hippiesploitation films to begin and end with the Sunset Strip riots, which

were the initial cultural touchstone through which people became aware of the Hippies. Throughout 1967, the country began to learn about Hippie style, demographics, and ideology, as well as the ways Hippies interacted with and distanced themselves from mainstream culture. 1967 also saw both independent and mainstream film companies try to understand the counterculture, although exploitation companies portrayed Hippies on-screen most authentically by casting younger actors and depicting Hippies as the target of moral panic by older generations. By 1968, the Hippie movement became more visible to the United States, and this visibility grew over time as the viewing public better understood the intricacies of the movement. As a controversial presidential election loomed, the world would soon be watching a clash between the Hippies and the Chicago police.

CHAPTER IV. "IN LINCOLN PARK THE DARK WAS TURNING": TRANSITIONAL
HIPPIE FILMS IN THE WAKE OF U.S. POLITICS, 1968

Phil Ochs was one of the premier political folk singers in the 1960s. Ochs had the talent of Bob Dylan but lacked the commercial appeal to become a mainstream success. In 1968, he became involved with the Yippies, led by Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin. Like the Yippies, Ochs was radical-left and delivered his message in a performative manner, but he possessed an air of literary legitimacy not found in the comedic protests of the Yippies and the Hippies. Ochs was with the Yippies in Chicago for the 1968 Democratic convention protests, which he saw as the death of America. Ochs wrote a song about the event, "William Butler Yeats Visits Lincoln Park and Escapes Unscathed" (Ochs 1969). The song is played on the piano rather than Ochs's usual guitar. He uses language Yeats might employ to tell the story of Chicago, each verse ending with the line, "In Lincoln Park the dark was turning." For Ochs and many other Americans, the Chicago Democratic Convention riots were the cultural touchstone of their generation.

During 1967, mainstream Americans' views of Hippies shifted. By 1968, Hippies had become more legitimate because of their anti-Vietnam War protests and their connections to the New Left and the Yippies. The election of Richard Nixon and the events leading up to his inauguration made 1968 a critical year. Essential events include Lyndon Johnson's decision not to run for a second term, the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy, and the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention. The convention resulted in a riot, caused more by the Chicago police than by the Hippies, Yippies, and New Left; yet much of the world placed the blame on the Hippies' behavior rather than police brutality. "The whole world is watching" became the anthem of the Chicago protest.

Additionally, this chapter discusses 1968 in Hippie films, with analyses of *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas* (Averback), *Psych-Out* (Rush), and *Wild in the Streets* (Shear). The latter two were released before the Chicago convention and represent a unique view of the Hippies. *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas* is a mainstream film which represents one of the first times a mainstream Hollywood film began to understand the growing counterculture. While not directed by Roger Corman, *Psych-Out* portrayed Hippies more fairly than any other Hippiesploitation film not directed by Corman. *Wild in the Streets*, a Hippiesploitation political farce, was representative of the older generations' generally negative and fearful view of the rising counterculture. The film also showed the potential positives of young people gaining political power. 1968 was the first significantly terrible year for the Hippies in mainstream culture, however it also brought with it generally positive depictions of the counterculture in film, even in the Hippiesploitation cycle.

“The Whole World is Watching!” The Hippies, Chicago, and 1968 U.S. Presidential Politics

By 1968, the United States was deep into the Vietnam War. Following the Hippies March on Washington on October 21, 1967, the country was more divided than ever over the conflict. When the Tet Offensive began on January 30, 1968, Allied forces were overwhelmed as the Vietcong operation struck over one hundred cities and towns. The Tet Offensive was a significant blow to U.S. forces and to morale at home and abroad. William L. O'Neill writes, “What the Tet offensive showed was that the VC [Vietcong] was still a power, would remain so for years to come, and that the people of South Vietnam were not loyal to their government” (1977, 347). Vietnam War proponents thought the end of the war was in sight until the Tet Offensive. However, after January 1968, the Vietnam War began to lose public support, and efforts by Johnson to deescalate the war began in earnest (O'Neill 1977, 348).

Many in the United States were shocked when CBS anchor Walter Cronkite denounced the war during a report from Vietnam on February 27, 1968. Cronkite was “The Most Trusted Man in America” (Dallek 1998, 506), known for his stoic demeanor and for being consistently unbiased in his reporting of the era’s events. Cronkite speaking out against the war gave considerable clout to the anti-war movement. After Cronkite’s report, only twenty-six percent of the country approved of Johnson’s handling of the war, with sixty-three percent disapproving. (Dallek 1998, 506). Cronkite famously ended his editorial by saying:

To say that we are closer to victory today is to believe, in the face of the evidence, the optimists who have been wrong in the past. To suggest we are on the edge of defeat is to yield to unreasonable pessimism. To say that we are mired in stalemate seems the only realistic, yet unsatisfactory, conclusion. On the off chance that military and political analysts are right, in the next few months, we must test the enemy’s intentions, in case this is indeed his last big gasp before negotiations. But it is increasingly clear to this reporter that the only rational way out then will be to negotiate, not as victors, but as an honorable people who lived up to their pledge to defend democracy and did the best they could. (Cronkite 1968)

Upon seeing the news report, Johnson reportedly declared, “If I’ve lost Cronkite, I’ve lost Middle America,” and he began to take steps to limit the war (Dallek 1998, 505-506). On March 31, 1968, he announced that he would not run for reelection, saying, “I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your President” (Dallek 1998, 513). This announcement was, at the time, good news for the Hippies and the New Left, who disdained Johnson and his pro-war policies. However, Johnson’s decision led to Republican Richard Nixon becoming president in 1969, an event that continued to stymie the anti-war movement.

Several issues divided the Democratic Party in the 1968 election. Southern Democrats, or Dixiecrats, did not support the civil rights movement. The divide led the party to split up when Alabama Governor George Wallace announced he would run for president as an independent. He took a large percentage of the southern vote with him in the general election. Of the remaining Democrats, the Old Left and the New Left disagreed on many issues. The Old Left comprised Established powers who stood for by-the-book liberal principles, while the New Left offered radical change. Yippie Phil Ochs summed up the New Left's view of the Old Left in his song "Love Me I'm a Liberal," which highlights the hypocrisy of the Old Left. The song first describes the Old Left as, "ten degrees to the left of center in good times and ten degrees to the right of center if it affects them personally," and it continues, "I cried when they shot Medgar Evers; Tears ran down my spine; I cried when they shot Mr. Kennedy; As though I'd lost a father of mine; But Malcolm X got what was coming; He got what he asked for this time; So love me, love me, love me, I'm a liberal" (Ochs 1966). These lyrics reveal a difference between the Old and the New Left, because while the New Left and the Hippies mourned Malcolm X's passing, Establishment liberals were silent. The divide in the Democratic Party was also pointed out by comedian presidential candidate Pat Paulsen, who observed, "This nation is divided as never before. The Democrats alone are split into three political factions: The New Left, The Old Left, and what's left" (Pasetta 1968). Paulsen ran a campaign for the presidency in 1968 as political satire for the countercultural TV show *The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour*.

Appealing to the nation's youth became an essential issue in the 1968 election because of their burgeoning political activism. Todd Gitlin writes, "In the spreading cross-hatch where the student movement and the counterculture intersected, a youth identity said, in effect: To be young and American is to have been betrayed; to be alive is to be enraged" (1989, 285-286).

Minnesota senator Eugene McCarthy was an early youth candidate for the Hippies and the New Left. McCarthy challenged Johnson in the primaries before the sitting president announced that he would not run again. An anti-establishment candidate, McCarthy quickly won the Wisconsin primary. Democratic Party leaders pushed Hubert Humphrey as their candidate in opposition to McCarthy, although they did not have him run in the primaries. Fellow candidate Robert Kennedy, brother of assassinated President John F. Kennedy, recognized McCarthy's youth appeal. While both McCarthy and Kennedy opposed the Vietnam War, McCarthy extended his lead among the youth when he made the war a principal focus of his campaign. Kennedy and McCarthy ran a tight campaign against one another, with each winning five major state primaries before Robert Kennedy was assassinated on June 5, 1968.

Prior to his assassination, Kennedy directed his attention to the poor and people of color. His youth support grew due to his policies and his youthful vigor. The possibility of a rebirth of John F. Kennedy's Camelot mystique was in the air. The assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. on April 4, 1968, swung Democratic support towards Kennedy. Race riots erupted around the country. At an Indianapolis rally, Kennedy informed a diverse crowd of supporters of King's assassination in Memphis. He empathized with the crowd before calling for peace, saying, "What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another; and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black" (Kennedy 1968). After his speech, no riots occurred in Indianapolis. Kennedy's speech swung public opinion towards him, and he likely would have been in contention for the Democratic nomination after

his primary victory in California. However, Kennedy's assassination shortly after the victory ended the dream.

To say that Dr. King's assassination was an American tragedy is an understatement. Black Panther Stokely Carmichael famously said, "When white America killed Dr. King last night, she declared war on us. It would have been better if she had killed Rap Brown ... or Stokely Carmichael. But when she killed Dr. King, she lost it ... He was the one man in our race who was trying to teach our people to have love, compassion and mercy for white people" (Cokley 2018). Johnson named April 7 a national day of mourning. King had influenced the Hippies, and his death affected on the 1968 election. The death of Martin Luther King, Jr. affects racial conversations to this day. Much has been written on King's assassination. King's principle of non-violence was picked up by the Hippie movement, and pacifism remained at the center of Hippie protests for many years. This changed with the Days of Rage and the rise of the Weather Underground, and some Hippies began to utilize forms of violent resistance by 1969.

Black Panther Party treasurer Bobby Hutton was killed on April 6, just two days after the assassination of Dr. King. He was in a car with fellow Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver and several other Party members. After fleeing from Oakland police, they engaged in a ninety-minute gunfight with police. When Cleaver was injured, Hutton went out to surrender, his hands raised, and the police shot him. He was the first prominent Panther Party member to be killed by police. Cleaver later admitted that he had provoked the conflict, wanting to gain press against the racist police. However, Bobby Hutton being killed was not part of his plan, though it illustrated the point Cleaver tried to make. In killing Hutton, the Oakland police were racist. The racism of Hutton's killing became especially evident after a grand jury handed down a verdict of justifiable homicide to the police officer who shot him. The murder of a second unarmed black man

immediately following Dr. King's assassination caused an uproar among the Panthers. Rather than riot, the Panthers continued to organize (Austin 2006, 165-168).

Between the killings of King, Hutton, and Kennedy, anti-war protestors began to converge on Chicago, well before the Democratic convention. While many were radical protestors, they were not violently dangerous like the Weather Underground became. Chicago's mayor, The Honorable Richard J. Daley, pitted law enforcement against anti-war demonstrators on April 27, 1968, by ordering police to "shoot to kill" arsonists and "shoot to maim" looters. Moretta writes, "Daley made clear his position on protestors when he unleashed the city's police, who viciously clubbed and maced 6,500 fellow Chicagoan antiwar marchers, who were shocked at the heavy-handed response to their placid vigilance" (2018, 268). The tactics of Daley and the Chicago police foreshadowed events at the August Democratic convention, particularly because Daley was took the convention personally. Daley considered the event to be *his* convention in *his* city.^{xxxiii} However, even before the Chicago convention, many election problems were still to come.

McCarthy was still ahead of Kennedy in the popular vote, but his campaign lost steam. With his victory in the California primary on June 5, 1968, it appeared Robert Kennedy was the presumptive candidate. After his acceptance speech Kennedy walked to the kitchen of the Ambassador Hotel, where an assassin's bullets riddled him. Isserman and Kazin write, "The public's grief was nearly as massive as that which had followed his brother's murder less than five years earlier. In the wake of another Kennedy martyrdom, McCarthy seemed the Democrats' only alternative to four more years of bloodletting and rancor, at home and in Southeast Asia" (2008, 243). Despite McCarthy's popularity and legitimacy, Vice President Hubert Humphrey used the power of the Democratic machine to obtain the nomination without actually competing

in the primaries. Humphrey and the Old Left wanted to continue Johnson's Vietnam policies, and they stole the nomination to achieve their goals.

Several weeks before the Chicago Democratic Convention, the Republicans held their convention in Miami. The Republican Convention was notable for several reasons. Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew easily became the presidential and vice-presidential nominees. The event was the first Republican Convention to take place below the Mason-Dixon line since before the Civil War. Small pockets of protest formed outside the convention hall. ABC began their series of debates between far-right pundit William F. Buckley, Jr. and far-left author Gore Vidal, whose comments were indicative of the nation's political and cultural divisions.^{xxxiv} The Republican Convention was far less controversial than its Democratic counterpart.

In Chicago, Daley was fully mobilized for the Chicago Democratic Convention and had rallied the police force for any possible outbursts. Daley was concerned about the Hippies, New Left, SDS, other anti-war protestors, and especially the Yippies. The Yippies were founded on New Year's Eve 1967 by Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, and Paul Krassner (Moretta 2018, 258). They were a performative branch of the Hippies like the Diggers, but the Yippies were far more involved in national politics. They desired, as one of Hoffman's books was titled, "Revolution for the Hell of It." Isserman and Kazin write, "Yippies viewed America much the way the Beats had in the 1950s: as a boring, sexually repressive place, run by anxious men who made war against the poor, the powerless, and the unconventional" (2008, 243). The Yippies stood against both the Old and New Left, the latter Yippies viewed as "dogmatic Puritans," always talking about revolution, but never taking action (Moretta 2018 258-259). Because of their opposition, Daley viewed the Yippies as a dangerous, radical group. How dangerous they were is debatable, but they were radical. After the Democratic convention riots, Hoffman, Rubin, Krassner and

other Yippies were considered enemies of the state. Besides the Yippies, the protest was also organized by the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, otherwise known as MOBE. Their leaders were chairman David Dellinger and organizer Rennie Davis. The SDS also joined the protest, including founder Tom Hayden. All these groups joining together was enough to incur the wrath of Daley and the Chicago police.

Daley took an instant dislike to the Yippies after hearing of their plans to disrupt the convention. Daley was particularly anxious because the Yippies had, “mused about lacing the city’s water supply with LSD and predicted that thousands of young rebels would float nude in Lake Michigan, after making love in the parks and on the beaches. Hardly any of this was serious, but media outlets lapped it up” (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 243-244). As discussed in the previous chapter, Hoffman had made similar wild claims about the Hippies’ March on Washington. As a tactic in their war against the counterculture coming to Chicago, Daley and the media exaggerated the possibility of drug use. The media widely disseminated the fearmongering, but the threats seemed more at home in a Hippiesploitation film than in reality. The theme of Hippies dosing people with LSD is found in several Hippiesploitation films, particularly in *Wild in the Streets* (Shear 1968). The 1968 film preceded the Democratic Convention riots and was oddly prescient of the shape of things to come, not in terms of the LSD dosing, but in the importance of the youth vote in the upcoming election.

The Yippies attempted to follow proper procedures for their protests. They applied for permits to protest in Soldier Field and Grant Park, and to protest and camp in Lincoln Park. Daley and other city officials denied all permits, with the exception of a brief window to protest in Grant Park. The Yippies predicted more than half a million young people would come out in protest. In actuality, attendance was closer to ten thousand. However, Moretta writes, “What

Daley failed to reckon with was that although only 10,000 protesters had shown up in Chicago ... a good percentage ... was ready, willing, and able to engage his police force in open street fighting; that they would not ‘turn tail’ and run” (2018, 274). Chicago’s black population avoided the event, as did many other people of color. They viewed the protests as “a white folks’ thing” (Moretta 2018, 268), though Black Panther chairman Bobby Seale joined in the protest.

Conflict began on August 23, when Rubin officially announced Pigasus as the Youth International Party nominee for president. Pigasus was a live pig they believed was a far more accurate portrayal of Democratic political life in 1968.^{xxxv} Rubin did so on the grounds of the Chicago Civic Center, where protestors had no permit to congregate. Police arrested Rubin, folk singer Phil Ochs, and seven other Yippies. Street fighting began on August 25, when police tried to oust one thousand Hippies from Lincoln Park, citing an 11:00 pm curfew. The Yippies began chanting “pig” at the police, who responded by launching tear gas into the crowd and attacking with batons. Protests continued through Wednesday, August 28, when the main riot began. In the convention hall, Hubert Humphrey accepted the Democratic nomination while Vidal and Buckley jostled verbally, but in Grant Park, the real fight was just beginning.^{xxxvi}

Violence between police and Hippies, Yippies, and affiliated groups began at 3:30 pm, when a young man climbed a flagpole to lower the American flag and raise a red cloth. Police took the supposedly provocative act as justification to arrest the unnamed youth and attack other protestors. Many Yippies and MOBE members believed the act was the work of “agent provocateurs” (Moretta 2017, 277). They responded by throwing paint, urine, and eggs at the police, who were better equipped with riot gear, tear gas, and billy clubs. MOBE organizer Rennie Davis tried to calm the tensions between police and protestors but was beaten by police. After tending to the injured Davis, Hayden grabbed a microphone and said:

The city and the military machinery it aimed at us won't permit us to protest in an organized fashion. Therefore, we must move out of this park in groups throughout the city, and turn this overheated military machine against itself. Let us make sure if blood flows, it flows all over the city. If they use gas against us, let us make sure they use gas against their own citizens. (Moretta 2018, 277)

Protestors made their way towards the Convention Hall, and "The Battle of Michigan Avenue" began. Allen Ginsberg tried to quell the violence by starting an "om" chant, but the mantra was not enough to stop the police brutality. Police attacked anyone not wearing law enforcement or military uniforms: "bystanders, demonstrators, medics, reporters, and photographers, all became targets" (277). Police pushed crowds of people against the window of the Hilton Hotel's Haymarket Lounge so tightly that the glass broke and people fell through. Delegates inside the Convention Hall had mostly stopped watching the nomination proceedings and instead looked out the windows at the police beating protestors and average citizens on the street. Most victims had not raised a hand against police or been carrying weapons. News cameras broadcast footage of the riot across the country for the next seventeen minutes. Connecticut senator and anti-war delegate Abe Ribicoff took the podium to denounce Daley and the Chicago police, accusing them of "Gestapo tactics." Daley responded, "Fuck you, you Jew son of a bitch. You, lousy motherfucker, go home." Daley's retort was not picked up by microphones at the time but was read by lip-readers after the event (Isserman and Kazin 2008, 245).

As police committed violence indiscriminately, the crowd began to chant, "The whole world is watching" for the news cameras broadcasting to the nation. Polls following the riot showed that people supported the tactics of Daley and the Chicago police by a two-to-one

margin. Sixty-three percent of African Americans polled believed the police had used excessive force, while only ten percent of whites polled felt the same. CBS received thousands of angry letters in response to its riot coverage. Roughly ninety percent of CBS viewers did not approve of the network's perceived bias towards the protestors (245-246).^{xxxvii}

The police response to the Chicago Democratic Convention protests illustrates the opposition of powerful hegemonic forces to a peaceful revolution. Hippies referred to white, racist, anti-progressive political leaders as "The Establishment" or "The Man." This group included Nixon, Humphrey, Daley, and Johnson. Hippies believed "The Establishment" had quelled an uprising in Chicago and had vilified the counterculture through cultural hegemony, a term coined by scholar and political prisoner Antonio Gramsci. Cultural hegemony describes the process of class subordination through pervasive ideological structures that maintain power and gain mass consent for the ruling class. Hippies understood this concept and tried to use their cultural image to battle hegemony by directly opposing "The Establishment." Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin were especially adept at using their Hip celebrity status to give a voice and face to the movement. Todd Gitlin writes, "Although his media-summoned constituency failed to descend on Chicago for the demonstrations in 1968, [Jerry] Rubin's celebrity status remained untouched, for the Chicago city government, the police, and the national apparatus of repression took his media reputation at face value and thereby ratified it" (Gitlin 1980, 173-174). The U.S. media and government thereby confirmed Rubin as a Hippie celebrity. At the same time, because he of his Hip celebrity persona, the media was able to utilize a wicked image of the entire movement, equating his bad behavior with the whole counterculture.

The "national apparatus of repression" turned public opinion against the counterculture through a narrative of supposed violence and inflammatory behavior. In the name of law and

order, six hundred sixty-eight arrests occurred, nearly one thousand citizens were sent to the hospital, and police reported one hundred ninety-two injuries. Eight police officers who were charged with violating protestors' civil rights were later acquitted. Those best remembered for the Chicago Democratic Convention riots were the eight people charged in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial, which began in March 1969. Among those tried were Yippie leaders Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, MOBE leaders David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, former SDS leader Tom Hayden, Black Panther leader Bobby Seale, and protestors John Froines and Lee Weiner.^{xxxviii} The government accused them of crossing state lines with the intent to start a riot, teach the making of incendiary devices, and commit acts to impede law enforcement. The trial was a farce, not only due to the defendants' outrageous courtroom behavior, but because it exemplified a controlled use of the judicial system by the "national apparatus of repression" to convict people perceived to threaten the status quo (Sharman 2016, 1).

In 1968, Hubert Humphrey lost the presidential election to Richard Nixon. Humphrey's loss was due, in part, to a lack of youth support and George Wallace having split the vote by running as an Independent. One of the few candidates to represent any countercultural sentiment was Pat Paulsen, who ran as a joke candidate as a tie-in with *The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour*. Nixon escalated the Vietnam War and was perhaps a greater enemy of the Hippies than Johnson or Humphrey.

1968 Hippiesploitation and Hippie Films

The counterculture was still new to most of the public, so Hollywood was more open to positive depictions of Hippies. Two mainstream Hippie films were released in 1968: *Skidoo* (Preminger) and *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas*. Both films showed that directors were trying to better understand the counterculture. While this was a positive step, mainstream filmmakers

depict Hippie life, style, or ethos slightly more realistically. Hollywood made multiple mistakes in their early Hippie films, including casting older, established stars over younger, hip actors. The decision made Hippies outsiders in their own films.

Skidoo was the first mainstream Hippie film of 1968, but it plays more like a mobster comedy, with the Hippies relegated to the background. A memorable scene involves Jackie Gleason dropping acid with Groucho Marx, who plays a mob boss named God, showing both of the older actors were trying to be Hip. The film relies on older stars like Gleason, Marx, Carol Channing, Burgess Meredith, Mickey Rooney, Caesar Romero, and George Raft, rather than showcasing young stars as in *The Happening*.^{xxxix} *Skidoo* was a financial and critical failure. In a 2011 review of the DVD release, New York Times columnist Dave Kehr wrote that the film was “politically aligned with the kids... but culturally bound to the grown-ups” (2011). *Skidoo* attempted a progressive depiction of Hippies, but it fell short.

The pressbook ads promote a progressive Hippie portrayal while making some of the same mistakes as other Hippie films. The use of drugs and sex to sell Hippie characters is the most significant concern. The poster uses Hippie body paint to sell the supposed sexiness of the film. It features a woman with her fly open and the film’s title and logo painted low on her upper groin. By contrast, distributor-produced news story, “Sympathetic With the Hippies,” states that director Otto Preminger made the film to “present the hippie movement as symptomatic of youth’s hope for a better world” (Paramount Pictures 1968, [14]). The film presents its Hippie characters in a generally positive light, but they are difficult for audiences to identify with, because they are monolithic background characters rather than individuals. Characters routinely make jokes at Hippies’ expense like, “nowadays you can’t tell the boys from the girls,” referring to their long hair. *Skidoo* gets most of the stylistic details of the Hippies right in their speech,

dress, music, as well as understanding Hippies' relationship with the police, and views on sex, drugs, and power structure. Nuance was new for mainstream Hippie films, but Hollywood was clearly making strides in understanding the counterculture.

Skidoo was not the only mainstream Hippie film to display a largely positive take on the counterculture. *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas* was also released in 1968.^{x1} The film stars Peter Sellers as Harold, an over-30, Jewish lawyer who lives a straight life and is engaged to be married. After a series of unfortunate events, he ends up with a loaner car painted with wild, psychedelic colors. He gives a ride to a Hippie named Nancy (Leigh Taylor-Young). She rewards him by giving him cannabis brownies, unbeknownst to him. The dosing causes Harold, his fiancée Joyce (Joyce Van Patton), and his parents to get high. He enjoys the feeling of being high so much that he abandons his conformist life to become a Hippie. Harold returns to his straight lifestyle after Nancy tells him monogamy is "square." However, he then leaves his fiancée at the altar for a second time, declaring that something in the world has to be "more beautiful."

I Love You, Alice B. Toklas further illustrates Hollywood's growing flirtation with the counterculture. From a narrative point of view, the film tries more seriously to comprehend the Hippies than does *Skidoo*. The film understands the counterculture more than other Hippie films, but it falls into the familiar trap of casting an older, established star in the lead role. The main problems of *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas* are the casting and the framing of the script to tell the story from an outsider's perspective, rather than focusing primarily on the young Hippies. Because the casting focused on the older outsiders like Sellers, the Hippies in the film are monolithic, with the exception of Nancy. Nancy's character is vital to understanding the positive depiction of the Hippies in the film. She has sexual agency and is not shamed for her choices.

Her take on monogamy clashes with Harold's views on sex and relationships. While her beliefs cause them to break up, the film does not depict Nancy as wicked or sinful. Nancy is also not shamed for her use of marijuana, and the film takes a progressive stance by not reproaching the use of cannabis.^{xli} Because this is a mainstream Hippie film, it gives a reasonably balanced look at the drug. While the filmmakers show Hippies as strange from Harold's perspective, the film is generally positive in its portrayal of the counterculture.

None of the mainstream Hippie films in 1967 and 1968 could best the authenticity of Hippie life shown in Hippiesploitation films such as *The Trip* or *Psych-Out*. However, the growing attempt to understand the counterculture paid off in 1969 with mainstream releases like *Alice's Restaurant* (Penn) and *Medium Cool* (Wexler), which featured Hippies as the lead characters and worked to portray them accurately. Mainstream films depicted Hippies more positively than their contemporary exploitation films. In the Hollywood Renaissance, mainstream auteur directors were primarily left leaning and had some degree of artistic freedom.

In 1968, AIP distributed two significant Hippiesploitation films: *Psych-Out* and *Wild in the Streets*. From a youth perspective, both films have positive things to say about the counterculture, often giving them some respect and deference. Hippiesploitation was generally more critical of the counterculture and often took advantage of moral panic by portraying Hippies in dismissive, inflammatory, and harmful ways. These two films are partial exceptions, in particular *Psych-Out*, which delivers decent depictions of its Hippie characters. *Wild in the Streets* implies youth culture has the potential to do plenty of good in the political world. However, it also offers a confused examination of youth culture by showing Hippies in power passing horrific laws. *Psych-Out*, as well as *Wild in the Streets* to a lesser extent, actively tries to understand the growing Hippie movement. Both films contain moments that the "silent" and

“greatest” generations might have viewed as abhorrent or even horrific. On the other hand, the films present unique characters with relatable traits, making them sympathetic and relatable for Hip audiences.

Psych-Out tells the story of Jenny (Susan Strasberg), a deaf girl who runs away from home to search for her brother, Steve (Bruce Dern), now a Hippie living in Haight-Ashbury. Jenny meets Stoney (Jack Nicholson), who offers to help her find her brother. As they search, their relationship becomes romantic. However, Jenny is unaware that Stoney practices polyamory and becomes jealous when he pursues another sexual relationship at a party. They get into an argument, and Jenny accepts some fruit juice from Dave (Dean Stockwell), Stoney’s former bandmate. She does not know it is laced with the LSD derivative STP and Dave does not know she takes it. She begins tripping and finds her brother, only to watch him die in a burning house. Now fully experiencing a bad trip, she wanders off, as Stoney and Dave desperately try to find her. They eventually save her from being run over on the Golden Gate Bridge. The film’s ending leaves the results of these events open to interpretation. While Stoney and Dave did save Jenny, how will the STP affect her in the long run? Was her brother’s death real? Is the ending positive or negative for Jenny? By ending the film in this manner, the filmmakers leave room for suspense and some fear of drugs, but also for empathy with the main characters.

Dick Clark Productions produced the film, which explains why the film is so sympathetic to Hippies. Due to his time on *American Bandstand* (ABC 1952-1989), Clark often appealed to and empathized with the youth. While this was largely for financial gain, he genuinely tried to reach and understand youth audiences, especially the Hippie movement. In an interview, Clark spoke positively of the Hippies:

I think you can retain out of this very strange period that young people saw a lot of things that older people didn't see. They make a lot of mistakes, as kids normally do. But they began to throw the lights on their thoughts on the Vietnam War, that sometimes maybe the United States could make a mistake, that you didn't have to be totally a leftist to have these ideas, but you would be thinking about it. I think it was the first time, probably in American history that the young people really taught the old people how to open their eyes. (Carson 2003b)

Psych-Out is the closest a Hippiesploitation film ever came to capturing life in Haight-Ashbury during the Summer of Love. As discussed in the previous chapter, several non-fiction exploitation documentaries filmed in the Haight, but *Psych-Out* was one of the only fictional films to show what life was like during the Summer of Love. The filmmakers effectively captured the atmosphere of Haight-Ashbury because they shot on location. Clark used Hippies as extras and Hells Angels members as security. The latter decision proved to be disastrous at Altamont, because Clark tied the groups too closely together and did not acknowledge their different ideologies, citing a shared love of marijuana. Clark mentions a Hippie said to him, "Ah, the straight folks have come to exploit us" (Carson 2003b). He and director Richard Rush slowly built trust with the Hippies, casting many in extra roles. His cast had countercultural credentials, such as Nicholson and Strasberg, who had recently worked on Corman's *The Trip*. The costumes, setting, and attitudes of the Hippie characters fits well with examples from the era. The film includes a scene meant to recreate the "Death of the Hippy" funeral, which was the Digger's performative way to end the Summer of Love. Rush matches the tone of the event with a reasonable degree of accuracy, despite a Hells Angel member with a swastika on his jacket who is incongruous with the rest of the Hippies at the funeral. The soundtrack features music by

Hippie groups The Seeds and The Strawberry Alarm Clock. Clark's knowledge of the music business helped in this aspect. The natural Hippie dialogue also helps the film stand out from the many Hippie films with incorrect slang or stilted line delivery.

Another way *Psych-Out* portrays Hippies positively is by focusing on three characters with story arcs and likeable qualities. The film also allows them to be flawed, making them among the first well-rounded Hippie characters outside of *The Trip*. Jenny is an outsider at first but later becomes a Hippie. Her reason for choosing her path is evident because her friends are in the counterculture. Stoney cares about Jenny, which he shows by helping her search for her brother with pure motives. He also does not place value in monogamy. This depiction does not shame him but allows him freedom during the sexual revolution happening in the Haight. His feelings for Jenny, whether out of romance or loyalty, eventually trump his lust. He and Dave rescue Jenny after she has a bad STP trip. Dave is a drug dealer, but he does not want Jenny to take the drug. He also does not like that Stoney is not clear with Jenny about his sexual desires before they begin a relationship. All of the characters are flawed, but real and mostly likable, giving them a sense of reality and allowing for relatability.

The one point on which Clark and the Hippies did not agree was the use of drugs. Like almost every Hippiesploitation film except for *The Trip*, *Psych-Out* creates an atmosphere of moral panic about drugs. In a gruesome scene, one Hippie takes STP and imagines that his hand is rotting off and his friends are zombies. He tries to cut off his hand with a rotating saw before his friends stop him. Clark said, "One of the things that worried me most about the drug culture was it was a waste. I knew it was wrong, I knew you shouldn't be doing it, but it was very difficult to come out with an overt message saying 'stop children don't take drugs, just say no' because they'd turn it off like that. So, if we're going to make a film like this, let's slip a few

things in there, let's show the raggedy hair edges of this thing" (Carson 2003b). The film's anti-drug message is not as subtle as Clark intended, but it does portray the drug users as characters who have consistently bad narcotics experiences rather than as inherently bad people.

The film's marketing reflects its anti-drug message and its heightened Hippie experience. However, the advertising is more familiar with the film's contents than with actual Hippie life. Posters and print ads feature taglines such as, "These are the Pleasure Lovers! They'll ask for a dime with hungry eyes... but they'll give you love – for NOTHING!" (American International Pictures 1968, *Psych-Out* [1]). Another reads, "Taste a moment of madness... Listen to the sound of purple/green" (American International Pictures 1968, *Psych-Out* [4]). The taglines imply several things about the Hippies, some of which were accurate. Hippies panhandled in the Haight, and Free Love was well known. The second tagline references the psychedelic nature of the film by saying one could "taste the color" of either purple or green, depending on the ad. It also warns that consuming such mind-altering drugs could lead to moments of madness, a few of which appear on film during the various STP scenes. The pressbook proposes several "seat selling slants" of ballyhoo, such as the standard suggestions to have Hippies outside the theatre and conduct a "'best drawing' contest of their conceptions of The Strawberry Alarm Clock, or The Seeds" (American International Pictures 1968, *Psych-Out* [8]). One bit of ballyhoo suggests that theatre owners "Hire a Hippie to cover your downtown area appropriately bannered with 'PSYCH-OUT' signs." The pressbook also claims that the film's producer, Clark, is a "built in sell," which was not a stretch given his popularity, particularly at the time of *American Bandstand*.

Several pre-written stories in the pressbook highlight the distancing of the Hippies from the mainstream, as well as the hegemonic forces keeping the counterculture down. The first,

“Dick Clark Nearly Arrested in New Film Producer Role” (American International Pictures 1968, *Psych-Out* [3]), discusses how the police almost arrested Clark for associating with the Hippies. According to the article, the confusion arose because Clark and his actors did not have a permit to film readily on hand. A crew member finally found the permit, preventing the police from arresting them. The article does not directly address the topic of clashes between the Hippies and the police. At this point, Hippies could be arrested for little more than existing, as could anyone associating with them, but the article says that Clark being arrested would have been “out of character.” Other articles highlight the soundtrack featuring The Strawberry Alarm Clock and The Seeds and the inclusion of young cast members Strasberg, Stockwell, and Dern. A noteworthy article on Bruce Dern, “Actor’s ‘Psych-Out’ Hippie Role Belies Social Register Background” highlights Dern’s upper-class background and historically military family. The article notes that Dern taking such a role was unusual because of his background. While Dern claimed he did not use drugs during this time (Carson 2003b), his image became synonymous with his countercultural role. The promotional story is particularly odd because the article contradicts his countercultural persona, even though it was factually accurate. The story highlights a hegemonic class clash by implying that Dern was safe because he was not a Hippie. Instead, he was supposedly a morally upstanding young person from a respectable family only playing a Hippie.

Wild in the Streets debuted at the box office in May 1968 and is prescient of counterculture involvement in the presidential election, due to the importance of the youth vote in the decision. The film also directly comments on a pertinent political movement of the day: the lowering of the voting age to 18 to match the draft age. The movement is referenced in the film’s soundtrack and marketing materials. *Wild in the Streets* is particularly important because

one can read the film in two different ways, depending on the generation of the viewer. To younger viewers or Hip, over-35 viewers, the film is a political farce. However, it reads as a horror film to an older audience afraid of losing power to younger generations.

The film follows young rock star Max Frost (Christopher Jones), who is first seen blowing up his parents' car and running away. When he next appears, he is the lead vocalist of a successful rock group called The Troopers. The group also features his 15-year-old prodigy attorney Billy Cage (Kevin Coughlin) on guitar, his girlfriend, Sally LeRoy (Diane Varsi), on keyboard, and a black Hippie named Stanley X (Richard Pryor) on drums. Senate candidate Johnny Fergus (Hal Holbrook) hires Max's band to play at a rally to lower the voting age to 18. Max improvises the song "Fourteen or Fight" about his belief that the voting age should be lowered to 14. The song argues that the real issues of power in the country are not on racial or class lines, but on generational lines, in the lyrics, "Black Power, White Power, That's old hat now, Fourteen or Fight, Youth power that's where the whole thing's at now, Fourteen or Fight." After political negotiations, Max agrees to campaign for Fergus with the new idea, "Fifteen and Ready." Fergus is elected to the Senate, and Sally is elected to Congress after a California congressman dies. Sally proposes a constitutional amendment for the "Fourteen or Fight" cause. Max and his crew spike the Washington, D.C. water supply with LSD, getting both houses of Congress high, and the amendment passes.

Sally passes a law allowing Max to run for President at age 24, although Max is annoyed that he must run as a Republican. After Max is elected, he implements a mandatory retirement age of 35 and puts anyone overage into a camp where they are force-fed LSD. The new law includes Max's parents (Bert Freed and Shelley Winters), who have an adverse reaction to the dope. Youthful revolutions break out around the world, young people gain control of the

economy, the United States sends food to developing countries, and the United States becomes “the most purely hedonistic society the world has ever known.” Max meets some young children at the end of the film, who say, “We’re gonna put everyone over 10 out of business.” He realizes another intergenerational war is imminent.

Wild in the Streets ends on a darkly comical note: what would Hippies and other young people do if given the power? The idea of absolute power corrupting absolutely is present within the film, as is the generational divide between the Boomer generation and the “silent” and “greatest” generations. However, while the film acknowledges that power corrupts, the United States flourishes economically under Frost’s leadership, and the world’s nations coexist and share resources peacefully. Therefore, *Wild in the Streets* gives a very mixed message about the possibility of youths, i.e. Hippies, gaining power. The film’s depiction of Hippies has three significant problems.

The first problem is Hippies did not desire national or political power, as discussed in previous chapters. They wanted to exist as smaller, interacting tribes with little-to-no power structure. Hippies were not running for any major political office. The Yippies, for example, were more performative anti-war activists than they were a legitimate political party. The Hippies just wanted to be left alone to make their own way in the world. Even after the Hippie movement declined, few tried to attain any political power. In 1976, Tom Hayden ran for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate, but he was 37 at the time and had moved away from what little remained of the Hippie movement. Eventually, he served in the California State Assembly and the State Senate (Rosen 2016). Few Hippies beyond Hayden even attempted to enter politics and even fewer during the time of the movement. Therefore, the film does not know quite what to do with the Hippie characters.

The second main problem is that the film implies young people of the time were all Hippies. This characterization is overly simplistic at best and a gross generalization at worst. The Hippies only made up a small percentage of the counterculture. In turn, the counterculture was only a small percentage of youth groups in the long 1960s. For example, Richard Pryor's character of Stanley X is supposed to be a Hippie. As mentioned in previous chapters, Black Hippies existed, but most countercultural people of color often found their way into groups like the Black Panthers. Even his name, Stanley X, signifies him as belonging in a group like the Panthers or the Nation of Islam. However, his style associates him with Hippie culture far more than with any other countercultural group. Almost all of the young people in *Wild in the Streets* are identifiable as Hippies with a few minor exceptions, such as the group of 10-year-olds Max runs into at the end of the film.

The film's last problem is its illustration of handful of young people receiving in-depth character studies are generally not likable. Max, for example, is a juvenile delinquent from the start. When he gains power, he becomes megalomaniacal by putting people into LSD camps. However, *Wild in the Streets* depicts the older characters as just as corrupt and unlikeable as Max and his group. These portrayals are worthwhile because the film puts all the characters on a level moral playing field. While none of the other young characters are relatable, they do have one advantage over the older characters in the film; they are cool. None of the characters allow for empathy, but the younger group is exciting and different from the older politicians. Multiple readings of the characters in the film are possible by portraying the characters in this way. Hence, the film depicts Hippies and older generations as more similar than different, with Hipness being the only separating factor.

Moreover, *Wild in the Streets* depicts Max and the Hippies in power as regressive, evil people who put older generations in camps and dose them with LSD. The film reads as a horror film during these scenes and during Shelley Winters's bad trip. The film treats the use of drugs farcically, but with a tinge of fear and moral panic. Varying depictions of acid trips exist in both Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films. *The Trip* attempts neutral authenticity, *Psych-Out* utilizes scare tactics, and *Riot on Sunset Strip* implies that LSD is a date-rape drug. *Wild in the Streets* treats acid as a joke where even the bad trips are fun to watch, but it makes the same mistake as *Riot on Sunset Strip* by showing Hippies dosing people without their consent. The film tries to deliver a sympathetic view of the counterculture but ultimately fails. *Wild in the Streets* helped to reinforce the hegemonic power structures that continue to hold back youth movements, particularly those involved with race or class.

The marketing for *Wild in the Streets* is unique for a Hippiesploitation film. The pressbook includes ads, posters, ballyhoo, distributor-produced newspaper advertising, and the complete short story the film is based on, "The Day It All Happened, Baby!" by Robert Thom. The inclusion of a short story in a pressbook is unusual because theater owners and newspapers were their primary recipients. It may have been an attempt to lend the film some literary credentials, but republishing the material was not an option for exhibitors. Most of the film's taglines mention that fifty-two percent of the country was under 25, implying that the social change in the film could happen in reality. Other taglines evoke fear in older audiences with lines like, "If you're thirty, you're through!" and "The old tigers are scared, baby! I want the two-car kids and the one-bedroom kids, the mother-lovers and the ones who can't stand the sight of the old lady! I want all of you! Let's see if those tigers can stop the future!" (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [16]). The second tagline suggests that generational and class

unity could aid the seizure of power from older generations. The pressbook features ballyhoo around the potential election in the film. One encourages theatre owners to post campaign posters saying, “Elect Max Frost President” around town. Another proposes inviting “local political and government officials” and “us[ing] their local comments in your radio and newspaper ads” (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [20]). The pressbook also offers tie-ins for the film’s novelization, soundtrack album, and *Wild in the Streets*/Elect Max Frost whoopie cushions (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [22-23]). The last tie-in highlights the film’s comedic nature, although no whoopie cushions are found in the film.

The Hippiesploitation film’s soundtrack is one of the first to include music that real Hippies were creating and listening to.^{xliii} The music is harder rock than most films were using, though not quite the acid rock that Hippie music later became. Each song has a political message, which was authentic to Hip rock. Some songs call for youth political action, such as “14 or Fight,” “Fifty Two Per Cent,” and “The Shape of Things to Come.” AIP released a 1968 promotional album called *The Shape of Things to Come* by the fictional Max Frost and the Troopers, primarily recorded by the band The 13th Power. Two additional songs by The Troopers appear in the AIP biker film *The Glory Stompers* (Lanza 1968). AIP wanted to profit from the film and create a buzz by gaining a following for Max Frost and the Troopers. Considering the fictional group had two albums, four singles, and an appearance on *The Glory Stompers* soundtrack, such an idea is not far-fetched (AllMusic). The pressbook acknowledges the soundtrack’s importance by including a direct advertisement for the album. Also included is the distributor-produced newspaper advertisement, “Music Makes the Plot Go Round” (American

International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [12]). The piece announces that composers Barry Mann and Cynthia Weil wrote the songs to fit the film's plot.

The pressbook's other distributor-produced newspaper advertisements primarily feature stories about the cast, with notable exceptions that reference the film's politics. The story, "Has Youth Become Sole Representative Citizen? Asks Author of Film," discusses Thom's short story, screenplay, and novelization. In the article, Thom states that *Wild in the Streets* "is an indictment of the adults in America who all seem to want to be 12-year-olds, those who would abdicate their responsibility in the running of the country. This state of affairs seems to leave only the 14 and 15-year-olds with the ambition to run the country and see if they can do a better job" (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [11]). The article goes on to claim that such a prospect would be "frightening" for the country. Another story, "'Wild' Theme May Have Precedent in History," discusses the only other progressive youth movement distributors could recall: the early thirteenth century Children's Crusade (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [13]). Lastly, the headline, "'Wild in the Streets' Supervised by Studio Heads as AIP Special," shows how popular Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films were becoming at the box-office. AIP's Samuel Z. Arkoff and James A. Nicholson took a particular interest in the making of the film (American International Pictures 1968, *Wild in the Streets* [11]).

The popularity of Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films continued for several years and reflected the dominant cultural opinions of Hippies. Representations worsened in Hippiesploitation films, with the major exception being Roger Corman's *Gass-s-s*, discussed in the conclusion. Mainstream Hippie films continued to portray Hippies in a comparatively positive light, despite cultural events continuing turning against the counterculture. The

dominant culture was also forming negative opinions of the Hippies, as evidenced by the opinion polls after the Chicago Democratic Convention riot. Mainstream filmmakers achieved these positive depictions by centering their films on individual, likable Hippie characters, rather than trying to generalize the counterculture. The final chapters of this dissertation reveal a consistent pattern of negative representations of the counterculture in Hippiesploitation and positive depictions in mainstream Hippie films.

1968 was a negative year for Hippies in culture, yet their representation on film were becoming more positive. While Hippies had incoming president Richard Nixon with whom to contend, their film counterparts were presented as worried about drugs and sex. 1969 would see mainstream Hippie films begin to better understand the counterculture, while Hippiesploitation moved towards a more obviously antagonistic view of Hippies. Exploitation filmmakers sensationalized Hippies' drug use and sexual habits, making money by doing so. The war between the dominant culture and the counterculture began in Chicago. Tensions continued to rise into the next year and beyond.

CHAPTER V. “THEY MIGHT THINK IT’S A MOVEMENT”: HOLLYWOOD EMBRACES
THE HIPPIES AND THE WAR COMES HOME, 1969

In 1967, Hippie singer/songwriter Arlo Guthrie released his debut album, *Alice’s Restaurant*. Guthrie, the son of Woody Guthrie, the grandfather of American folk music, dedicated the entire first side of his album to a song called “Alice’s Restaurant Massacree.” The song tells two stories. The first, about a Thanksgiving he spent at a restaurant run by his friend Alice, recounts his tale of being arrested and tried for littering. The second is about Guthrie being drafted and nearly conscripted until he reveals he had been convicted of a crime: littering. It concludes with some recommendations. One draftee could sing a few bars of “Alice’s Restaurant” to convince the draft officer he was insane. If two men sang “in harmony,” they could be disqualified for being gay. If three people sang the chorus, the draft board would think they were an organization, and if “fifty people a day [came] walking in singin’ a bar of Alice’s Restaurant and walking out . . . they may think it’s a movement” (1967).

In 1969, the anti-war movement imagined in Guthrie’s song came to fruition in the U.S. and in cinema, as Hollywood Renaissance director Arthur Penn adapted the song into the film *Alice’s Restaurant*. In 1969, Hippies’ evolution into a serious political movement created clashes with the “Establishment.” College students protested across the country, including at the University of California, Berkeley, where students trying to save a park encountered state-authorized police violence. At the Chicago Conspiracy Trial, which arose from the Democratic Convention riots, mainstream figures sought to discredit Hippies and anyone who opposed the war. Hippies became militant during the Days of Rage in Chicago in October 1969. Charles Manson’s “Family,” which mainstream media associated with Hippies despite their contrasting beliefs, carried out the “Helter Skelter” murders.

Representations of the Hippie counterculture show that by 1969, Hollywood had come to understand the basic tenants of Hip ethos and style, as revealed by the mainstream Hippie films *Alice's Restaurant* and *Medium Cool* (Wexler). The portrayals in these films depict Hippies more realistically and in a positive light. By comparison, the Hippiesploitation film *Alice in Acidland* (Greer) reflects the exploitation film industry's rejection of the counterculture because, like *The Acid Eaters* (Mabe 1968), it focuses on the evils of drugs and sex while profiting from sensationalized representations of Hippies. In 1969, one of the only Hippie films made by a member of the counterculture, Tobe Hooper's *Eggshells*, had a limited release. The film illuminates a connection between the original Hippie film cycle and New American Cinema. *Eggshells* also shows that some Hippies were able to make films during this era. The year 1969 is paradoxical - various events and cultural products undermined Hippies' political and social gains, yet it represented a moment when filmic representations of Hippies were at their most empathetic.

Hippies in 1969 Culture

In 1969, students demonstrated on campuses across the country, including at the University of California, Berkeley, just outside of San Francisco where the Hippie movement began. Protests were led by New Left organizations such as the Free Speech movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement, and the Students for a Democratic Society, or SDS, alongside civil rights groups such as the Black Panther Party, Chicano groups, and the Black, Yellow, and Red Power movements. Many protesting students were detained, arrested, and brutalized by police. The Hippies began a new environmental campaign on the UC Berkeley campus in the spring of 1969.

In 1968, UC Berkeley evicted students and Hippies and demolished their housing facilities in order to build a new section of student housing and athletic fields. The university ran out of funds before completing the project, leaving a muddy wasteland of weeds, broken-down cars, and chunks of unfinished foundation. On April 18, 1969, early Yippie Stew Albert wrote an article in the *Berkeley Barb*, an Underground Press periodical that had a circulation of roughly 95,000 (Rorabaugh 1989, 157). Albert called for Berkeley residents to reclaim the land and build a park on April 20.^{xliii} Despite an initially meager following, Albert's renegade public works project was joined by activists Wendy Schlesinger and Michael Delacour and "as motley a crew as ever gathered in one place for a single purpose. Hippies and radicals were joined by straight-looking professors, students concerned about the environment, curious neighborhood residents, and grandmothers" (1989, 157). Both the *San Francisco Telegraph* and the *Berkeley Barb* covered the building of the park, which was initially viewed as a success. On May 11, 1969, the People's Park was consecrated by Reverend Richard York of the Free Church (Rorabaugh 1989, 159).

However, California Governor Ronald Reagan opposed land reclamation and the People's Park. Reagan despised the Hippies and flippantly dismissed their principles and the construction of the park, which he interpreted as a direct challenge to his gubernatorial authority. In the early morning hours of May 15, 1969, California Highway Patrol officers and Berkeley police began tearing up large sections of the park. In response, protestors organized a large rally during the day. Rorabaugh writes, "The atmosphere was tense. The hippies were angry, the radicals ready for revenge, and even many students spoiled for a fight" (160). Law student and draft resistor Dan Siegel delivered a speech denouncing the destruction of Berkeley residents'

beloved park, and he declared, "Let's go down and take over the park" (160). Many protestors followed, ready to defend the land they had recently reclaimed.

Police took this response by Hippies, radicals, and students as provocation, and "Bloody Thursday" began. Protestors opened fire hydrants, threw rocks and bottles, attempted to tear down the fences police had put up, and briefly managed to chase off the police. Police officers launched tear gas and fired birdshot directly into the crowd, permanently blinding at least one man and killing student James Rector. Rector had been a bystander and was not directly involved in the protests (anon 1970, 15-16). Rorabaugh writes, "All in all, 110 people were shot. No one fired at the police" (1989, 162). Reagan later admitted that excessive police force resulted in grievous bodily harm, but he insensitively said, "It's very naive to assume that you should send anyone into that kind of conflict with a flyswatter" (Gustaitis, 1969). Twelve sheriff's deputies were indicted for misuse of authority (anon 1970, 15-16). Six thousand people were ultimately involved in "Bloody Thursday."

In the aftermath, Reagan called in the National Guard, but Hippies and other student protestors found creative ways of demonstrating against the police. They planted flowers along their route, and when police tore them out of the ground, they planted more. The National Guard complained that landing a helicopter in a park was difficult due to a kite being flown. Soon, kites flew throughout the People's Park. The Guard blocked students from entering campus, and when they tried to anyway, Hippies and protestors were sprayed with the most potent form of tear gas on the market. The gas affected more than just the Hippies and protestors on campus – it drifted and harmed people in nearby hospitals and pools. On May 23, 1969, the city council voted 8-1 to request that Reagan remove the Guard. Reagan did not fully remove the Guard from Berkeley, but he did take them off the streets and kept them at the ready (Rorabaugh 1989, 164-165).

The conflicts in Berkeley culminated on Memorial Day, May 26, 1969, when 25,000-50,000 people marched in the streets of Berkeley. As the Hippies had done during the March on Washington, Quakers in Berkeley put daisies in the rifle barrels of the Guardsmen on duty. Rorabaugh writes, "By this point the guardsmen had begun to talk with the local residents, especially the women, and many citizen soldiers sympathized with the desire of the local people to control their city" (1989, 166). UC Berkeley Chancellor Roger Heyns was prepared to lease the land back to the city of Berkeley in order to formalize the People's Park, but Reagan's opposition caused the measure to be voted down. Due to the occupation of the People's Park and subsequent fallout, conservatives never again gained significant power in Berkeley.

In a final attempt by government forces to maintain their power, UC Berkeley's Board of Regents turned a portion of the park into a parking lot. However, students overwhelmingly supported the park, and Rorabaugh writes, "no one parked there. Considering the shortage of parking in Berkeley, this result was noteworthy. This boycott showed solidarity with the hippies; it also avoided slashed tires. A militant was caught painting 'Reserved for James Rector' signs on the parking spaces" (166). In 1970, Reagan sent the National Guard in again to disrupt protests, saying, "If it takes a bloodbath, let's get it over with ... No more appeasement" (Cannon 2003, 295). Protests continued throughout the 1970s, and in a rare victory for the Hippies, a large portion of the People's Park did become a park.

Perhaps the greatest victory of the Hippie movement was Woodstock, which became a touchstone for the Hippie generation, despite its disastrous west coast follow-up, Altamont. The cultural importance of Woodstock cannot be understated. Moretta calls Woodstock, "a brief ray of hope for the hip counterculture's survival," (2017, 285). Between August 15-18, 1969, musical acts performed for over 400,000 Hippies and other youth. Despite venue trouble,

inclement weather, security concerns, and two deaths, most attendees recall Woodstock nostalgically. The event united the nation's youth and encouraged people to dream, in a haze of marijuana and acid, that music and peaceful revolution could change the world. Described as "3 Days of Peace & Music," Woodstock was one of the most iconic events of the 1960s and, indeed, the twentieth century.

Although remembered for its positive elements, Woodstock ran into difficulties from the start. The festival was originally slated to take place in Wallkill, New York, but due to a series of unfortunate events, it was held in a field on Max Yasgur's dairy farm in Bethel. The promoters sold over 186,000 tickets before the event began, but more than 50,000 people who had not purchased tickets showed up the first day. So many people arrived that they crashed through the concert's walls. The promoters lost a great deal of money and eventually announced that Woodstock was now a free concert. They had already invested in the concert and its surrounding materials, losing a great deal of money. They did not invest in the only two items that actually made money: the film and music albums. They also had difficulty bringing in performers and had to fly them in by helicopter. At the start of the event, only two musicians were on site: Tim Hardin, known for the song, "If I Were a Carpenter," and Richie Havens. Hardin was supposed to perform first, but he was "so stoned he could barely stand up let alone play guitar and sing" (291). Havens was not scheduled to appear until the next day, but the promoters begged him to perform until other musicians arrived. Havens played for three hours and eventually had to ad-lib songs. The performance, particularly his improvised song, "Freedom," made his career.

Problems continued for the promoters, attendees, and performers at Woodstock. When the roads became impassable, promoters urged prospective attendees, via radio, to turn back. Instead, people abandoned their vehicles on the side of the road and walked the rest of the way.

Among the relatively safe drugs was also dangerous “brown acid.” Two people were born at Woodstock, but two people died. One person was accidentally killed by a tractor, and the other died of an overdose (Engel 2019). Moretta writes of the relatively low death toll:

Given the size of the crowd, that only 800 individuals (or 2 percent, a minuscule figure in proportion to the number of human beings) had to be treated for taking too much dope was rather miraculous ... Moreover, because of the absence of hard drugs such as methedrine, heroin, cocaine, and even alcohol, the outbreaks of violence and rioting that marred subsequent concerts, did not occur at Woodstock. (2017, 297)

Additionally, Woodstock lacked food and basic necessities for such a large audience. Initially, a black market of Hippie capitalists emerged, selling food and drugs for incredible prices. Water supposedly sold for \$1 a quart and sandwiches for \$2. A New York Times article maintained that at one point, a \$7 one-day ticket would have bought an audience member “a peach or half a sandwich” (Collier 1969, 22). Drug prices also increased: “LSD tabs for \$6 a pop (they usually sold for no more than \$2 a pill), [and] a ‘lid’ of marijuana for \$30 (which usually sold for \$10)” (Moretta 2017, 295). Organizer Michael Lang asked attendees to share their food, dope, and shelter, which they eventually did. Nearby farms also shared their food with the Hippies, showing an understanding between the counterculture and the straight-laced farmers around them. Max Yasgur, on whose land Woodstock occurred, blessed the Hippies onstage.^{xliv} Monticello Police Chief Lou Yank said, “Notwithstanding their personality, their dress, and their ideas, they were and they are the most courteous, considerate, and well-behaved group of kids I have ever been in contact with in my 24 years of police work” (qtd. in Kaufman 1969, 34). This quote illustrates stylistic and ideological differences between the generations, but also the potential for connection between people on an individual basis.

The rain was perhaps the biggest obstacle at the festival, but it became more of a fond memory than a calamity. The concert came to a brief halt when a heavy downpour began on Saturday. The Hippies in the audience had no real shelter from the rain and had to spend hours in the muddy field. However, the rain resulted in some of Woodstock's legendary experiences. Some people huddled together under blankets; others formed a giant mud slide; still others had sex in the mud. As one, Hippies sang "Let the Sunshine In" from the Broadway musical *Hair* (Ragni and Rado 1967). The rain brought people together and transformed the event from a music festival into a historical cultural event. As Janis Joplin said, "We used to think of ourselves [hippies] as little clumps of weirdos. But now we're a whole new minority group" (Wadleigh 1970). The event ended with 20,000 hardcore fans remaining to watch Jimi Hendrix play his rock n' roll-inspired version of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Hendrix's rendition was one of the most important musical performances of the twentieth century. It also symbolized Hippies' peaceful protests by covering a patriotic song in a veneer of acid-drenched psychedelic rock. The euphoria of Woodstock and the Hippie movement at large would not last much longer, but for three glorious days, the Hippies succeeded in their message of peace, love, and music.

However, just weeks before Woodstock, the counterculture had to face tragedy at the hands of Charlie Manson and his Family. The Manson killings are relevant to Hippie historiography because the killings and the subsequent trial affected public perceptions of the counterculture for years to come. Manson became emblematic of the Hippie movement because the press called him a Hippie, despite the fact that he was not a Hippie and, in fact, hated the Hippie movement. Manson began his rampage in June 1969, spurred on by his violently racist ideology: Helter Skelter. Named after the Beatles song, Helter Skelter was Manson's term for a race war. The phrase was culturally significant and later became the title of his Family's

murders, the book by prosecutor Vincent Bugliosi, and the last film of the original Hippie film cycle. The Family began their killing spree on July 1, 1969, by murdering Bernard “Lotsapoppa” Crowe, a man Manson believed to be a Black Panther, which Manson thought would set off a race war (Bugliosi and Gentry 1994, 372). Beat-poet-turned-Hippie Ed Sanders describes Manson’s rants:

Language as flawed as a President’s announcing an invasion of a South Asian country, he [Manson] announced that the blacks would rise up, kill a few million whites, take over the reins of the government. Then, the story continues, after forty or fifty years the blacks would turn the government over to Manson when they supposedly found themselves unfit to run the world. Oo-ee-oo. (Sanders 1971, 148)

Manson’s belief that killing a Black Panther would cause a race war was fundamentally flawed for several reasons. First, Manson was incorrect in his belief that Crowe was a member of the Black Panthers. Second, killing a single Panther would not have started a race war, as evidenced by the police killings of Bobby Hutton, Mark Clark, and Fred Hampton. The Family then killed Gary Hinman, a former friend of the Family, on July 27, 1969 and drew a Panther sigil in his blood. This murder also failed to cause Manson’s desired race war (Cooper 2018, 62). On August 8 and 9, the Family carried out the infamous Tate-LaBianca murders, killing seven people including actress Sharon Tate. Family member Susan Atkins bragged about the murders in prison, and after several weeks, police took her seriously and investigated Charles Manson and his Family. By December 1, prosecutor Vincent Bugliosi issued arrest warrants for several Manson Family members (Bugliosi and Gentry 1994, 219). Police had already arrested Manson in August for stealing several Volkswagen Beetles to convert into dune buggies, which he hoped would help the Family hide in the desert during an approaching race war.

Media outlets erroneously associated the Manson Family and their string of murders with the Hippie counterculture. To the media's credit, Manson deliberately exhibited several stylistic similarities to the counterculture. Manson and Hippies wore similar clothes, had long hair, lived communally, listened to the same music, participated in orgies, and indulged in psychoactive drugs like LSD and marijuana. However, these choices by Manson encompassed a calculated pattern of code switching that enabled his message to more easily reach an audience of wayward and impressionable youths seeking transcendence. Sanders writes, "Charlie had a tremendous effect on those he met. Open. An incredible talent for using one part of a personality against another. For spotting weaknesses – for creating confusion and appearing therein as a source of leadership" (1971, 36). Manson used Hippie style to gain followers and turn them to his racist agenda. The media, seeing only his long hair, bellbottoms, and drug use, branded him a Hippie cult leader. Sanders argued, "He was depicted all at once as a hippie satanist car thief cult leader sex maniac bastard butcher" (6). This archetype became the basis for a series of "Manson films" that constituted their own sub-cycle within the broader Hippiesploitation cycle.

Manson had already been involved in the entertainment industry prior to his Family's murders. Manson sold a song to the Beach Boys through his friendly acquaintance Dennis Wilson, one of the group's three founders. He also discussed the possibility of a film and album project with Terry Melcher, a famous record producer who had worked with bands like Paul Revere and the Raiders. Melcher visited Spahn's Ranch, an old Western movie set that housed the Family. NBC was interested in producing a TV documentary but balked at Manson's demands. Sanders writes that NBC "wanted a verité hippie-commune movie with a narrator. But Charlie hated hippies. Charlie wanted to make an honest movie presenting the family in an as-is situation, adding marauder elements, bikers, creepy-crawlie capers – in order to magnet in on

potential followers and attract them” (180). Manson’s desire to add a biker element to his film is interesting because both his ideology and bikers’ ideology preclude them from being Hippies.

Had journalists of the time looked deeper, they would have realized that Manson’s ideological beliefs definitively separated him from the Hippie subculture. In fact, Manson embodied everything that Hippies opposed: he was violent; he situated himself as a leader, whereas Hippies tried not to have leaders; he had an open, volatile hatred of women; and he was virulently racist. The last two are particularly noteworthy. Manson was a sociopath who knew how to manipulate people, particularly the women he lured into his Family. Manson’s targets were vulnerable, young, and sometimes underaged women who Manson was able to twist into non-consensual sexual acts with multiple partners. Manson ultimately exerted his control over the women to incite them to commit murder. He kept a Svengali-like hold over them to sustain a campaign of physical, mental, and sexual abuse and control.

Manson’s blatant racism further distanced him from the counterculture. The Hippies were almost universally in favor of civil rights and worked towards equality alongside progressive groups like the Black Panthers. Manson, on the other hand, believed and hoped that a race war was imminent and planned to profit from the aftermath. Baynard Woods writes, “Mr. Manson was not the end point of the counterculture. If anything, he was a backlash against the civil rights movement and a harbinger of white supremacist race warriors like Dylann Roof, the lunatic fringe of the alt-right” (Woods 2017). Manson’s racist ideology was another difference the media could have examined had they desired to report the truth. Instead, the media indulged in the muckraking tactics of tabloid journalism in order to attract readers who were aware of the Hippie counterculture but lacked an understanding of its philosophies.

Manson's hatred of Hippies also separates him from genuine members of the counterculture. John Anthony Moretta writes, "being called a hippie sent him into a rage of denial. Yet he himself did a masterful job of passing as a hippie and used the hippie scene for his own debauched and sinister purposes" (2017, 308). According to the documentary *Manson* (Hendrickson and Merrick 1973), Charlie called his Family "slippies," because they could slip in and out of the Hippie counterculture while still being recognized as part of the larger whole. By the time the murder trial began in 1970, several extremist Hippies, such as Jerry Rubin and the Weather Underground, even embraced Manson (Bugliosi and Gentry 1994, 297-298). Rubin and the Weathermen accepting Manson should be seen as an outlier as most Hippies did not approve of the violence the Manson Family used. Additionally, Manson being accepted by any Hippies is simply further evidence of his sociopathic tendencies. Manson possessed the ability to blend in with the counterculture while hating the very principles for which they stood. Despite all evidence to the contrary, Manson and his followers were therefore labeled Hippies by the media. The erroneous association between Manson and Hippies contributed significantly to the downfall of the Hippie movement.

The Chicago Conspiracy Trial was another event that marked the decline of the Hippie movement. It began on September 24, 1969 and was the only major trial resulting from the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention riots. The few police officers charged with excessive force were quickly and quietly released and their charges dropped. The following were tried: SDS founder Tom Hayden; MOBE members Rennie Davis and Dave Dellinger; Yippies Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin; college antiwar protestors John Froines and Lee Weiner; and Black Panther Party founder Bobby Seale. The defense attorneys were William Kunstler and Leonard Weinglass, and the prosecuting attorneys were Richard Schultz and Tom Foran. The prosecution

was supported by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, President Richard Nixon, and Attorney General John Mitchell (Hayden 2009, 70-71).

Just as almost every major Hippie event was problematic, the antics by the prosecution, judge, and defendants caused an imbroglio in court. The trouble began when Bobby Seale's attorney, Charles Garry, was undergoing gallbladder surgery and was therefore unavailable. Judge Hoffman^{xlv} refused to allow Seale a postponement and told him to accept Kunstler as his lawyer. Seale did not want to be represented by Kunstler and asked to represent himself. Kunstler respected his decision, but Judge Hoffman denied this request as well. Seale and Judge Hoffman continued to clash throughout the trial. Seale interjected loudly during cross-examinations of witnesses, declaring that he had the right to serve as his own defense. Judge Hoffman ordered Seale to be chained to his chair and gagged. Nick Sharman writes:

Despite the attempts to silence him for the next 2 days, Seale frequently extracted himself from the gag and continued to demand the right to cross-examine witnesses and defend himself and to shout insults at the judge for what he clearly regarded as the unjust treatment he was receiving. A sketched image of a black man in chains in a white courtroom appeared throughout the US media. (2016, 53)

Eventually, Judge Hoffman separated Seale's case from the other Chicago Conspiracy Trial defendants. Seale was sentenced to four years in prison for sixteen contempt citations, although all of the Chicago Conspiracy Trial charges were eventually overturned, including Seale's. With Seale's separation, the Chicago Eight became the Chicago Seven, but any pretense of justice in the courtroom was gone. The defendants, particularly Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, decided that if the trial was going to be a miscarriage of justice, they would make it an obscene circus.

The performative outbursts by the defendants, especially Hoffman and Rubin, deeply influenced the dominant culture's view of Hippies. Judge Hoffman revoked Dellinger's bail for "barnyard vulgarity" on the witness stand. Abbie Hoffman and Rubin appeared one day in court wearing judge's robes. When Judge Hoffman ordered them to remove the robes, Hoffman and Rubin revealed that they were wearing Chicago police uniforms underneath, causing further upheaval in court. Rubin regularly compared Judge Hoffman to Hitler, and Abbie Hoffman told Judge Hoffman, "you are a shande fur de Goyim," Yiddish for "disgrace in front of the gentiles" (qtd. in Lukas 1970, 41). Judge Hoffman called their behavior an obscenity, to which Abbie Hoffman responded, "your idea of justice is the only obscenity in this court, Julie." Newspapers focused on the defendants' outlandish behavior, which encouraged the dominant culture to judge the defendants and therefore Hippies in general. Combined with negative press coverage, the group's behavior ultimately did more harm than good by discrediting their defense and tarnishing the counterculture's image in the minds of the public.

Among those who tried to do some good during the trial were Kunstler, Dellinger, Davis, and Hayden. They decided that if the prosecutors were going to use the proceedings to put the counterculture on trial, they would do the same for the Vietnam War. Whereas Hoffman and Rubin's strategy was anarchic, Kunstler's was methodical. He displayed a Viet Cong flag next to an American flag on the defense table, and every day he wore a black armband and read aloud the names of the dead on both sides of the war. He also stonewalled the trial for several weeks by calling celebrity witnesses, including: Jesse Jackson; Norman Mailer; Woodstock participant Country Joe McDonald; and Hippie elders Allen Ginsberg and Timothy Leary. Kunstler's witnesses sang anti-war songs on the stand, including Judy Collins, who sang Pete Seeger's "Where Have All the Flowers Gone." Judge Hoffman became annoyed by the singing and did

not allow Phil Ochs to sing “I Ain’t Marchin’ Anymore” or Arlo Guthrie to sing “Alice’s Restaurant” (Linder 1969-1970).^{xlvi} Kunstler made his anger at the proceedings known, saying, “If I am angry, I think I am righteously so” (Linder 1969-1970). These theatrics had two purposes: postponing the trial in hopes of getting better press, and publicly documenting the dissatisfaction many Americans felt over the Vietnam War.

The trial lasted through 1970 and did not garner the good press for which the defendants and their counsel had hoped. In fact, the coverage of the defendants was largely negative. Sharman writes, “the New York Times’ primary aim in its editorials was to protect the judicial system from the attacks on its partiality caused by the evidence of judicial partisanship in Judge Hoffman’s conduct of the case” (2016, 174). Ultimately, all eight defendants and their two attorneys were sentenced to varying prison terms for contempt of court. Kunstler received the longest sentence: four years and thirteen days. Five defendants – Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, David Dellinger, Tom Hayden, and Rennie Davis – were also found guilty of crossing state lines to start a riot. The charges of all those convicted in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial were later reversed on appeal. Kunstler and the other defendants got their anti-Vietnam War sentiments on the public record, but that did not end the war, and press coverage ensured lasting damage to the counterculture’s public image.

While the Chicago Conspiracy Trial began in court, the war came to the streets of Chicago in the form of the Days of Rage. The Days of Rage began in Chicago on October 8, 1969, and transformed the public perception of Hippies from peaceful, if misinformed, youths to violent radicals. The event further divorced Hippies from the dominant culture and showed fissures within the counterculture. Within the SDS, founded by Chicago defendant Tom Hayden, was a sub-group known as the Weathermen. The group chose their name in reference to the line,

“You don’t need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows,” in Bob Dylan’s “Subterranean Homesick Blues.” The Weathermen believed they saw the direction the country was heading, from escalations in Vietnam to Richard Nixon’s election and the Chicago Conspiracy Trial. Run by Bill Ayers and his wife, Bernadine Dohrn, the Weathermen were more radical than the greater SDS and grew to become infamous.

The goals of the Days of Rage were to bring the war home through chaotic acts of property destruction and to commemorate the Chicago Democratic Convention riots the year prior. Before the Days of Rage formally began, The Weathermen blew up the monument dedicated to the police officers who died in the 1886 Haymarket Square bombing, although no one was ever formally arrested for this act (Hayden 2009, 112). Between October 8-11, Hippies, antiwar protesters, and other countercultural figures rejected peaceful protest and fought police in Lincoln Park. Police shot six participants and arrested two hundred fifty others on October 8. The rioters, in turn, injured seventy-five police officers, damaged property, and earned enough media attention to believe they had won the first day (Gitlin 1989, 394).

After October 11, the Weathermen concluded their violent protest, which had already begun to influence public perceptions of the counterculture. Chicago Conspiracy Trial attorney Leonard Weinglass and defendants Tom Hayden, Abbie Hoffman, and John Froines arrived on the final night. Hayden was shocked by the crowd, who were preparing for battle by painting their faces and donning homemade riot gear. Hayden writes, “I could understand civil disobedience with an objective, I could understand illegal activities conducted in secret, but I could not fathom why all these people were going to run amok straight into the guns and the cameras. It was like a ritualistic initiation event” (Hayden 2009, 113). The rioters smashed over fourteen hundred windows and engaged in active combat with police. Chicago city attorney

Richard Elrod broke his neck and became paralyzed in an attempt to attack protestors. While the Days of Rage officially ended on October 11, the Weathermen made sure it was not the last day of violence.

The Weathermen attended the November 15 Moratorium to End the War in Vietnam March on Washington. Roughly 750,000 Americans participated in the protest, which was the largest in American history. South Dakota Senator George McGovern gave a progressive speech. John Denver, Arlo Guthrie, the cast of *Hair*, and other musicians peacefully performed songs, including folk patriarch Pete Seeger, who sang John Lennon's "Give Peace a Chance," hoping to spread its message (Gitlin 1989, 394). However, the Weathermen, along with Yippies Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, began rioting and throwing bottles, rocks, and smoke bombs, to which police responded with tear gas and batons. Todd Gitlin writes, "The Nixon White House, which had tried for weeks to tar the entire antiwar movement with the brush of violence, was delighted" (395). The three days of peace, love, and music at Woodstock might as well have occurred in a different decade. While angry militants made up only a small percentage of the antiwar movement, the mainstream public had all the evidence they needed to condemn the counterculture as violent radicals.

If Woodstock was the high point of the Hippie movement in 1969, Altamont was the low point. Held on December 6, Altamont was marketed as "Woodstock West" and was headlined and promoted by The Rolling Stones, whose songs reflected the growing violence within the movement (Moretta 2017, 327). Altamont was marred by excessive drug use and extreme violence. The Hippies at Woodstock almost universally did dope, which kept tragic incidences to a minimum, and no real violence took place. By comparison, Altamont saw two hit-and-run deaths, one LSD-induced drowning, and the infamous stabbing death of Meredith Hunter,

immortalized in the film *Gimme Shelter* (Maysles, Maysles, and Zwerin 1970). Altamont suffered from violent attendees, problematic Hells Angels, hard drug overdoses, and callous, incompetent management.

Hells Angels hired by concert promoters to provide security were one cause of violence at Altamont. While Hippies and bikers were both part of the larger counterculture movement, the two groups were ideologically opposed. Many bikers incorporated racism into their speech and iconography, used harder drugs than Hippies did, and were known for their indiscriminate violence. While the Hells Angels acted as security guards, they used and dealt hard drugs and were violent toward anyone who approached them. In addition, the promoters and The Rolling Stones had made the terrible decision to pay the biker club not in cash, but in \$500 worth of beer (Moretta 2017, 323).

Drug use was another critical issue at Altamont. Michael Lydon states that, among the Hippies, there were, “speed freaks with hollow eyes and missing teeth, dead-faced acid heads burned out by countless flashes, old Beatniks clutching gallons of red wine ... There were people who were damaged or people who should have been in prison for drugs” (2000, 309-311). Woodstock had marijuana, LSD, mushrooms, and peyote, mostly calming drugs when pure. Promoters took care to announce the existence of dangerous drugs, such as the brown acid. Altamont attendees, on the other hand, also used hard drugs like meth, cocaine, and heroin. The 300,000-person crowd was roughly the size of Woodstock, but the overdoses were far worse than the two percent of people treated at Woodstock. Lack of crowd awareness or adequate medical attention exacerbated the severity of the overdoses. Moretta writes, “lots of bad dope, including inferior acid spiked with speed, circulated throughout the crowd, causing all manner of ‘freak-outs’ and seriously bad trips, which harried medical professionals had a hard time keeping up

with, especially as Thorazine temporarily ran out with which to treat the epidemic” (2017, 322). If Woodstock had been a fun celebration, Altamont was a violent, embarrassing disaster.

Perhaps worse than the violent crowd, Hells Angels, and bad dope reactions was management’s handling of the affair. They knew that the restroom facilities were inadequate and that the concert sound was low fidelity, and they did not turn up the lights until The Rolling Stones took the stage late that night. Organizers did not disclose the venue to promoters or attendees until days beforehand, and they did not warn local citizens, arousing anger from neighboring landowners. Woodstock organizers and attendees had made themselves known to surrounding farmers and actively sought their support (Bangs et. al. 1970). Altamont management cared only about making money and promoting The Rolling Stones. Moretta writes, “Such was the reality confronting a young man desperately searching for the father of a toddler who had been stepped on by a Hell’s Angel (by accident) ... [Rolling Stones tour manager Sam] Cutler not only prohibited the man from making an announcement for help in locating the father, but also personally refused to put out a call for assistance” (322). Management’s indifference to attendees’ well-being was the biggest problem at Altamont. Had the organizers taken precautions and responded proactively, the terrible events at Altamont may not have occurred.

Perhaps the worst incident to take place at Altamont was the stabbing death of Meredith Hunter by the Hells Angels, an act of violence that forever marred the event. Problems occurred just as The Stones started the song “Sympathy for the Devil.” As the song began, an overly drugged, topless woman tried to get onto the stage, only to be beaten by Hells Angels. After the scuffle, the Stones began “Under My Thumb,” and a group of people, including Hunter, tried to bum-rush the stage. A few people made their way onstage, but the Angels kept Hunter off, hitting him several times. High on methamphetamines, Hunter left, only to return with a

revolver. Hells Angel Alan Passaro stabbed Hunter several times, killing him. Moretta writes, “The moment Hunter fell to the ground witnesses saw other Angels stomping on him, kicking his face. Horrified and stunned the crowd did nothing. Hunter died in a pool of blood” (330). Mick Jagger tried to calm the crowd and the Angels, but the Angels began to attack people with reckless abandon. The Rolling Stones performed “Street Fighting Man” before leaving in a helicopter. The Grateful Dead witnessed the events and choose to remain in their tour bus rather than perform.

The event is comprehensively detailed in the Rolling Stones documentary, *Gimme Shelter*, which covers the band’s complete 1969 tour. The film captures each obscenity of Altamont in excruciating detail, including Hunter’s stabbing, several bad acid trips, and the moment Jagger is punched upon exiting his helicopter. When the topless woman attempted to get onstage, co-director David Maysles reportedly told a cameraman to stop filming, saying that he only wanted “beautiful things” in his film. The unnamed cameraman reportedly replied, “How can you possibly say that? Everything here is so ugly” (qtd. in Talbot 2012, 139-140). *Woodstock* represents the Hippie movement at its best. *Gimme Shelter* shows it at its worst. Both films are essential to accurately chronicling important moments in U.S. history. Comedian Patton Oswalt says of the film:

Gimme Shelter is a horror film about all of the rage and darkness that has soaked into the soil that somehow got evaporated away at Woodstock and didn’t infect people, but now they’re on the west coast. It literally feels like it’s seeping out of the dirt and bad stuff is about to surface ... It’s all just bad stuff and the sixties are about to end in the worst way possible. (Oswalt 2020)

Just as no singular event can be said to begin the Hippie movement, no one moment can truly be called its end. However, Altamont certainly represents the beginning of its decline. Sol Stern called “Altamont Pearl Harbor to Woodstock Nation,” writing, “the popular myth of Woodstock died an untimely and unreported death. Upwards of half a million of the supposed citizens of Woodstock Nation were present in those last hours, but the national media which gave its birth a rave review have yet to run even a funeral notice” (1970, 113). Altamont contributed significantly to the end of any hope or goodwill behind the movement.

The final 1969 cultural event that affected the Hippies was the murder of Black Panther leader, Fred Hampton, and fellow Panther Mark Clark. The death of Hampton was the loss of one of the civil rights movement’s great voices and was the last underdiscussed assassination of the 1960s. On December 4, 1969, Hampton had been drugged by an FBI informant and was fast asleep when Chicago police raided his apartment. Police fired their guns between 90-99 times. In contrast, the Panther Party fired one shot. Deborah Johnson, Hampton’s fiancée, was eight months pregnant with their son. After the shooting, police led Johnson out of the bedroom, and she saw two reenter. Johnson supposedly heard one police officer ask, “Is he still alive?” Two shots were fired, and his partner responded, “He’s good and dead now” (qtd. in Haas 2019, 118). Lilian C. Calhoun wrote, “Neither the wild Weathermen destruction nor the total massive chaos of Woodstock evoked violence nearly so great as that of December 4 against nine sleeping black youngsters” (Calhoun 1969, 2).^{xlvii} The historical consensus is that Hampton was not incidentally killed in a two-sided gunfight - he was murdered by the Chicago police.

The murder of another unarmed black man further radicalized the Hippie’s more extreme members. The Weathermen, now known as the Weather Underground, bombed several police vehicles (Dohrn, Ayers, et. al. 1974, 2). The Black Panthers and Hippies continued to work

towards common causes, but they began to disconnect because of the radical Weathermen. In 1970, the Underground and the Black Panthers worked together one last time to break Timothy Leary out of jail, but the escape was more a business arrangement than an alliance. Their relationship split after Hampton's death, the Hippies and Panthers pursued revolution separately. For the Hippies, however, the idea of peaceful revolution began losing its popularity.

These cultural events directly influenced how filmmakers depicted Hippies on-screen during the final years of the movement and in the Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie film cycles. Student protests, such as the People's Park, became the basis for a sub-cycle of films that began in 1970. Manson films also began in 1970 with the release of *I Drink Your Blood* (Durstun) and became the predominant sub-genre of Hippiesploitation in the final years of the cycle. *Woodstock*, perhaps the single most vital positive depiction of the Hippies on film, received the Academy Award for Best Documentary in 1970. The Chicago Conspiracy Trial partly formed the basis for several films, including *Punishment Park* (Watkin 1971) and a scene in Woody Allen's *Bananas* (1971). At least five filmic depictions of the trial were released after the Hippie film cycle ended in 1976. An upcoming film, *The Trial of the Chicago 7* (Sorkin 2020), is scheduled to be released on September 25, 2020, one day after the fiftieth anniversary of the trial's start date. The Days of Rage and similar protests influenced future Hippie films by depicting members as becoming more radicalized, such as *The Revolutionary* (Williams 1970). Finally, Altamont received its screen time in the documentary *Gimme Shelter*.

The Hippies on Film in 1969

The Witness (Arlo Guthrie): The end of the song is the chorus which goes: [sings] "You can get anything you want---"

The Court (Judge Julius Hoffman): Oh, no, no. No. I am sorry.

Mr. Kunstler: Your Honor, that's what he sang for the defendants.

The Court (Judge Julius Hoffman): I don't want the theater owner where this picture is shown to sue me.

Mr. Kunstler: We'll represent you, your Honor.

The Court (Judge Julius Hoffman): No singing. No singing. No singing, sir.

Mr. Kunstler: Mr. Weinglass and I, free of charge, will represent you.

The Court (Judge Julius Hoffman): I will reserve my comment on that one.

-Excerpt from Arlo Guthrie's testimony in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial (Linder 1969-1970)

In July 1969, Columbia Pictures released one of the most important countercultural films of the 1960s: *Easy Rider* (Hopper 1969). Several scenes in the film incorporate elements of the counterculture, including scenes in which Wyatt (Peter Fonda) and Billy (Dennis Hopper) take acid and stay in a Hippie commune. The character George (Jack Nicholson) is an Establishment lawyer who is turned on to becoming a Hippie by Wyatt and Billy. Finally, the characters have run-ins with various police officers and other anti-counterculture characters. Despite these generic Hippie references, however, *Easy Rider* functions more as a road film or a biker film than a concrete Hippie film.

Alice's Restaurant is unmistakably a Hippie film and is essential in discussing mainstream, liberal filmmakers' growing understanding of, and sympathy for, the movement. Although the film largely follows the plot of its eponymous song, it includes a fictional prologue and denouement that do not appear in the song, because Arthur Penn knew the eighteen-minute-twenty-second song would need to be expanded to fill a two-hour film. Two key moments in both the song and the film actually happened to Arlo Guthrie. The first was his arrest and

conviction for littering after a Thanksgiving dinner that “couldn’t be beat” (Guthrie 1969). The second was his appearance before the draft board, only to be dismissed because of his prior conviction for littering.

The movie begins with Arlo, played by Guthrie,^{xlviii} dropping out of college in the mid-1960s, after being attacked and thrown through a window for being a Hippie.^{xlix} Singing in various folk clubs along the way, Arlo goes to New York and visits his dying father, Woody (Joseph Boley), in the hospital. Arlo then visits his friends, Alice (Pat Quinn) and her husband, Ray (James Broderick), who have purchased a deconsecrated church and opened a restaurant in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Arlo’s other Hippie friends visit, including Shelly, a heroin addict, and Jake, a black man who lost an arm in Vietnam. The film meets up with the song when, after a big Thanksgiving dinner, Arlo and his friends decide to dump several months’ garbage for Alice. They load up a red Volkswagen microbus and drive to the town dump, only to find it closed. They throw the garbage off of a hillside instead. The next day, Arlo is arrested by Officer Obie, played by the real-life officer who arrested Guthrie for littering, Stockbridge Police Chief William Obanhein.

After an amusing court case involving a blind judge and evidence Obie could not share due to the judge’s condition, Arlo is sentenced to pay a \$50 fine and pick up the garbage. Arlo is later drafted and reports to a New York draft board, only to be saved by two questions: whether he has ever been convicted of a crime, and whether he feels remorse. He claims that he does not feel remorse and so escapes the draft. Arlo returns to Alice and Ray’s church in time to witness them renew their wedding vows. The film ends on a somber note as the newlyweds face marriage trouble, and Shelly dies from a heroin overdose.

Alice's Restaurant is a vital piece of mainstream Hippie cinema due to its focus on the experiences and relationships of one likeable Hippie, Arlo Guthrie. Arlo is depicted as an oddball, but also as a decent, sympathetic character. For example, an early scene depicts Arlo being propositioned by an underage groupie who has supposedly slept with several moderately famous musicians and wants to add Arlo to her list because he will “get to be in an album.” Arlo turns her down because she is only fourteen, but he gives her his scarf to remember him by. He is also propositioned by a Mrs. Robinson-esque club owner who knew his father, Woody. He turns her down, as well, because of their existing power imbalance. Arlo does have sex with Mari-chan (Tina Chen), who is a good match for him, and their interracial relationship is one of the taboo subjects Guthrie and Penn address in the film.

Alice's Restaurant invites the audience to empathize with its countercultural protagonists, while it negatively portrays characters who are cruel or antagonistic toward Arlo and his friends. The people who throw Arlo through a window invite no sympathy, nor do the draft board members who are violent and angry towards Arlo. Officer Obie is one of the film's few relatable antagonists. Obie does not hassle Arlo because he is a Hippie but rather because he litters. Obie's favorable, if goofy, depiction partially originates from Obie's inspiration, William Obanhein. By the making of the film, Guthrie and Obanhein had become friends. Elaine M. Bapis writes, “*Alice's Restaurant* asked viewers to accommodate the counterculture and identify with its perspective ... the film identified hippies, long hair, and communal living as central to American freedom of expression and part of a long tradition of American bohemianism” (2008, 61). *Alice's Restaurant* had a mainstream director and a best-selling musician at the helm. Penn and Guthrie's fame invites further sympathy from the audience as they were public figures to whom an audience could relate.

Alice's Restaurant represents Hollywood's improved efforts to better understand the counterculture. Penn, one of the first auteurs of the Hollywood Renaissance and a left-leaning director sympathetic to the Hippie movement, was the most vital component of the picture. He did not fully understand the counterculture but listened to Guthrie enough to give the most realistic mainstream portrayal of Hippies on-screen. Penn correctly interprets the music and ethos of the counterculture, and he includes a brief anti-Vietnam statement via Jake, the Black Hippie, who lost his arm in the war.¹ Penn treats marijuana usage as safe and normal, although he shows the perils of drugs like heroin via Shelly's death. He also attempts to show the openness of Hippie sexuality, adding a bit of nuance. Hippies believed that, while marriage absolutely could happily occur, a marriage contract was irrelevant to the need and enjoyment of sex. However, consent between partners for pursuing outside of a relationship was essential. Ray sleeps with another woman without Alice's knowledge or consent. Alice is clearly perturbed by this act of infidelity, signally problems which exist in their relationship which appears throughout the film. Guthrie says of Penn's importance:

The thing that was funny about Arthur Penn is that he was one of the first people that actually believed that the song about Alice's restaurant was not fiction ... he said, "you know, these Hippies are not making this up, these are real people." ... He was nice to work with. I don't think he understood everything that the culture had to offer. I don't think the people who were in charge of the production had a sense of what was happening with who we were and what was happening at the time. It was a different world. But I think it was a valiant attempt to make a movie of it anyhow. (Guthrie 2002)

The film's pressbook focuses on the transformation of a hit song into a film, with little ballyhoo.² The pressbook declares Arlo Guthrie the inheritor of his father's legacy, and it

suggests that the “Woodstock Generation” might be a worthy successor to the “Greatest” and “Silent” generations. Distributor-produced advertisement, “Arlo Guthrie Follows Famed Dad, Woody, to Folk Stardom,” opens with the lines, “It’s tough to be a great man’s son ... If you haven’t got it, people say that’s the way it should be: because no great man ever had a great son. Well, a time has come to dispute that old belief” (United Artists 1969, [6]). It details Guthrie’s rise in popularity, gives a rough outline of the Massacree, and mentions the film at the end. One tagline reads, “Every generation has a story to tell,” implying that it was time for Baby Boomers to tell their story. The tagline suggests that Guthrie, like his father, was leading the way. The film includes a comparable scene in which Arlo walks along an empty highway saying, “Seems like Woody’s road might’a passed through here sometime.” Arlo follows his father’s road, just as the Boomers were following the road laid out by the “Greatest” and “Silent” generations. While the Boomers were following the roads of the previous generations, they were also carving out their own place in the world, hence the tagline “Every generation has a story to tell.” Bapis writes, “Guthrie, therefore, brought to the screen a collective separation for a younger generation, whose politics centered on showing themselves as the deserving innocents – progressive, tolerant, and free thinking” (2008, 68). Penn uses Guthrie’s tale not only to tell a story of the Woodstock generation, but to bring a sense of understanding and empathy to them from their elders.

Haskell Wexler’s film *Medium Cool* goes one step further than *Alice’s Restaurant* and brings viewers into the streets with the counterculture. The film was the directorial debut for Wexler, already a distinguished cinematographer. Although middle-aged, he was left-leaning and believed that the countercultural youth had something important to say. Wexler wanted to capture the atmosphere of the Chicago Democratic Convention riots on screen. Peter Bart writes, “‘Medium Cool’ was the product of a string of apocalyptic events: Martin Luther King Jr. and

Bobby Kennedy had just been assassinated. Race riots were wracking the country along with Vietnam protests. Lyndon Johnson suddenly withdrew from the presidential race. Even pop music seemed torn between social upheaval and psychedelic rapture” (2003, 6). Against the backdrop of the circumstances surrounding the movie, Wexler set out to make one of the most important countercultural statements on film.

After Wexler saw the countercultural youth descend on Chicago for the 1968 Democratic convention, he significantly altered the film to include the Hippies. Wexler brought cameras to Grant Park and filmed the Hippies and Yippies marching on the convention center. Using his documentary filmmaking experience, Wexler shot the film in the *cinéma-vérité* style to fully capture the march and make viewers feel like they were on the streets with the protesters. The style also creates a collaborative feel between the actors, protestors, crew, and audience. Wexler invites the audience to see themselves in the Hippies and to experience the riots firsthand. In a *Film Quarterly* review of *Medium Cool*, Judith Shatnoff writes, “The eye of the camera replaces the human eye if not the human ‘I,’ especially in the eye of the ultra-cool medium television, our cyclops in the electronic cave” (1969-1970, 48). Wexler’s first-person footage feels more real, intimate, and frightening than third-person, bird’s-eye-view news reporting.

The film’s protagonist is a newsman named John, played by Robert Forster. He first appears shooting footage of a traffic accident, and he only thinks to call the police once he has finished. The film’s *cinéma-vérité* style makes viewers feel that they are personally spending time with John while he attends several parties. John meets and grows close to two characters who have moved to Chicago from West Virginia: Eileen, played by Verna Bloom, and her son Harold, played by Harold Blankenship. John later interviews a group of Black militants after one turns in a wallet containing \$1000. During these scenes, the interviewees break the fourth wall

and speak directly to the audience. The Hippies arrive in the last third of the film, when John is assigned to cover the Democratic Convention. Eileen learns that the Hippies are on their way to the convention center from what appears to be Grant Park. The viewer travels with Eileen on her journey through groups of friendly Hippies and hostile police. She eventually finds John, and the two make plans to date. In a scene interspersed with Hippie chants and convention interviews, John is gravely injured and Eileen dies when their car crashes. A stranger takes a photo of the crash, as John did in the beginning, but this time, he and the woman he loves are the ones bleeding out. Harold's fate is left to the viewer's imagination.

The final third of the film invokes the most empathy for Hippies due the relatable protagonists, the film's *cinéma-vérité* style, and Haskell Wexler's footage of the real Chicago Democratic riots. Lawrence Webb writes, "In the climactic sequences of *Medium Cool*, the characters wander through unstaged, violent clashes between protestors and police, bring together fiction and nonfiction, Hollywood and *cinéma-vérité*" (2019, 133). Wexler also films the news cameras filming the protestors and Wexler's crew. In a famous scene, one crewmember yells, "Look out, Haskell! It's real!" The moment helps viewers situate themselves in the film's world, while maintaining a solid footing in reality. *Medium Cool* also shows the Hippies as non-violent towards police, although a Hippie occasionally calls a cop a "pig." Wexler's style marks a clear divergence from what viewers may have seen in media coverage of the riots and what they are now seeing in the realistic but fictional film. Wexler was horrified by what he saw: "I am a very patriotic person ... But at that moment in time I felt like we were all enemies within our own country. It was as though the ruling powers were saying, 'This is America and you're not part of it'" (Bart 2003). Wexler translates this feeling to film, captures the mood of Hippies

on the street, and encourages viewers to reexamine their perceptions of the 1968 Democratic Convention riots.

The film's ending is particularly somber and impactful. In addition to its statement about morally detached reporters, Wexler juxtaposes real protest audio with the death of Eileen, the probable death of John, and the uncertain future of Harold. Wexler also uses audio to his advantage in a scene depicting the convention's interior and exterior. Shatnoff writes, "in *Medium Cool*, [Democratic organizers] loudly play 'Happy Days are Here Again' as Democratic delegates wearing paper-hats parade national solidarity on a stick, while outside in the park, police and National Guardsmen riot ... The young cry out to the high priests of the tube, and as the tear-gas spreads in a white cloud and the tanks roll closer another voice shouts, 'Watch out, Haskell – it's *real!*'" (1969-1970, 50). The exclamation was added by Wexler in post-production to heighten the fear felt by the real Hippies, the fictional characters, and even Wexler and his crew. The *cinéma-vérité* style drives home the tragedy of the likeable protagonists' deaths and the brutality of police against peaceful Hippies.

The pressbook for *Medium Cool* highlights the positive reviews of the film and includes progressive ballyhoo that could be helpful to young viewers. One piece of ballyhoo suggests that exhibitors hold amateur filmmaking and photography competitions. The contest idea anticipates the rise in popularity of film festivals and the distribution of American independent cinema. The most progressive ballyhoo advises exhibitors: "Contact colleges in your area – many of them are presently offering courses in film-making – and set up a contest whereby you could get exposure for these students' films at your theatre or on a local television program" (Paramount Pictures 1969, [8]). The ballyhoo not only publicizes the film and benefits students, but also provides an opportunity to foster the next generation of filmmakers. The remainder of the pressbook consists

of matte ads for *Medium Cool* that advertise its critical acclaim. The two distributor-produced articles promote *Medium Cool* as Wexler's directorial debut and highlight its original footage of the Chicago riots. While many distributor-produced advertisements propped up mainstream hegemony, the story, "'68 Chicago Convention Activity Provides Background for Movie," focuses on Wexler filming the Hippiesⁱⁱⁱ without a permit and reveals that he was teargassed by the National Guard and thrown to the ground by police. Wexler states that the National Guard "acted restrained, but the police 'pushed us around'" (Paramount Pictures 1969, [2]). This reinforces a progressive statement made by Wexler and the distributors: the police were the antagonists of not only Wexler and his crew, but the Hippies.

While 1969 saw two of the more positive mainstream Hippie movies released, the Hippiesploitation cycle was not so progressive. The trend is evident in 1969 Hippiesploitation film *Alice in Acidland* (Greer). The film combines an anti-drug public service announcement, a psychedelic experiment in filmmaking, and softcore sexploitation. The story is largely told visually, in black and white, and it is alternately narrated by an unnamed narrator and by Alice (Sheri Jackson) in voiceover. It often feels inauthentic because the narration resembles that of a classroom scare film. The film replaces dialogue with sex and contains little diegetic sound, which does not allow for conflict and prevents the film from being engaging.

Alice in Acidland tells the story of Alice, "a normal, well-adjusted young lady," who is led astray and pulled into a decadent Hippie life. By explicitly saying that Alice is normal and well-adjusted before she meets the Hippies, the film implies that Hippies, by contrast, are not. Alice is slowly lured into a Hippie lifestyle through sequential introductions to alcohol, marijuana, and LSD. After Alice tries cannabis for the second time, she engages in a brief lesbian relationship with a woman named Sheila (uncredited). Her lifestyle change is portrayed

as unhealthy and immoral, although the camera lingers on their sexual encounter for an inordinate length of time. The narrator says, “She now belonged to another society. Another world. A world of pot, LSD, and Free Love ... She had now become a wild and provocative ... Hippie, complete with the Indian beads and moccasins” (Greer 1969). During the narration, Alice goes to a gas station on the Sunset Strip and changes into a vaguely Hippie-style outfit that, like most of the film’s costumes and set design, does not correspond with most known Hippie aesthetics. The Hippies in this film dress conservatively when they are wearing clothing including her new boyfriend Animal (Roger Gentry). Though Hippies were not monolithic in how they dress, the style of the characters in the film does not match with how most Hippies dressed. They live in large, open-concept houses with modernist furniture, and only shag rugs and a guitar to signify their supposed Hippie style. The film primarily focuses on various Hippies having sex, with little in the way of character or plot development.

When Alice takes acid, the film becomes even more anti-Hippie and anti-drug. The film transitions from black-and-white to color when Alice tries an LSD sugar cube, much like *Hallucination Generation* (Mann 1966), and director Donn Greer emphasizes the psychedelic effects by utilizing colored gels and matte overlays. While this section focuses on the nude female form, Alice speaks her mind. She notices a necklace left by her friend, Janice (uncredited), who had killed herself after taking acid. Alice says, “I remembered then that Animal was the one who found Janice that night, hanging by the neck from a children’s jungle gym in Griffith Park. Animal must have removed this necklace and ankle bracelet and kept them as souvenirs. Or should the word be trophies?” The film implies that Animal is both a drug peddler and an indirect murderer. Moreover, the film implies he is a direct murderer because he keeps trophies. Alice’s trip shows either Janice or Alice naked on a wicker chaise lounge. The

narrator reveals that Alice has become catatonic, saying, “Yes, this is Alice Trenton. A mental vegetable. For this Alice, there was no looking glass back through. This was no fairy tale. This Alice had gone on a long, long trip to Acidland, never to return.” The narration and image of Alice in a straitjacket are grim, but then a title card reading “The End” appears in the shape of a woman’s bikini bottom. The film is tonally confusing, shifting from depicting wild sex to denigrating Free Love to damning drug use.

The film portrays Hippie life badly in several ways. While the characters are supposed to be Hippies, they do not have the style or ideals, only the drug use and casual sex. The film does not give the Hippies a voice because it lacks dialogue. As previously noted, the film essentially labels Animal a murderer because he and his friends do drugs, which implies that Hippies who take or share drugs are as culpable as Animal. Additionally, *Alice in Acidland* gives an inaccurate portrayal of the effects LSD usage. The film shows Alice as catatonic after one LSD trip, but the odds of acid having a catatonic effect are miniscule (Perera, Ferraro, and Pinto 1995, 324).

The film’s biggest issue is the hypersexualization of the (female) Hippie body. Long, lingering shots taken from the perspective of the male gaze persist throughout the film, a common criticism of sexploitation and porn cycles. Because Hippies were known for sex, drugs, and rock n’ roll, the film sells Alice, Sheila, and Janice’s sexual liberation while at the same time damning it. The film absolves the audience for viewing the sex scenes while shaming the characters participating in them. It also shames gay relationships, as the narrator calls Sheila “the known lesbian” and implies that she is partly responsible for Janice’s death. Yet the film sells sex and exploitatively lingers on the lesbian scene between Alice and Sheila. Per to the narrator, shaming Hippie sex acts is alright because LSD destroys “moral responsibility.” Therefore, the

film is warning the viewer against the dangers of LSD and Hippie life, while at the same time tantalizing them with gratuitous sex.

The advertising material emphasizes the film's explicit sex and moral panic about LSD. The pressbook of *Alice in Acidland* purports that it is "the first film" to tell the truth about LSD (Bernhard Films 1969, [2]). The poster hypes up the moral panic with the tagline, "The shockingly naked facts about L.S.D., revealing for the first time an inside look at the damaging effect of the sugar cube on the morals of a young girl" ([4]). The pressbook clearly sells the film's sexual component by including nude photos of the sex scenes, while also having a puritanical view of sex, particularly about women enjoying sex. According to a line in the middle of the photographs, the film "lays bare all the shameful and raw detail of sex-for-pleasure 'Free-Love' orgies ... hosted by an 'in-group' of post graduates for a selected list of students who qualify in 'pleasures of the flesh'" ([2]). The "shameful" comment likely refers to female pleasure, as men were the target audience for sexploitation. The line is problematic because the film fetishizes orgies for the audience's excitement while shaming Free Love and Hippies as a whole. Finally, the line troublingly suggests that graduate students use undergrads for sex.

Scenes of graduate students pressuring or grooming undergraduates for sex do not appear in the film, but the line might exist to connect Hippies with academia and therefore collectively label them as wicked. As discussed in previous chapters, many student organizations, including the SDS, were heavily involved in the Hippie movement. The line in the pressbook heightens moral panic about Hippies and implies that the real power lies in the grad students supposedly leading the fight. Overall, *Alice in Acidland* is representative of the era's Hippiesploitation films in the way it demonizes Hippie sexuality and drug use as cause for moral panic.

The majority of Hippie films either capitalized on moral panic or crafted positive representations of the counterculture, and only a few were made by self-identified Hippies. One of the first examples of an American independent film produced and distributed by a Hippie was Tobe Hooper's debut film, *Eggshells* (1969), a film that fits into the New American Cinema movement. Yannis Tzioumakis argues, "For these filmmakers, independence meant producing and distributing ultra low-budget film entirely outside the structure and influence of the US film industry" (2006, 172). Hooper had not worked in Hollywood and was not a film school graduate; rather, he was a Hippie paying his bills by making short films and educational PSAs for an insurance company. Matt Becker writes that Hooper "loathed the prospect of a career in mainstream commercial work, wanting instead to do art" (2006, 44). Hooper self-identified as a Hippie, saying, "Oh, yeah, man. I mean sandals and long hair and you know, the whole nine yards" (Austin Film Society 2014). Like Hooper, his cast and crew were Hippies from Austin, Texas, who protested the war, smoked marijuana, and had casual sex.

Eggshells has a small cast, and all of the characters have roughly the same amount of screen time. No singular protagonist exists, a common feature in New American Cinema. The film centers on the romantic relationships between the Hippies, while a mysterious, benevolent force enters their lives. The film begins with footage of a Vietnam War protest in Austin, Texas. Like *Medium Cool*, *Eggshells* is shot in the *cinéma-vérité* style, giving viewers a sense of belonging with the counterculture. The film shifts to a small commune of Hippies living in a supposedly haunted house. The mysterious being "plays" with the Hippies while they try to discover the nature and source of the being. The characters discover that the house is haunted by a caring force, and one of the characters, Mahlon (Mahlon Foreman), calls it "Earth's house."

Hooper experiments with various techniques while exploring the relationships between the characters. The characters in romantic relationships are as follows: Allen and Sharon (played by Allen and Sharon Danziger), married with a child; David (David Noll) and Amy (Amy Lester), engaged and later married; and Toes (Kim Henkel) and Mahlon, in a new relationship. Hooper experiments with editing techniques in a sequence in which Ron (Ron Barnhart) gets into a swordfight with himself while the house plays with him. In the final sequence, Toes, Mahlon, Ron, and his girlfriend Pam (Pamela Craig) hook themselves into a machine from the basement. Their bodies are purified, and they become marijuana smoke, according to Hooper, who says, “These Hippies got down. They got pure. They found a way to integrate into nature” (Hooper and Black 2013). As the film ends, the Hippies not in committed relationships become one with the Earth.

Eggshells is one of the most genuine Hippie films, because Hippies worked together to tell a story that related directly to them. Amit Itelman, the artistic director for the Steve Allen Theater, told Alex Cohen that the film is so important because “it depicts hippie life before the darker side of the decade, when Charles Manson terrorized the nation and fights at a Rolling Stones concert turned fatal” (Cohen 2010). While the film is hard to follow at times, *Eggshells* reflects happy experiences; the mysterious entity is kind towards the Hippies, and the human characters have little conflict beyond some arguments over gender roles. The film also showcases the experimental techniques that became Hooper’s hallmark in later films like *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* (1974). Zane Gordon-Bouvard writes, “the signature psychedelia of *Eggshells* worms its way into *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* in unexpected ways. If *Eggshells* is ‘an American Freak Illumination’, then *Chain Saw* is ‘An American Freak Nightmare’ – a trip gone horribly wrong” (2017). Hooper stated that the film “was about the beginning of the end of

the [hippie] subculture” (Jaworzyn 2003, 20). *Eggshells* successfully captures the good feelings that still existed in the Hippie movement as everything crashed around them in 1969.

The film, which had a budget of \$40,000, was not a financial success and actually lost money. Hooper said, “Since the movie virtually didn’t get any play dates, other than playing around college campuses... Austin, Dallas, Miami, but any rate, didn’t make any money. It did win some awards and it was written up in *American Cinematographer*. The special effects part was celebrated” (Hooper and Black 2013). Because it was rarely shown outside of occasional campus screenings, Hooper remarked that marijuana smoke in theatres made it “hard to see the image through the smoke” (Austin Film Society 2014). *Eggshells*’ niche was not big enough to sustain the film. Because of lost revenue, Hooper waited five years before he directed his next feature film, *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre*. Hooper’s foray into horror films and commentary on the Vietnam War propelled him into mainstream success.

Because the film was unsuccessful at the box office, *Eggshells* was thought to be lost for many years, before the Austin Film Society tracked down and preserved a copy in the 2000s. Austin locals see the film as a unique time capsule of the city in 1969, and it has been shown many times in Austin since its recovery. *Austin Chronicle* reporter Marjorie Baumgarten writes, “The film celebrates alternative lifestyles and politics and people and an odd, kinky semimysticism that is grounded more in humor than the supernatural. It captures what Austin looked like in the Sixties as well as the political sensibility shared by so many at the time” (2014). The film is a vital piece of both Hippie cinema and Austin filmmaking. Gordon-Bouzard writes that, through *Eggshells*, he “discovered Tobe Hooper, the psychedelic hippie and experimental filmmaker. The man who lived through an incredibly romanticized period in the history of my city, and whose debut film held the same DNA as several other Austin-based films

but was also wholly its own freak-out” (2017). The film explores the lives of members of the counterculture in the American south, in a field in which many discussions about Hippies focus on Los Angeles, Haight-Ashbury, Chicago, or Woodstock.

Despite a few positive moments, the Hippie movement experienced several tragedies and setbacks in 1969, both on- and off-screen. The cycle of Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films changed after 1969, as mainstream filmmakers understood how to realistically and sympathetically portray Hippies. Further, youth culture was addressed in a hip and comprehensive way, and mainstream filmmakers began to cast young actors as protagonists. However, positive mainstream Hippie films declined again as the most damaging sub-cycle of Hippiesploitation began: the Manson movies. Like Teensploitation, Hippie films began to lack radical new statements, while simultaneously adding sub-cycles that drifted away from daily Hippie life, such as the hitchhiking and campus protest sub-cycles. While 1969 saw a significant improvement in how Hippies and youth culture were represented on-screen, the improvements did not proceed into the 1970s. After 1969, the majority of Hippiesploitation films were negative, and positive mainstream Hippie films became increasingly rare.

CHAPTER VI. "HALLELUJAH, I'M A BUM": 1970 FILMS AND CONCLUDING
THOUGHTS

In 1970, jazz, folk, and blues vocalist Barbara Dane produced an album called *FTA! Songs of the GI Resistance*. FTA stands for Free the Army, a phrase central to the GI Movement comprised of anti-war veterans and draftees. The album includes anti-war folk ballads "Bring 'Em Home" and "Resistance Hymn," as well as "We Shall Not Be Moved," a 1970 rendition of the anti-slavery spiritual. One of the album's most important offerings is Dane's updated version of the folk song "Hallelujah, I'm a Bum," which was a response to the supposedly carefree life of hobos. Dane's adaptation highlights Richard Nixon's 1970s reference to Hippies as "bums" and the 1970 Kent State Shootings, as it features the line, "When he first called us bums, didn't know what he meant; but the Guard has defined it on the campus at Kent." It also calls attention to the incarceration of Black Panther Party members in the line, "Hey we could spring Huey [P. Newton] and Bobby [Seale] from jail; with Julie and Tricia [Nixon] for ransom and bail." Dane's song challenges the Establishment's violence against the counterculture in 1970. Its biting lyrics point to the rising militancy of counterculture groups like The Weather Underground (formerly The Weathermen), a terroristic faction that impacted how the dominant culture perceived Hippies and represented them on film.

In contrast to the violence off-screen, 1970 was one of the most positive years in terms of filmic depictions of the Hippie movement. Several mainstream Hippie movies were released in 1970. The most positive was *Woodstock* (Wadleigh), which captured the high and low points of the previous year's music festival. Another positive Hippie film, *The Strawberry Statement* (Hagmann), came out in June, one month after the Kent State Massacre; it is one of the first in the campus protest sub-cycle of Hippie cinema. *Joe* (Avildsen) offers a negative depiction of the

type of far-right characters who opposed Hippies. Hippiesploitation films also continued into 1970. Roger Corman's *Gas-s-s-s* represents the single most progressive stance on youth culture in a Hippiesploitation film. It focuses on various youth groups trying to form a utopian society after an apocalyptic event. By comparison, *I Drink Your Blood* (Durstun), the first film in the Manson sub-cycle of Hippiesploitation, led to a series of Manson films that presented the counterculture in the darkest possible light. In this chapter, I provide close readings of *Woodstock* and *Gas-s-s-s* to discuss some of the last progressive representations of Hippies on film. While 1970 was generally a positive year for Hippie representation on-screen, it also introduced several sub-cycles that diminished innovation in the Hippie film cycle.

Positive Representations in Hippiesploitation, Mainstream, and Independent Hippie Films

Woodstock (Wadleigh 1970), is the most positive, well-known representation of Hippies on film. A *Time* article called *Woodstock*, “the moment when the special culture of U.S. youth of the '60s displayed its strength, appeal, and power; it may well rank as one of the significant political and sociological events of the age” (anon 1969). Despite its hurdles, *Woodstock* was a major cultural success for the Hippies, and for that it owes a great debt to the documentary. *Woodstock* surpassed *Medium Cool* as the most positive filmic depiction of the counterculture; it contains the same cinematographic elements as *Medium Cool*, but unlike Wexler's film, *Woodstock* is utterly authentic. It is a meticulously accurate record of a real event rather than a fictional story set during that event, and it has a significant place in film history.

Woodstock won the Academy Award for Best Documentary and earned nominations for Best Sound and Best Editing, which is notable because documentaries rarely receive nominations for editing. Director Michael Wadleigh captured remarkable footage, and acclaimed editor Thelma Schoonmaker edited it together to recreate the concert's positive psychedelic experience.

Woodstock shines on three levels: its kind representation of the Hippies, performers, and local residents; Wadleigh's comprehensive footage; and Schoonmaker's unique editing style. These elements make *Woodstock* a vital entry in film history and bolster its reputation as the Hippies' most positive representation in a mainstream film.

Wadleigh's approach to framing Hippies makes *Woodstock* one of the best on-screen representations of the counterculture. While the film's musical performances are the highlight for many viewers, the film gives Hippies equal screen time as the musical acts, making them as important as musicians like Jimi Hendrix, Arlo Guthrie, and Joan Baez. The Hippies are not portrayed as passive observers to the real show. The film opens with Hippies arriving at Woodstock, joined by nuns, mothers and children, and young people not associated with the counterculture. Residents of Sullivan County and the town of Bethel, New York, are welcoming and speak positively of the young Hippies, calling them polite and courteous. The townsfolk share food with the Hippies and even have warm conversations with them. In one interview, a local family is asked who is coming into town. Off-screen, a Hippie says, "Freaks." The word prompts the following exchange between the father of the family and the Hippie:

Father: Is that what you call yourselves? Is that what you call yourself, really? Why?

Hippie: That's what everybody else calls us.

Father: Well, why do you call yourself that for?

Hippie: Because we admit it. Compared to everybody else, we're freaks.

Father: I don't think you are. As long as you're behaving yourself, there's nothing wrong.

(Wadleigh 1970)

This civil exchange illustrates a point made throughout the film: perhaps the disconnect between the Woodstock Generation and the "Silent" and "Greatest" generations is not such a

vast chasm. By coexisting for a weekend, members of the counterculture and the citizens of Bethel and Sullivan County gain respect for one another. An unnamed chief of police^{liii} says, “People should be proud of these kids. Notwithstanding the way they dress or the way they wear their hair, that’s their own personal business. But their inner workings, their inner selves, their self-demeanor cannot be questioned. They can’t be questioned as good American citizens” (Wadleigh 1970). Like the real Monticello Police Chief Yank, the older generations do not approve of the Hippies’ style but are kind, welcoming, and willing to listen.

In addition to music, *Woodstock* places a focus on human kindness. The film has no villains, only people trying to live and be happy. During the weekend, they struggle with enormous hardships but still help each other. Wadleigh references price gouging by drug, food, and drink vendors, but he focuses more explicitly on people being good to each other. Kitts writes, “While Wadleigh struggles with Woodstock’s complexities, he ultimately interprets, safeguards, and propagates Woodstock as a ‘magnificent symbol of an era’” (2009, 722). Wadleigh did not attempt to keep Woodstock “pure,” but he chose to showcase people helping and caring for each other. Neighboring citizens offered food and drink. After the rain, promoters had helicopters drop dry clothing and bedding for the attendees. Hippies led yoga sessions, had open sex, and shared music, food, and drugs. Wadleigh brings the audience along for the ride with his close documentary style. By showing the Hippies go through the worst, Wadleigh presents them at their best.

Through interviews, Wadleigh also captures several core beliefs of the counterculture that other filmmakers ignored in their films. For example, the filmmakers interview two hitchhikers, a man and a woman who live in the same commune and are traveling together. When they arrive at the concert, they plan to separate and each spend the weekend however they choose. They love

each other but are not beholden to one another. The interview highlights several critical aspects of Hippie ideology that filmmakers had previously not fully explored. The first point is the importance of communal living for the Hippies. The two interviewees live together but also share parts of their lives with others. They practice Free Love and are also free from jealousy. Unlike Hippiesploitation films, *Woodstock* does not present Hippies as sex-obsessed, but rather as relatable people with coherent beliefs. Despite this sympathetic portrayal, the film allows audiences to draw their own conclusions. Un-Hip film reviewer Foster Hirsch writes:

I began to view *Woodstock* as a kind of Rorschach blot, in which the material presented is highly suggestive, not at all fixed in a final, unambiguous formulation, and therefore capable of inducing a wide range of interpretation. According to one point of view, the kids may be heroes, their life style the expression of rebellion against mindless, inhumane authority; according to another point of view, the kids may seem vague, immature followers of a parallel, equally conformity-ridden culture. The film, I think, offers plentiful support for either interpretation, as well as for many intermediate responses between these poles. (1971, 55)

While Hirsch is correct that not all viewers will interpret the film the same way, he fails to acknowledge that *Woodstock* actively works to engender empathy for Hippies. The sheer volume of film Wadleigh captured contributes to *Woodstock's* empathetic portrayal of Hippies. In addition to filming nearly every performance, Wadleigh had cameras in the crowd throughout the event, capturing acts of love, both physical and spiritual. Wadleigh had at least two cameras turned on the stage for most performances, which Schoonmaker deftly edited together and which contributed to the film's empathetic view of the Hippies. Wadleigh captured shots of the massive audience that take up the entire frame, as well as close-up shots of individuals. As with previous

Hippie films that portrayed Hippies well, *Woodstock* encourages audiences to identify with Hippies by focusing on individual, engaging members of the audience. By also interviewing members of older generations and citizens not involved in Woodstock, Wadleigh gives viewers options for people they can relate to.

Schoonmaker's editing also encourages audiences to empathize with the people in the film. Her noteworthy split-screen technique serves three functions: it gives the musical performances a kaleidoscope effect; it allows Schoonmaker to present several events simultaneously; and it allows her to juxtapose different perspectives of the event. By creating a kaleidoscope effect, Schoonmaker compels viewers to engage with the musical performances on a variety of levels. Schoonmaker gives the performances a psychedelic, acid trip feels and enhances their immersive qualities, making the audience feel that they are at Woodstock. When Schoonmaker uses the split-screen to display multiple images simultaneously, she lets longer takes remain on screen while still conveying a message. For example, when the Hippies arrive at Woodstock, Schoonmaker shows them arriving on foot, alongside footage of the line of cars leading back through the highway. Schoonmaker could have chosen shorter, sequential shots, but placing them side by side allows the viewer to grasp the full scope of the event.

Finally, Schoonmaker juxtaposes images so that viewers can experience all of the sights and sounds of Woodstock. For example, Schoonmaker presents Hippies doing drugs while Arlo Guthrie performs his pro-dope song "Coming into Los Angeles." Schoonmaker also juxtaposes Hippies skinny-dipping with the police chief declaring that Hippies are good people. The first example invites viewers to relate with Hippies - particularly young people, many of whom had had similar trips and associated the lyrics with recreational drug use. The second example provides insight into the older generations' views of Hippies. The police chief says that the kids

are “good American citizens,” even though he does not approve of “the way they dress or the way they wear their hair.” No doubt the chief and many of his contemporaries would have disapproved of the blatant nudity and open sexuality. However, by placing the two images next to each other, Schoonmaker implies that Hippies are still “good American citizens,” even though they practice nudism and alternative sexuality. *Woodstock* stands out as one of the most honest and complete records of Hippie life. The film is also one of the most empathetic films toward the counterculture because of its displays of kindness, Wadleigh’s extensive footage, and Schoonmaker’s editing.

However, *Woodstock* glosses over some of the most negative aspects of the event. Yet, as Thomas M. Kitts writes, “Wadleigh reveals the tensions and contradictions of the festival through images with underlying ambiguities (an amphetamine-high dancer, a terrified young woman overwhelmed by the crowds), with ominous overtones (night scenes about ten minutes into the film), of human exploitation (the selling of water, Bill Graham’s comparison of attendees to ants), and of environmental destruction (the ravaged postfestival landscape)” (2009, 721-722). While Wadleigh acknowledges that Woodstock was not perfect, the film contributes to the fondness of people’s memories. *Woodstock* holds a special place in cultural and filmic history because it was a record of a catastrophe that brought people together. Like the Summer of Love, participants tend to view Woodstock nostalgically, remembering only the good and none of the bad. *Woodstock* stands as perhaps the single most important and empathetic mainstream Hippie film. However, it was not the only positive Hippie film released in 1970.

In September 1970, Roger Corman and American International Pictures released their last collaboration: *Gas-s-s-s*, sometimes known as *Gas! or It Became Necessary to Destroy the World in Order to Save It*.^{liv} The film is one of Corman’s most optimistic counterculture films

and the most positive Hippiesploitation film produced during the Hippie film cycle. Nick Heffernan writes, “*Gas-s-s-s* remains remarkable and unique among the thirty or so feature films made about the youth counterculture between 1966 and 1971 in its total identification with the youth viewpoint and its utter lack of cynicism or ambivalence about youthful political idealism. And in formal terms, it is marked by the complete absence of any of AIP’s customary exploitation devices designed to titillate the curious outsider or prurient voyeur” (2015, 12). *Gas-s-s-s* contributed to “the very notions of identity connected to youth rebellion, the counterculture and to baby boomers [being] hashed out in the public eye and in personal consumption,” which cemented its importance the cultural conversation (Bartkowiak and Kiuchi 2015, 106).

The film begins with a John Wayne-esque cartoon general announcing that the military industrial complex accidentally released a gas that killed everyone over the age of 25. The film focuses on its two lead Hippie characters, Coel (Robert Corff) and Cilla (Elaine Giftos), as they travel the country in search of a place to live peacefully. They meet new friends, including Carlos (Ben Vereen), a black radical; his pregnant, white, rock n’ roll-obsessed girlfriend Marissa (Cindy Williams); and fellow Hippies Hooper (Bud Cort) and Coralee (Talia Shire). The group also meets several antagonists representing mis-matched elements of youth culture: bikers who have taken over a golf course and ride around in golf carts; a fascist, rapist football team; cowboys who rustle cars instead of cattle; a Texas ranger who finds himself out of his jurisdiction in New Mexico; and a pair of goths, one fashioned after Edgar Allen Poe, who follow the group. The group begins living in a pueblo village in New Mexico, where they meet an unnamed Hippie who explains the town’s ethos:

Unnamed Hippie: “We’re all here in this pueblo because we want to be. We can all make a contribution by doing what you enjoy doing. There’s food, shelter, friendship, and love here. There’s no violence. None. Not a thought of it. Only love. The speech goes something like that.”

Cilla: “Beautiful. But does it mean anything?”

Unnamed Hippie: “Not yet. But we can give it meaning if we live by it. We’re anxious to make this pueblo come alive. And we can only do that with people.”

The conversation sums up much of the Hippie ideology and Corman’s positive opinions of them. In the film’s climax, the football team returns to raid and destroy the village and rape its inhabitants. In a *deus ex machina*, God literally intervenes and brings back all of the characters who the Hippies left behind throughout the film. They decide to live together in the pueblo as peaceful Hippies. As the film ends, God and Jesus discuss whether or not they should return to Earth. Jesus agrees, as long as God goes first this time. Few endings in the Hippie film cycle are as hopeful as that of *Gas-s-s-s*.

Gas-s-s-s represents Corman’s final attempt to make a significant countercultural statement, and certain aspects of the film are successful. For example, Corman makes the statement that youth culture is not monolithic by acknowledging a variety of non-Hippie youth cultures, including jocks, bikers, and goths. Through the film’s plot, Corman argues that Hippies have developed the best lifestyle: one that includes everyone and forms utopia. Goth character Edgar Allen (Bruce Karcher) represents Corman’s left-leaning viewpoint, while Edgar Allen’s goth girlfriend, Lenore (uncredited), represents the conservative viewpoint. Edgar Allen and Lenore act as narrators, following the Hippie heroes and commenting on their actions. Heffernan describes an exchange between the two characters:

“Aren’t they all going to rape, cheat, steal, lie, fight, and kill?” inquires Edgar’s incredulous companion, Lenore, voicing the conservative view (and that of every AIP counterculture film save *Gas-s-s-s* and *The Trip*), in which youth radicalism was merely a cover for power trips, sexual incontinence, sleazy criminality, or infantile, oedipal rage. “Nevermore!” answers Edgar’s pet raven, and the millennium arrives as a series of fallen liberators, including Lincoln, Gandhi, JFK, Che Guevara, and Martin Luther King Jr., rise again to bless the new society, associating the youth revolt with the global struggle to extend human freedom. (2015, 13)

While Corman’s film makes positive statements about the counterculture, it falls into a pitfall similar to *Lord Love a Duck* (Axelrod 1966): it tries to comment on too much, and Corman’s thesis statement gets lost. Mathew J. Bartkowiak and Yuya Kiuchi write, “A film that takes on dissent, generational rebellion, war, peace, style, ethos, and music offers an even overwhelming taste of the time and the zeitgeist. To have so many cues operating within the same text, for good or ill, creates a potential hypertext of the times” (2015, 105). For example, the golfing bikers are representative of both conformity and counterculture, but they appear in the film so briefly that their role is unclear, except as foils from whom the Hippies escape.

One of the film’s most problematic moments involves the rapist football players. Three of them gang-rape Cilla (off screen). When the film returns to the group, Cilla has outlasted the rapists, who look exhausted. Cilla explains basic feminist theory to them. Cilla later tells Coel that they had raped her but that she was able to “lay back and enjoy it.” The film reveals that Corman, like (male) Hippies, did not understand or address the issues occurring within second-wave feminism, but moreover had a fundamental misunderstanding of rape from a woman’s

perspective.^{iv} However, despite its shortcomings, *Gas-s-s-s* serves as an essential text when analyzing positive films about the Hippie movement.

Gas-s-s-s also marked two significant changes in the world of exploitation filmmaking: it was the last positive Hippiesploitation film and the last collaboration between Corman and AIP. Corman, who had worked intermittently with AIP since its formation in 1955, left AIP because of the film's editing and release date. God and Jesus were initially supposed to appear as omniscient narrators throughout the film, but AIP, particularly James A. Nicholson, cut most of those scenes. Corman blamed the changes on Nicholson growing more conservative (Corman and Jerome 1990, 166). Additionally, while the film was released in September 1970, it did not receive a wider release until 1971. By that time, positive feelings within and towards the Hippie movement had largely evaporated due to tragic cultural events. As a result, *Gas-s-s-s* did poorly at the box office.

After the split, Corman founded New World Pictures, but he only directed one more film in the 1970s: his Red Baron film, *Von Richthofen and Brown* (1971). Afterwards, he switched to a producorial role for the rest of his career, with the exception of *Frankenstein Unbound* (1991), which he directed as a challenge to himself. Heffernan writes, "Although he has attributed this career turn to creative fatigue and absorption in running New World's business operations, it is clear that Corman's withdrawal from directing had as much to do with the industry's loss of interest in genuinely countercultural material and the failure to find the right audience" (2015, 15). Corman particularly lamented this "loss of interest" and "failure to find the right audience" because he called *Gas-s-s-s*, "the most intricate and most organized intellectual film that I have ever made" (qtd in Goldman 1971, 53). Corman produced only one countercultural film with

New World: the biker film *Angels Hard as They Come* (Viola 1971). After *Gas-s-s-s*, most Hippiesploitation films focused on Charles Manson, and all took a negative view of Hippies.

While *Gas-s-s-s* was the last positive Hippiesploitation film, it was not the last positive Hippie film. Independent Hippie film *Gold* (Desloge and Levis 1972), like *Eggshells* (Hooper 1969), is a rare example of a Hippie film produced by Hippies. Co-director Bob Levis shot the film on a budget of \$1000, which he inherited from his grandmother. *Gold* feels amateurish at times because of its low budget and improvised dialogue. The film lacks a formal screenplay and has no credited screenwriter. *Gold* takes place in a northern California town that experiences a boom when gold is discovered. The now-wealthy townspeople desire to remove the Hippies living on the town's outskirts. They hire Captain Harold Jinks (Gary Goodrow), an uptight police officer from out of town, to become their new sheriff. Jinks initially complies with the townspeople's request and rounds up the Hippies and puts them in a large, barbed-wire pen. However, he soon begins arresting and even killing townspeople if they step out of line, especially if they appear nude in public. Luckily, the townspeople and the Hippies have a mutual ally: Hawk (Del Close), a Hippie preacher who peddles conspiracy theories. Hawk creates havoc for Jinks and later breaks the Hippies and townspeople out of the caged area. By the film's conclusion, the Hippies and townspeople have acclimated, and they attempt to get Jinks to loosen up, even stripping him nude to go swimming. Jinx leaves town as the Hippies and townspeople celebrate together.

Gold is the only Hippie film to feature an exclusively Hippie cast and crew. While many mainstream Hippie films feature older, established actors portraying both Hippies and characters reacting to Hippies, *Gold* does the opposite. It showcases Hippies portraying "Establishment" characters, creating a funhouse mirror of such mainstream films as *I Love You*, *Alice B. Toklas*

(Averback 1968) or *Skidoo* (Preminger 1968). The Hippies portray these characters in an exaggerated but also grounded manner, because they understand the dominant culture. Unlike other Hippie films, *Gold*'s Hippy cast members portray their Hippy characters realistically and as the norm. By contrast, Jinks and the "Establishment" townspeople are the oddballs. Had *Gold* been a more mainstream film, this statement would have been revolutionary.

Unfortunately, like *Eggshells*, *Gold* did not make a significant cultural or filmic impact upon its release, and like *Gas-s-s-s*, its debut at the box office was delayed. *Gold* was shot in 1968, but due to its low budget and the poor quality of the film, it was not distributed until 1972. Although it was an American production, it was initially released only in London, England, and it did not see a theatrical release in the U.S. until 1996, well after the Hippy movement had ended. Because of its limited release, it did not succeed financially in either the U.K. or the U.S. Its widest release was a DVD distribution from Wild Eye Entertainment in 2004. Co-director Bob Levis appeared on New York City public access television to promote its home video release, which still failed to garner the film a wide audience (Channer 2008).

After 1970, Hippiesploitation and other Hippy films made the same mistakes as Teensploitation: they began to rely on too many formulaic conventions, and they divided into ever-smaller sub-cycles. In 1970, at least three mainstream college protest Hippy films were released: *The Strawberry Statement* (Hagmann), *The Revolutionary* (Williams), and *Getting Straight* (Rush). Films that focused on specific aspects of Hippy lifestyle, such as hitchhiking and Free Love, were also released in the 1970s. *Thumb Tripping* (Masters 1972) and *Pick-Up* (Hirschenson 1975) are examples of hitchhiking films. The Free Love sub-cycle includes *Group Marriage* (Rothman 1973), *The Harrad Experiment* (Post 1973), and *Harrad Summer* (Stern 1974). Other mainstream Hippy films from this period are *Zachariah* (Englund 1971), *Billy Jack*

(Laughlin), and *Fritz the Cat* (Bakshi 1972). Sexploitation Hippiesploitation continued with *Ghetto Freaks*, a.k.a. *Sign of Aquarius* (Emory 1970), *Love-In '72* (Hansen, Knight, and Nuchtern 1970), and *Bummer!* (Castleman 1973).^{lvi} International Hippiesploitation and Hippie films include the Italian American *Zabriskie Point* (Antonioni 1970), the Canadian *Dr. Frankenstein On Campus* (Taylor 1970), and the Israeli *An American Hippie in Israel* (Sefer 1972). *Joe* is one of the few unique Hippie films of the cycle's final years; it acknowledges the counterculture's far-right adversaries and does not portray them sympathetically. However, it does not entirely portray its Hippie characters sympathetically either.

Manson films comprised the largest sub-cycle of the last years of the Hippiesploitation cycle. Between 1970 and 1976, roughly one dozen explicitly Manson films were released, primarily by exploitation film companies (Cooper 2018, 15-54). The films portrayed not only Manson as vile, but the entire Hippie movement as well. It is vital to divorce the Hippie movement in reality from Manson the person. However, Manson films are essential to the larger Hippie film cycle, because most were made and marketed as Hippiesploitation films. Manson films began in 1970 with the release of *I Drink Your Blood* (Durstun 1970). The Manson sub-cycle is a series of films about violent, communal, Hippie groups killing people, often at the direction of a charismatic but wicked leader. The Manson killings were responsible, as an individual concept, for more films than any other single event. AIP-distributed *Manson* (Hendrickson and Merrick 1973) stands out, because it was nominated for an Academy Award for Best Documentary and features interviews with Manson Family members, including "Squeaky" Fromme, who later attempted to assassinate President Gerald Ford. CBS TV movie *Helter Skelter* (Gries 1976), which featured Steve Railsback as Charlie, was the Manson sub-cycle's most widely seen film. Many Manson films have been released since 1976. While the

films were not responsible for the decline of the movement, they were indicative of the social forces that contributed to the disillusion of the counterculture by the mid-1970s.

Few positive cultural events occurred for the Hippies in the 1970s. On May 2, 1970, the Ohio National Guard shot and killed multiple protestors in what became known as The Kent State Massacre. Timothy Leary went to prison for marijuana possession in 1970, only to be broken out by the Weather Underground later that year. The Weather Underground continued their campaign of terror, bombing several more government facilities throughout the 1970s. Heiress Patty Hearst was kidnapped and brainwashed by the Symbionese Liberation Army, a far-left group associated with the Hippies in the press. Several prominent Hippies died due to drug use. Some Hippies left the movement in favor of other progressive causes, like environmentalism and second-wave feminism. Others, such as Jerry Rubin, began investing in Wall Street and created a new subculture: Yuppies. The Hippies had only two positive events: in 1974, the Vietnam War ended, and Richard Nixon resigned. However, it was too little too late for the Hippie movement.

Conclusion

From the beginning of the Teensploitation and mainstream teen cycles, filmmakers rarely portrayed Hippies realistically. Many teen films directly opposed their lifestyles and portrayed them as representative of a teenager's need to mature. The same is true of early Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie films. While Hippiesploitation films began to understand the basic style and ethos of the counterculture before mainstream films, they also portrayed Hippies in a generally negative light. Hippiesploitation often reflected dominant cultural concerns about Hippies. Anti-Hippie exploitation films traded on controversy and fed into the moral panic about Hippies, drugs, sex, and rock n' roll. Marketing for the films often painted an even worse picture

of the counterculture. Even with partially positive Hippiesploitation films, such as *Psych-Out* (Rush 1968), the advertising materials fed into negative Hippie stereotypes. Roger Corman, who had a personal affinity for countercultural causes, was one of the few exploitation filmmakers who made positive Hippiesploitation films.

Hippies were occasionally depicted positively on film, but it was not until 1969 that mainstream filmmakers made Hippie films that were both sympathetic and realistic. Early mainstream Hippie films cast older, established actors as mainstream protagonists that reacted to Hippie characters, thereby taking focus away from the Hippies. As Hippies were increasingly covered by the media, left-leaning filmmakers began to understand Hippies more fully. Many cultural events involving the Hippies inspired positive filmic representations of the counterculture. As mainstream filmmakers better understood the Hippies, they began featuring Hippie characters more prominently. These roles invited empathy by making the Hippie characters relatable and likable. Mainstream filmmakers also made the characters feel more realistic by shooting the films using the *cinéma-vérité* style. Most progressive portrayals of the Hippies in mainstream films were developed by powerful, left-leaning auteurs.

Some of the earliest positive depictions of the counterculture were found in Hippiesploitation documentaries, whose filmmakers spoke with real Hippies and encouraged them to share their perspectives. Several independent Hippie films also portrayed Hippies positively, often because they were made by people who themselves identified as Hippies. However, because they were financially unsuccessful and lacked wide distribution, independent films did not carry the same cultural significance as Hippiesploitation or mainstream Hippie films.

In the 1970s, the Hippie movement ended alongside the Hippie film cycle. After decades of collaboration, Roger Corman broke with AIP. Although AIP continued to produce and distribute movies well after 1970, *Gas-s-s-s* was their last film by such an influential countercultural filmmaker. With the exception of the exploitation documentary *Manson*, it was also their final Hippiesploitation film. 1970 also marked the moment Hippie films began to suffer the same pitfall as teen films. They lacked the narrative innovation to tell new stories in an interesting and relatable way, and they instead relied on narrative gimmicks to attract audiences. Lack of innovation in film often signals ends of cycles, as it did for teen films and would do in future cycles such as slasher films in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Like the Teensploitation beach monster musical, *The Horror of Party Beach* (Tenney 1964), Hippie films added multiple unnecessary narrative devices, rather than finding new ways to address the concerns of the counterculture. For example, *Zachariah* was a Hippie western musical, and *Fritz the Cat* was an animated Hippie comic book movie. If filmmakers were not amassing narrative devices, they examined narrow aspects of Hippie lifestyle, such as campus protests, Free Love, and hitchhiking. Some late Hippie films did not even feature recognizable Hippie characters. For example, *The Harrad Experiment* and *Harrad Summer* supposedly analyzed Free Love and group marriages, but they were more teen sex films than Hippie films. On-screen Hippies eventually became the joke or the villain.

The hopeful end for this dissertation is to turn it into a book. I am still examining ways in which I can do make the transition, but there are several plans. First, I will expand the timeline back to 1976. Even though there were reasons for me ending my study in 1970, there are also good reasons for examining up until 1976. That is the last year there was a Hippie film that directly commented on something happening in Hippie culture. The film was *Helter Skelter*,

which both looked back at the Manson murders and trial, while at the same time was directly commenting on Manson in the news, as “Squeaky” Fromme had just tried to assassinate President Gerald Ford. The second thing I plan to do is move beyond the binary of good representation vs. bad representation, as many of these films are not so cut and dry. I plan on adapting one of these chapters as a journal article, then moving onto the larger book project. I feel a book about Hippie films is necessary as there is so little information available about the cycle.

Hippie films almost exclusively reflect the dominant culture in which they were produced, with notable exceptions that provide genuine insights into the Hippie lifestyle and ideology. Hippies were only one small part of the larger counterculture. Examining filmic depictions of Beatniks, bikers, punks, and other countercultural groups are also essential studies, some of which have been done, others which need expanding. David Sterritt has examined filmic depictions of Beatniks and Peter Stanfield has done work on biker films. The analysis of Hippie films provides insight into multiple modes of filmmaking from the mid-1950s to the early 1970s. The field of film studies benefits from an examination of the diverse approaches of mainstream, independent, and exploitation filmmakers to a shared topic. The Hippie film cycle uncovers a great deal about the film industry, such as how different parts of the industry portrayed the counterculture. The Hippie movement developed progressive ideas that are still culturally relevant, which is vital to their legacy on the screen. Their positive depictions in film are reflections of the progressive voices within the movement. The message of peace, love, and music continues to this day.

ENDNOTES

-
- i See *A History of Narrative Film* by David Cook, *Hollywood v. Hardcore : How the Struggle Over Censorship Saved the Modern Film Industry* by Jon Lewis, *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era* by Thomas Schatz, *The Hollywood Renaissance: Revisiting American Cinema's Most Celebrated Era* edited by Yannis Tzioumakis and Peter Krämer, etc.
- ii See *In Search of the Lost Chord: 1967 and the Hippie Idea* by Danny Goldberg, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* by Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, amongst others
- iii See “No Parents, No Church, No Authorities in Our Films: Exploitation Movies, the Youth Audience, and Roger Corman’s Counterculture Trilogy” by Nick Heffernan, “A Taste for Trash: The Persistence of Exploitation in American Cinema, 1960-1975” by David Lerner, and *Camera and Action: American Film as Agent of Social Change, 1965-1975* by Elaine M. Bapis, amongst others
- iv By the mid to late-1950s, the Bowery Boys were finishing up their theatrical runs, as they had become less and less successful with the rise of teen films. The end to this series was none too soon as Bowery Boy leader Leo Gorcey was 39 in his last film in which he played a young adult.
- v “Essentially good kid” is my term for this type of character.
- vi Distributor-produced advertising is often called “native” advertising in the modern parlance. I prefer to use distributor-produced advertising as it is a far less problematic term and differs from the modern usage of online “native” advertising.
- vii Beatniks and coffeehouse are more of the choir and the setting of Roger Corman’s *A Bucket of Blood* (1959). The pressbook for the film does not mention Beatniks explicitly, and what mention there is of them in the advertising does not disparage them. The only distributor-produced advertising story does not even reference them by name, the title reading, “Wild Poets – Crazy Artists Hit the Screen in ‘A Bucket of Blood’” (American International Pictures 1959, [2]). Most of the pressbook sells the horror comedy angle, using single panel cartoons. It includes ads for its companion film *Attack of the Giant Leeches* (Kowalski 1959) and tries to sell the AIP Records soundtrack for both the films. Even the exploitation section of the pressbook, called “Showmanship Ideas for Showmen,” is more focused on the horror comedy aspects of the film, such as, “Run another contest in your local newspaper, asking persons to write in as many feature titles that have the word BLOOD in it, i.e., BLOOD ALLEY, KISS THE BLOOD OFF MY HAND, BLOOD ISLAND” (American International Pictures 1959, [4]). Given that the distribution company was AIP, it is entirely possible the company was trying to solicit ideas for future movie titles with this campaign.
- viii David Sterritt points out several inconsistencies between real Beat life and what is portrayed in *A Bucket of Blood*, arguing, “many of the film’s sociological details are not particularly Beat at all ... a typical Beatnik breakfast in the film appears to consist of carefully munched California health food, quite different from the anything-goes, on the run meals ... characteristically described in Beat literature. Sexual mores in the coffeehouse appear to mirror those of square society” (1998, 143). He writes that the film has a “Beat-unfriendly attitude.” Sterritt does not contextualize this position in terms of other Beat exploitation films, which treated Beatniks far worse and that most of the shots that the film takes are meant in good fun, not maliciously.

He also writes of the folk artist playing in the club in the film arguing, “Folk music does seem quite at home on the soundtrack of Jonas Mekas’s strongly Beat-related *Guns of the Trees*, but the film was released three years later in 1962, when folk music had begun to thrive” (1998, 143). In reality, folk artists like the Kingston Trio were playing in Beat-friendly coffeehouses like The Purple Onion and the hungry i as early as 1957 (Bush 2013, 51-52). Additionally, any incorrect details the film may have had were due to Corman and screenwriter Charles B. Griffith’s small budget and quick turnover time. Thoughtful treatment of subcultures in a Beatnik film, particularly a Beatnik exploitation film, is rare. The approach was both an imitation, albeit an often incorrect one, and a parody. Such treatment is likely due to Corman being at the helm of the film, as he has historically been very understanding of youth subcultures, be they teens, Beatniks, or later, Hippies (Heffernan 2015, 5).

ix He has a decent voice, but wavers between mild late 1950s rock n’ roll and easy listening. He is something of a low-rent Bobby Darin-type if Darin came from a gang-filled background and was not as good a singer.

x The Chicago Eight, or Seven, or Ten depending on how one counts them, will be discussed at some length in Chapter 4. They were Hippies, Yippies, members of the New Left, and one Black Panther who protested Hubert Humphrey’s nomination at the Chicago Democratic Convention and were arrested in what is commonly known as the Chicago Conspiracy Trial.

xi Of course, westward expansion in the United States has been a cause for hope and idealism since the beginnings of the country.

xii The emphasis is Wolfe’s.

xiii Again, the emphasis belongs to Wolfe.

xiv The all caps emphasis existed in the magazine.

xv Presidential candidate Richard Nixon would famously say on a 1968 episode of the show in an attempt to get the youth vote.

xvi A typical idea of the Hippies includes Free Love and the sexual revolution. Free Love, at least in its modern sense, owes much of its original founding to John Noyes, who founded the Oneida community in 1848. It was a religious community that was Christian yet promoted ideas about sex and gender equality far more progressive than most Christian societies at the time. Some of the values preached by Noyes in the Oneida community included communal living, freedom of women from men, tantric male sex to allow for full female pleasure, the ability of partners to criticize one another, and polyfidelity, which is a type of closed group marriage. In the case of the Oneida community, it would be a group marriage within their commune. Many of these beliefs would be taken up by Hippies in the next century, though how much of this is attributed to Noyes is unclear. Noyes was not the only person to preach Free Love before the Hippies. Victoria Woodhull, who was also one of the first female candidates for United States president under the Equal Rights Party, promoted the idea of Free Love. Woodhull advocated for a person’s right for sexual freedom and was herself involved in several “triadic love relationships, including one with a prominent Christian minister that caused a national scandal” (Anapol 2010, 49). Following her was Emma Goldman, a feminist, anarchist, and Free Love activist in the 1930s and 1940s, who not only fought for women’s issues but who also brought issues of sexual liberty and reproductive rights into the conversation.

xvii Several critics have called *The Horror of Party Beach* one of the worst films of all time.

xviii The film is as convoluted as the plot indicates. It is a Teensploitation-monster-beach movie and a musical. As a drive-in film, it was cheap, harmless fun, with the possible exception of its surprising level of violence. The gore in the film is surprising, given the topic and time, as

well. Also questionable about the film is how it portrays Dr. Gavin's black maid Eulabelle, played by Eulabelle Moore in her only film credit as well. The film gives her role all the subtlety of Butterfly McQueen in *Gone With the Wind* (Fleming 1939). She is a stereotypical black maid character with little support other than the occasional, "Yessir" and her superstitious belief in voodoo, though no voodoo occurs in the film.

xix The origins of this term are unclear. King's usage of the word "grue" might be a shortened version of the word gruesome here as a way of describing violent, gory material. It could also be a reference to monsters which live in dark places, as described in Jack Vance's *Dying Earth* fantasy book series or in connection to Dean A. Grennell's science fiction magazine. King, as a student of popular literature, may be aware of this latter usage of the word, but it is foggy at best.

xx In its press book, *The Horror of Party Beach* is credited as "the first horror monster musical" (Twentieth Century Fox 1964, [1]). This marketing is inaccurate since *The Horror of Party Beach* was released on June 1, 1964 and was preceded by the horror monster musical *The Incredibly Strange Creatures Who Stopped Living and Became Mixed-Up Zombies!!?* (Steckler 1964), released on February 10 of that year.

xxi The emphasis in bold is in the pressbook.

xxii The inclusion of racist iconography in biker films is a part of the reason they are not analyzed with Hippiesploitation and mainstream Hippie movies, because it shows the radical ideological differences between bikers and Hippies.

xxiii This is my term for 1967.

xxiv The italic emphasis is Moretta's.

xxv The Kingston Trio, a group responsible for introducing the folk era of American music, performed the final concert of their original run at San Francisco Beat nightclub the hungry i on June 17, 1967. Trio members Nick Reynolds and John Stewart left Bob Shane on stage to sing his final song, "Scotch and Soda," and go to the Monterey Pop Festival that night. Jeff Tamarkin writes, "Whether they would ever admit it publicly or not, for many of the Monterey acts, from Jefferson Airplane to the Association to the Mamas & the Papas, the Kingston Trio had served as a primary influence" (2007).

xxvi The emphases in this block quote exist in the original press release.

xxvii Perhaps the script had been written and, when the protests occurred, the producers were able to include them in the plot. Maybe the film had been shot, and then scenes about the "riots" were added before the movie was released.

xxviii A pressbook for *The Happening* does exist, however it was beyond my means to obtain it for my analysis.

xxix This line does seem to express more mainstream acceptance of young people in comparison to the film *Rebel Without a Cause*. However, such a generational bridge is not shown in culture of the era. The film also does not make clear exactly what the young Hippie's "cause" actually is.

xxx Thomas is likely referencing the French New Wave film *Last Year at Marienbad* (Resnais 1961), which is high praise indeed. He puts the title in quotes rather than the correct style of italics.

xxxi In one of the most unusual uses of diegetic sound I have come across, before Lila murders people, she performs a striptease. Each one is to the same song, the title song of the movie, which explicitly mentions her using drugs and then killing men like a mantis in mid-coitus.

xxxiii It should be noted that, while they did not focus on youth or counterculture, exploitation documentaries *Mondo Bizarro* (Frost 1966) and *The Forbidden* (Andrews and Frost 1966) also feature footage from the Sunset Strip “riots.” These films were released in 1966, before the “riots,” but apparently when they were released in the U.S. in 1967, footage from the “riots” were incorporated into new cuts of the films.

xxxiii The emphasis is mine.

xxxiv The verbal matchups between those two eloquent speakers forever changed how televised debating occurred in the U.S., but that is an area for further study.

xxxv This analogy is somewhat fitting, because Carl Sandberg once described Chicago as the “hog butcher to the world.”

xxxvi William F. Buckley and Gore Vidal’s on-air arguing led to their penultimate debate in which Vidal called Buckley a “crypto-Nazi,” and Buckley countered with, “Now listen, you queer, stop calling me a crypto-Nazi, or I’ll sock you in your goddam face, and you’ll stay plastered” (Hertzberg 2015). This style of public television debate became more popular with the rise of TV pundits but can be traced back to this series between Buckley and Vidal.

xxxvii This could explain why CBS censors cut a musical number featuring Harry Belafonte from the debut episode of the third season of *The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour* (1966-1969), which featured footage of the riots (Muldaur 2002). *The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour* was one of the few countercultural voices on television in the late 1960s.

xxxviii The Chicago Seven is the popular name for the group, but it leaves out Bobby Seale, whom Judge Julius Hoffman removed from the trial after numerous disruptions. Some have called the group the Chicago Eight, which includes Seale, or the Chicago Ten. The latter term also includes their lawyers William Kunstler and Leonard Weinglass, whom Judge Hoffman convicted of contempt of court. While the Chicago Eight or Ten are more accurate names, the trial will be referred to as the Chicago Conspiracy Trial in the rest of the dissertation to avoid confusion.

xxxix Frankie Avalon and John Philip Law are the only major young actors in the film.

xl The title of the film holds countercultural roots in its reference to Alice B. Toklas, longtime paramour of Gertrude Stein and author of *The Alice B. Toklas Cookbook*, the first cookbook to include a recipe for cannabis brownies.

xli The film gives a somewhat inaccurate depiction of marijuana use, showing Harold “tripping” on pot.

xlii Another example of early Hippie rock appearing in a soundtrack is the previously mentioned Hippiesploitation documentary *Revolution*.

xliii Oddly enough, 4-20 is widely regarded as a date and time to consume marijuana in the U.S.

xliv Yasgur was not a priest, so this was not an official blessing. He spoke very positively of the Hippies for a few minutes and closed by asking God to bless them.

xlv For clarity, in referring to the two unrelated Hoffmans in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial, I will refer to Abbie Hoffman by his last name and Julius Hoffman as Judge Hoffman.

xlvi It is unclear whether or not Judge Hoffman knew that “Alice’s Restaurant” was eighteen and a half minutes long, and if so, if that factored into his decision. Additionally, the court references Guthrie’s film, *Alice’s Restaurant* (Penn 1969).

xlvii The other Panther Party members there that night besides Hampton, Clark, and Johnson, were James Grady, Brenda Harris, Louis Truelock, Ronald “Doc” Satchell, Blair Anderson, and Harold Bell.

-
- xlviiii For clarity, I will call the person Arlo Guthrie, Guthrie; the film character, Arlo; and his father, Woody Guthrie or just Woody.
- xliv This moment is anachronistic to the song and it is unclear whether the film takes place in 1965 or in 1967. The song takes place in 1965 - Guthrie released the song in 1967 and stated that the Thanksgiving dinner as occurred two years prior. The film also shows Arlo visiting his father, famed songwriter Woody Guthrie, in the hospital, and Woody's death in 1967 is shown in the film. This timeline is potentially anachronistic because while Hippies existed in 1965, the term Hippie was not in regular use until late 1966, and even then primarily in the Bay Area.
- i Or Blippies, as Bobby Seale called them.
- ii The only ballyhoo in the pressbook for *Alice's Restaurant* involves advertising the film in actual restaurants, as well as a tie-in cookbook written by the real Alice Brock, which supposedly sold 50,000 copies in its first printing (United Artists 1969, [7]).
- iii The story does not use the word Hippie, but it is implied.
- liii He is not named in the film or the credits, so it is unclear whether he is the same Monticello Police Chief Lou Yank who previously spoke highly of the Hippies attending Woodstock.
- liv The latter title comes from a Vietnam War era communique that famously said, "It became necessary to destroy the village in order to save it."
- lv Corman also addresses rape badly in several other of his films, including *Humanoids From the Deep* (Peeters 1980), *Galaxy of Terror* (Clark 1981), and most of his women-in-prison movies, such as *The Big Doll House* (Hill 1971), *Women in Cages* (de Leon 1971), and *The Big Bird Cage* (Hill 1972).
- lvi *Love-In '72* has an interesting tagline: "Phil Had a Tough Decision to Make. Joan and Uncle Sam Both Wanted His Body... Guess Who Won?" *Bummer!*, on the other hand, has one of the worst taglines I have ever run across: "You Don't Have to Assault a Groupie... You Just Have to Ask!"

REFERENCES

- Allied Artists. 1959. *The Rebel Set*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- AllMusic. 2019. "Max Frost & the Troopers: Biography & History."
<https://www.allmusic.com/artist/max-frost-the-troopers-mn0000866042/biography>.
- American International Pictures. 1957. *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*. Pressbook. Ray Browne Popular Culture Library, Bowling Green, OH.
- American International Pictures. 1959. *A Bucket of Blood*. Pressbook. Zombos' Closet.
https://www.zomboscloset.com/zombos_closet_of_horror_b/2016/10/bucket-of-blood-1959-pressbook.html.
- American International Pictures. 1966. *The Wild Angels*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- American International Pictures. 1967. *Riot on Sunset Strip*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- American International Pictures. 1968. *Psych-Out*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- American International Pictures. 1968. *Wild in the Streets*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Anapol, Deborah. 2010. *Polyamory in the Twenty-First Century: Love and Intimacy with Multiple Partners*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Anon. 1967a. "Wholly Independent 'Hippie Revolt' Backed by Costly Selling Campaign."
Variety, December 20, 1967.
- Anon. 1967b. "A Gathering of the Tribes for a Human Be-In." *San Francisco Oracle*, 1967.
- Anon. 1968a. "Inside the Mind of Director George Axelrod." *Lord Love a Duck*. DVD. United States: MGM.

Anon. 1968b. "Warning to So-Called 'Paper Panthers'." *Black Panther*, September 14, 1968.

Anon. 1969. "The Message of History's Biggest Happening." *Time Magazine*, August 29, 1969.

Anon. 1970. "Postscript to People's Park." *Time Magazine*, February 16, 1970.

Anthony, Gene. 1980. *The Summer of Love: Haight-Ashbury at Its Highest*. San Francisco: Last Gasp of San Francisco.

Arthrell, Bill. 1988. "The Ones They Missed With Bullets." In *Kent State/May 4: Echoes Through a Decade*, edited by Scott L. Bills. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Austin, Curtis J. 2006. *Up Against the Wall: Violence and the Making and Unmaking of the Black Panther Party*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Austin Film Society. 2014. "AFS Presents: EGGHELLS with Tobe Hooper & Louis Black (7/8/14)." Filmed July 8, 2014 at the Marchesa Hall & Theatre, Austin, TX. Video, 50:09. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QMM4j_0ymcI.

Bangs, Lester, Reny Brown, John Burks, Sammy Egan, Michael Goodwin, Geoffrey Link, Greil Marcus, John Morthland, Eugene Schoenfeld, Patrick Thomas, and Langdon Winner. 1970. "The Rolling Stones Disaster at Altamont: Let It Bleed." *Rolling Stone*, January 21, 1970.

Bapis, Elaine M. 2008. *Camera and Action: American Film as Agent of Social Change, 1965-1975*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Barjul International Pictures. 1960. *The Beatniks*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.

Barkowiak, Mathew J., and Yuya Kiuchi. 2015. *The Music of Counterculture Cinema: A Critical Study of 1960s and 1970s Soundtracks*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

- Baron, Cynthia. 2012. "Peter Sellers: A Figure of Impasse." In *New Constellations: Movie Stars of the 1960s*, edited by Pamela Robertson Wojcik, 115-38. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bart, Peter. 2003. "The Birth of 'Cool.'" *Variety*, August 18, 2003.
- Baumgarten, Marjorie. 2014. "'Eggshells' Is an Austin Time Capsule." *The Austin Chronicle*, July 7, 2014.
- Becker, Matt. 2006. "A Point of Little Hope: Hippie Horror Films and the Politics of Ambivalence." *The Velvet Light Trap*, 57 (1): 42-59.
- Bernhard Films. 1969. *Alice in Acidland*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Bernstein, Irving. 1996. *Guns or Butter: The Presidency of Lyndon Johnson*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bugliosi, Vincent, and Curt Gentry. 1994. *Helter Skelter: The True Story of the Manson Murders*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Burroughs, William. 1959. *Naked Lunch*. New York: Grove Press.
- Bush, William J. 2013. *Greenback Dollar: The Incredible Rise of the Kingston Trio*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Calhoun, Lilian C. 1969. "Black and White: The Death of Fred Hampton: A Special Report" *Chicago Review of Journalism* 2, no. 2 (December).
- Cannon, Lou. 2003. *Governor Reagan: His Rise to Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Carson, Greg. 2003a. "Tune In, Trip Out." *The Trip*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Carson, Greg. 2003b. "Love & Haight." *Psych-Out*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Clark, Randall. 1995. *At a Theater or Drive-in Near You: The History, Culture, and Politics of the American Exploitation Film*. New York: Garland Publishing.

- Cohen, Alex. 2010. "Eggshells: Tobe Hooper's First Film." Recorded January 8, 2010 at 89.3 KPCC, Los Angeles, CA. Audio, 4:24.
<https://www.scpr.org/news/2010/01/08/10292/eggshells-tobe-hoopers-first-film/>.
- Cohen, Allen. 1991. *The San Francisco Oracle Facsimile Edition: The Psychedelic Newspaper of Haight-Ashbury 1966-1968*. Berkeley: Regent Press.
- Cohen, Allen. 1995. *Haight-Ashbury In The Sixties*. Rockument, compact disc.
- Cohen, Stanley. 2002. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: Routledge.
- Cokley, Kevin. 2019. "How MLK's Death Changed America." *Dallas News*, August 24, 2019.
<https://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/03/27/how-mlk-s-death-changed-america/>.
- Collier, Bernard. 1969. "300,000 at Folk-Rock Fair Camp Out in a Sea of Mud; 300,000 at Music Fair Find Mud Plentiful and Food Scarce." *New York Times*. August 17, 1969.
- Columbia Pictures. 1967a. *The Love-Ins*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Columbia Pictures. 1967b. "The Happening Radio Spot." Audio, 00:00:59.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_ecMRZBsYuo.
- Columbia Pictures. 1967c. "The Happening Theatrical Trailer." Video, 3:07.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lAupa3dICGs>.
- Connors, Peter H. 2010. *White Hand Society: The Psychedelic Partnership of Timothy Leary and Allen Ginsberg*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Cooper, Ian. 2018. *The Manson Family on Film and Television*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Corman, Roger, and Jim Jerome. 1990. *How I Made a Hundred Movies in Hollywood and Never Lost a Dime*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo.

- Corrigan, Timothy. 2004. *A Short Guide to Writing About Film*. London: Pearson.
- Corrigan, Timothy, and Patricia White. 2012. *The Film Experience: An Introduction*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Cronkite, Walter. 1968. *CBS Evening News*. "Who, What, When, Where, Why: Report from Vietnam by Walter Cronkite." Aired February 27, 1968, on CBS.
- Dallek, Robert. 1998. *Flawed Giant: Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961-1973*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, Mike. 2007. "Riot Nights on Sunset Strip." *Labour/Le Travail* 59: 199–214.
- di Franco, J. Philip, ed. 1979. *The Movie World of Roger Corman*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Diggers, The. 1967. "The Death of the Hippy Press Release." *Free City News* (1967-68), Single Street Sheets. http://www.diggers.org/free_city_news_sheets.htm.
- Doherty, Thomas. 2010. *Teenagers and Teenpics: The Juvenilization of American Movies in the 1950s*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Dohrn, Bernadine, Billy Ayers, Jeff Jones, and Celia Sojourn. 1974. *Prairie Fire: The Politics of Revolutionary Anti-Imperialism*. San Francisco: The Bay Area Prairie Fire Organizing Committee.
- Engel, Currie. 2019. "The People Who Were Born and Died at the Woodstock Festival." *Time Magazine*, August 9, 2019. <https://time.com/5641667/woodstock-50-health-care/>.
- Estellachild, Vivian. 1970. "Hippie Communes." *Women: A Journal of Liberation* 2 (2): 40-41.
- Fallon, Michael. 1965. "A New Haven for Beatniks." *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 5, 1965.

- Feaster, Felicia and Bret Wood. 1999. *Forbidden Fruit: The Golden Age of the Exploitation Film*. Baltimore, MD: Midnight Marquee Press.
- Ferro, Shaunacy. "Are Acid Flashbacks A Myth?" *Popular Science*, June 9, 2019.
<https://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-08/fyi-can-acid-trip-really-give-you-flashbacks/>.
- Fisher, Austin, and Johnny Walker. 2016. *Grindhouse: Cultural Exchange on 42nd Street, and Beyond*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gair, Christopher. 2013. *The American Counterculture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gaskin, Stephen. 1974. *Hey, Beatnik: This is the Farm Book*. Summertown, TN: The Book Publishing Company.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1989. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- Gleason, Ralph. 1967. "The Tribes Gather For a Yea-Saying." *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 20, 1967.
- Goldberg, Danny. 2017. *In Search of the Lost Chord: 1967 and the Hippie Idea*. Brooklyn: Akashic Books.
- Goldman, Charles. 1971. "An Interview with Roger Corman." *Film Comment* 7, no. 3 (fall): 49-54.
- Goldwater, Barry. 1964. "Acceptance Speech." Filmed July 16, 1964 at the Republican National Convention, San Francisco, CA. Video, 1:41.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eKeDW_Ib9I8.

- Gordon-Bouzard, Zane. 2017. "The Psychedelic Illumination Of Tobe Hooper's EGGSHELLS." *Birth. Movies. Death.*, September 14, 2017.
<https://birthmoviesdeath.com/2017/09/14/the-psychedelic-illumination-of-tobe-hoopers-eggshells>.
- Gray, Beverley. 2004. *Roger Corman: Blood-Sucking Vampires, Flesh-Eating Cockroaches, and Driller Killers*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Grieve, Victoria M. 2018. *Little Cold Warriors: American Childhood in the 1950s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffith, Daniel. 2017. "Return to Party Beach: A Retrospective Documentary on *The Horror of Party Beach*." *The Horror of Party Beach*. Blu-Ray. United States: Severin.
- Guarino, Ann. 1967. "'Hippie Revolt' Misses Mark." *Daily News*, December 20, 1967.
- Gustaitis, Rasa. 1969. "Helicopter Sprays Gas On Berkeley 'Mourners': Guardsman Led Away." *The Washington Post*, May 21, 1969.
- Guthrie, Arlo. 2002. "Audio Commentary." *Alice's Restaurant*. DVD. Avante-Garde Collection. United States: MGM.
- Haas, Jeffery. 2019. *The Assassination of Fred Hampton: How the FBI and the Chicago Police Murdered a Black Panther*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Harland, Cisco. 1991. *The Hippie Papers – A History of the Communication Company*. Marlborough, MA: Water Row Books.
- Haut, Woody. 2016. "'Anarchy on Sunset Strip': 50 Years on from the 'Hippie Riots'." *The Guardian*, November 11, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/11/sunset-strip-riot-hippie-los-angeles>.
- Hayden, Tom. 2009. *The Long Sixties: From 1960 to Barack Obama*. New York: Routledge.

- Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Heffernan, Nick. 2015. "No Parents, No Church, No Authorities in Our Films: Exploitation Movies, the Youth Audience, and Roger Corman's Counterculture Trilogy." *Journal of Film and Video* 67 (2): 3–20.
- Hemmer, Kurt. 2015. "The Beats." In *A History of California Literature*, edited by Blake Allmendinger, 231-245. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hertzberg, Hendrik. 2017. "Buckley, Vidal, and the 'Queer' Question." *The New Yorker*, June 19, 2017. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/buckley-vidal-and-the-queer-question>.
- "Hippie Button Collection." 1964-1976. Author's personal collection.
- Hirsch, Foster. 1971. "Woodstock." *Film Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (spring): 54-56.
- Hooper, Tobe and Louis Black. 2013. "Audio Commentary." Disc 2: *Eggshells. The Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2*. Limited Edition Steelbook Blu-Ray. United Kingdom: Arrow Video.
- Howard, John Robert. 1969. "The Flowering of the Hippie Movement." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 382, no. 1 (March): 43–55.
- Huxley, Aldous. 1954. *The Doors of Perception*. New York: Harper & Rowe.
- Isserman, Maurice, and Michael Kazin. 2008. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, third edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaworzyn, Stefan. 2003. *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre Companion*. London: Titan.
- Kaufman, Michael T. 1969. "Generation Gap Bridged as Monticello Residents Aid Courteous Festival Patrons." *New York Times*, August 18, 1969.
- Kehr, Dave. 2011. "Gleason as Tripster, Groucho as God." *New York Times*, July 22, 2011.

- Kennedy, Robert F. 1968. "Remarks on the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr." Speech given in Indianapolis, IN, April 4, 1968.
- Kesey, Ken. 1981. "The Grateful Dead, Ken Kesey." Interview by Tom Snyder. *The Tomorrow Show*, NBC, May 7, 1981.
- King, Geoff. 2002. *New Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction*. London: I.B.Tauris.
- King, Stephen. 1981. *Danse Macabre*. New York: Berkeley Books.
- King, Stephen. 1999. *Hearts in Atlantis*. New York: Scribner.
- Kitts, Thomas M. 2009. "Documenting, Creating, and Interpreting Moments of Definition: Monterey Pop, Woodstock, and Gimme Shelter." *The Journal of Popular Culture* 42, no. 4 (August).
- Klatch, Rebecca E. 2002. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kopkind, Andrew. 1969. "Woodstock: A Special Report by the Editors of Rolling Stone" *Rolling Stone*, September 20, 1969.
- Krassner, Paul. 1968. "Liner notes." On *Revolution*. Music by the Quicksilver Messenger Service, the Steve Miller Band, and Mother Earth. United Artists Records, UAS 5185, vinyl record.
- Kupferberg, Tuli. 1967. "The Hip and the Square." *Berkeley Barb*, 4-10, August, 1967.
- Leary, Timothy. 1968. "Dope." *Electric Newspaper* 1, no. 3, 1968.
- Leary, Timothy. 1983. *Flash Backs: An Autobiography*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Lehndorff, John. 1989. "Kesey Take in Life With a 60's Slant." *Wichita Eagle*, September 17, 1989.

- Lerner, David. Dec. 2012. "A Taste for Trash: The Persistence of Exploitation in American Cinema, 1960-1975." PhD diss., University of Southern California.
- Levis, Bob. 2008. Interview by Harold Hudson Channer. *Conversations with Harold Hudson Channer*, New York City Public Access, August 7, 2008.
- Lima Productions. 1968. *Like It Is*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Linder, Douglas O. "The Chicago Eight Trial: Excerpts from the Trial Transcript." Famous Trials. <https://famous-trials.com/chicago8/1335-chi7-trial>.
- Lipton, Lawrence. 1968. "The High Priest of LSD." *Los Angeles Free Press*, May 22, 1970.
- Lukas, J. Anthony. 1970. "Judge Hoffman Is Taunted at Trial of the Chicago 7 After Silencing Defense Counsel." *New York Times*, February 6, 1970.
- Lydon, Michael. 2000. *Rock Folk: Portraits From the Rock 'n' Roll Patheon*. New York: Citadel.
- MacFarlane, Scott. 2007. *The Hippie Narrative: A Literary Perspective on the Counterculture*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Mandeville-Gamble, Steven. 2007. *Guide to the Allen Ginsberg Papers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Libraries.
- Mann, Robert. 2011. *Daisy Petals and Mushroom Clouds: LBJ, Barry Goldwater, and the Ad That Changed American Politics*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Mansnerus, Laura. 1996. "Timothy Leary, Pied Piper Of Psychedelic 60's, Dies at 75." *New York Times*, June 1, 1996.
- Marca, Trevor. 2013. "The Unsustainable Lifestyle of the Beatnik." Master's thesis, California State University, Dominguez Hills.

- Mathijs, Ernest, and Jamie Sexton. 2012. *Cult Cinema: An Introduction*. Somerset, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McGee, Mark Thomas. 1989. *Beyond Ballyhoo: Motion Picture Promotion and Gimmicks*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Mele, Christopher. 2000. *Selling the Lower East Side: Culture, Real Estate, and Resistance in New York City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mettler, Katie. 2019. "The Day Anti-Vietnam War Protesters Tried to Levitate the Pentagon." *The Washington Post*, July 31, 2019.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/retropolis/wp/2017/10/19/the-day-anti-vietnam-war-protesters-tried-to-levitate-the-pentagon/>.
- Miles, Barry. 2004. *Hippie*. New York: Sterling Publishing.
- Miller, Cynthia J., and A. Bowdoin Van Riper. 2015. "Marketing, Monsters, and Music: Teensploitation Horror Films." *The Journal of American Culture* 38 (2): 130–141.
- Miller, Timothy. 1991. *The Hippies and American Values*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Moran, Jim. 2012. "A Hard Rain: The Kingston Trio & The Music of Protest." Lecture given at Kingston Trio Fantasy Camp, Phoenix, AZ, August 7, 2012.
- Moretta, John Anthony. 2017. *The Hippies: A 1960s History*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Morgan, Jo-Ann. 2014. "Huey P. Newton Enthroned – Iconic Image of Black Power." *Journal of American Culture* 37, no. 2 (June): 129-143.
- Morgan, Robin. 1970. "Goodbye to All That." *Rat*, 6-23, February, 1970.

- Oswalt, Patton. 2020. "Patton Oswalt Introduces GIMME SHELTER." Criterion Channel Adventures in Moviegoing. Video, 3:48.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JDyoEMRgZhQ>.
- Paramount Pictures. 1968. *Skidoo*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Paramount Pictures. 1969. *Medium Cool*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Perera, K.M.H., A. Ferraro, and M.R.M. Pinto. 1995. "Catatonia LSD induced?" *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 29, no. 2 (June).
- Perry, Charles. 1985. *The Haight-Ashbury: A History*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Perry, Helen Swick. 1995. "The Human Be-In." In *Takin' It to the Streets: A Sixties Reader*, edited by Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines, 271-272. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Persephone, Peggy and Robin of Arc. 1968. "Witch Power." *Rat*, 15-28, November, 1968.
- Platts, Todd K. 2017. "A Comparative Analysis of the Factors Driving Film Cycles: Italian and American Zombie Film Production, 1978–82." *Journal of Italian Cinema & Media Studies* 5 (2): 191–210.
- Rorabaugh, W.J. 1989. *Berkeley at War: The 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosen, Ben. 2016. "How the Late Tom Hayden Went from a Fiery Activist to a Progressive Lawmaker." *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 24, 2016.
<https://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2016/1024/How-the-late-Tom-Hayden-went-from-a-fiery-activist-to-a-progressive-lawmaker>
- Ross, Steven J. 1998. *Working Class Hollywood: Silent Film and the Shaping of Class in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sanders, Ed. 1971. *The Family: The Story of Charles Manson's Dune Buggy Attack Battalion*.

- New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Santino, Jack. 2004. "Performative Commemoratives, the Personal, and the Public: Spontaneous Shrines, Emergent Ritual, and the Field of Folklore." *The Journal of American Folklore* Vol. 117, No. 466 (Autumn): 363-372.
- Schaefer, Eric. 2001. *"Bold! Daring! Shocking! True!": A History of Exploitation Films, 1919-1959*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sharman, Nick. 2016. *The Chicago Conspiracy Trial and the Press*. New York: Palgrave Macmillain.
- Sharrett, Christopher. 2011. "From the Archives: *Riot on Sunset Strip*." *Cineaste Magazine*, Fall, 2011.
- Shatnoff, Judith. 1969-1970. "Medium Cool." *Film Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (Winter): 47-51.
- Sherman, Scott. 2001. "Walter Cronkite." *Columbia Journalism Review* 40, no. 4 (November/December): 64.
- Smith, Jeff. 2014. *Film Criticism, the Cold War, and the Blacklist: Reading the Hollywood Reds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sounes, Howard. 2011. *Down The Highway: The Life Of Bob Dylan*, second edition. New York: Grove Press.
- Stanfield, Peter. 2015. *The Cool and the Crazy: Pop Fifties Cinema*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Stern, Sol. 1970. "Altamont: Pearl Harbor to Woodstock Nation." In *Counterculture and Revolution*, edited by David Horowitz, Michael Lerner, and Craig Pyes, 112-131. New York: Random House.
- Sterritt, David. 2005. *Mad to Be Saved: The Beats, the 50s, and Film*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

- Students for a Democratic Society. 1966. *The Port Huron Statement*, third edition. Chicago: Students for a Democratic Society.
- Sutherland, James. 2008. *Ronald Reagan: A Twentieth Century Life*. New York: Viking Books.
- Talbot, David. 2012. *Season of the Witch: Enchantment, Terror, and Deliverance in the City of Love*. New York: Free Press.
- Tamarkin, Jeff. 2007. Review of *The Final Concert*, by The Kingston Trio. *Allmusic*, 2007.
- Thomas, Kevin. 1967. "Movie Reviews: 'Blood,' 'Skin' Twin Bill." *Los Angeles Times*, May 7, 1967.
- Thornton, Sarah. 1996. *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Timely Motion Pictures, Inc. 1967. *Mondo Mod*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Trans American. 1966. *Hallucination Generation*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Twentieth Century Fox. 1964. *The Horror of Party Beach*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Tzioumakis, Yannis. 2006. *American Independent Cinema: An Introduction*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- United Artists. 1966. *Lord Love a Duck*. Pressbook. Ray Browne Popular Culture Library, Bowling Green, OH.
- United Artists. 1969. *Alice's Restaurant*. Pressbook. Something Weird Video, Seattle.
- Warner, Simon. 2014. *Text and Drugs and Rock n Roll: The Beats and Rock Culture*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Watts, Alan, Timothy Leary, Allen Ginsberg, Gary Snyder, and Allen Cohen. 1967. "The

- Houseboat Summit.” Recorded February, 1967. Transcript with streaming audio, 1:07:13. <https://www.organism.earth/library/document/100>.
- Webb, Lawrence. 2019. “The Auteur Renaissance, 1968-1972.” In *Hollywood on Location: An Industry History*, edited by Joshua Gleich and Lawrence Webb, 124- 154. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Wester, John. 2012. “Death Of Hippie.” Anderson Valley Advertiser. Last modified April 26, 2012. <https://www.theava.com/archives/15346>.
- Whaley, Preston. 2004. *Blows like a Horn: Beat Writing, Jazz, Style, and Markets in the Transformation of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- White, Theodore H. 1963. “For President Kennedy: An Epilogue.” *Life*, Dec. 6, 1963.
- Wiegand, Erin. 2019. “The Margins of Mondo.” *Film International* 17, no. 2 (June): 15-23.
- Wolfe, Tom. 1968. *Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Wood, Wallace and Russ Jones. 1964. *The Horror of Party Beach*. New York: Warren Publishing.
- Woods, Beynard. 2017. “Charles Manson Was Not a Product of the Counterculture.” *The New York Times*, November 20, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/20/opinion/charles-manson-counterculture.html>.
- Worland, Rick. 2018. *Searching for New Frontiers: Hollywood Films in the 1960s*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Youngblood, Gene. 1967. “Film Review: The Trip Makes It Sexually, Cinematically.” *The Los Angeles Free Press*, September 15, 1967.

FILMOGRAPHY

- Addis, Joe, dir. 1958. *The Cry Baby Killer*. DVD. United States: Buena Vista Home Entertainment.
- Allen, Woody, dir. 1971. *Bananas*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Andrews, Benjamin and Lee Frost, dirs. 1966. *The Forbidden*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Antonioni, Michelangelo, dir. 1970. *Zabriskie Point*. DVD. United States: Warner Brothers.
- Archer, Harry, descriptor. n.d. *The Beatniks*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Arnold, Jack, dir. 1958. *High School Confidential*. DVD. United States: Olive Films.
- Asher, William, dir. 1963. *Beach Party*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Asher, William, dir. 1965. *How to Stuff a Wild Bikini*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Averback, Hy, dir. 1968. *I Love You, Alice B. Toklas!*. DVD. United States: Warner Bros.
- Axelrod, George, dir. 1966. *Lord Love a Duck*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Bakshi, Ralph, dir. 1972. *Fritz the Cat*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Beatty, Edgar, dir. 1967. *The Hippie Revolt*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Benedek, Laslo, dir. 1953. *The Wild One*. DVD. United States: Mill Creek Entertainment.
- Brooks, Richard, dir. 1955. *Blackboard Jungle*. DVD. United States: Warner Bros.
- Cahn, Edward L., dir. 1957. *Invasion of the Saucer-Men*. DVD. United States: Media Collectables.
- Castleman, William Allen, dir. 1973. *Bummer!*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Cavara, Paolo, Gualtiero Jacopetti, and Franco Prospero, dirs. 1962. *Mondo Cane*. DVD. United States: Blue Underground.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1954. *The Fast and the Furious*. Seattle: Something Weird Video.

- Corman, Roger, dir. 1959. *A Bucket of Blood*. DVD. United States: MGM/UA Home Entertainment.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1965. *The Wild Angels*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1967. *The Trip*. Blu-Ray. United Kingdom: MGM and Signal One Entertainment.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1970. *Gas-s-s-s*. Blu-Ray. United Kingdom: MGM and Signal One Entertainment.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1971. *Von Richthofen and Brown*. DVD. United Kingdom: MGM and 101 Films.
- Corman, Roger, dir. 1991. *Frankenstein Unbound*. DVD. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.
- Curtiz, Michael, dir. 1933. *Mystery in the Wax Museum*. DVD. United States: Warner Bros.
- Desloge, Bill and Bob Levis, dirs. 1972 *Gold*. DVD. United States: Wild Eye Releasing.
- Dolgin, Gail and Vincente Franco, dir. 2007. *American Experience*. "The Summer of Love." United States: PBS.
- Dreifuss, Arthur, dir. 1967a. *Riot on Sunset Strip*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Dreifuss, Arthur, dir. 1967b. *The Love-Ins*. YouTube.
- Drenner, Elijah, dir. 2010. *American Grindhouse*. DVD. United States: Kino Lorber.
- Durston, David, dir. 1970. *I Drink Your Blood*. DVD. United States: Grindhouse Releasing.
- Emery, Robert J., dir. 1970. *Ghetto Freaks*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Englund, George, dir. 1971. *Zachariah*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Esper, Dwain, dir. 1936. *Marihuana*. DVD. United States: Mill Creek Entertainment.
- Fleming, Victor, dir. 1939. *Gone With the Wind*. DVD. United States: WB.

- Fowler, Jr., Gene, dir. 1957. *I Was a Teenage Werewolf*. DVD. United States: Media Collectables.
- Fowler, Jr., Gene, dir. 1959. *The Rebel Set*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Frees, Paul, dir. 1960. *The Beatniks*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Frost, Lee, dir. 1966. *Mondo Bizarro*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Gasnier, Louis J., dir. 1936. *Reefer Madness*. DVD. United States: Mill Creek Entertainment.
- Gordon, Bert I., dir. 1958. *Earth vs. the Spider*. DVD. United States: Lionsgate Home Entertainment.
- Greer, Donn, dir. 1969. *Alice in Acidland*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Gries, Tom, dir. 1976. *Helter Skelter*. DVD. United States: Warner Brothers.
- Griffith, Daniel, dir. 2017. "Return to Party Beach: A Retrospective Documentary on *The Horror of Party Beach*." *The Horror of Party Beach*. Blu-Ray. United States: Severin.
- Hagmann, Stuart, dir. 1970. *The Strawberry Statement*. DVD. United States: Warner Bros.
- Hansen, Karl and Sidney Knight and Simon Nuchtern, dirs. 1970. *Love-In '72*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Hendrickson, Robert and Laurence Merrick, dirs. 1973. *Manson*. Unreleased. United States: American International Pictures.
- Henning, Paul. 1955-1959. *The Bob Cummings Show*. New York: NBC.
- Hirschenson, Bernard, dir. 1975. *Pick-Up*. Blu-Ray. United States: Vinegar Syndrome.
- Hopper, Dennis, dir. 1969. *Easy Rider*. Blu-Ray. United States: The Criterion Collection.
- Hooper, Tobe, dir. 1969. *Eggshells*. Disc 2: *Eggshells. The Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2*, Limited Edition Steelbook Blu-Ray. United Kingdom: Arrow Video.

- Hooper, Tobe, dir. 1974. *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre*. Blu-Ray. United States: Dark Sky Entertainment.
- Keller, Harry, dir. 1956. *The Unguarded Moment*. DVD. United States: Universal Pictures Home Entertainment.
- Kowalski, Bernard G., dir. 1959. *Attack of the Giant Leeches*. DVD. United States: Mill Creek Entertainment.
- Kubrick, Stanley, dir. 1964. *Dr. Strangelove, Or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. DVD. United States: The Criterion Collection.
- Landers, Lew, dir. 1958. *Hot Rod Gang*. DVD. United States: Indio Productions.
- Laughlin, Tom, dir. 1971. *Billy Jack*. DVD. United States: Shout Select.
- Lerner, Alan Jay and Frederick Lowe. 1960. *Camelot*. New York: Random House.
- Lewis, Herschell Gordon, dir. 1963. *Blood Feast*. DVD. United States: Something Weird Video/Arrow Video.
- Mabe, Byron, dir. 1968. *The Acid Eaters*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.
- Mann, Edward, dir. 1966. *Hallucination Generation*. YouTube.
- Masters, Quentin, dir. 1972. *Thumb Tripping*. United States: Avco Embassy.
- Maysles, Albert, David Maysles, and Charlotte Zwerin, dirs. 1970. *Gimme Shelter*. Blu-Ray. United States: Criterion Collection.
- Muldaur, Maureen, dir. 2002. *Smothered: The Censorship Struggles of the Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour*. YouTube.
- O'Connell, Jack, dir. 1968. *Revolution*. YouTube.
- Parker, Norton S. and William A. O'Connor, dir. *The Cocaine Fiends*. DVD. United States: Mill Creek Entertainment.

Pasetta, Marty, dir. 1968. *The Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour*. Season 3, episode 1. DVD.

United States: Time Warner.

Penn, Arthur, dir. 1967. *Bonnie and Clyde*. Blu-Ray. United States: Warner Bros.

Penn, Arthur, dir. 1969. *Alice's Restaurant*. DVD. United States: MGM.

Pennebaker, D.A., dir. 1968. *Monterey Pop*. DVD. United States: Criterion Collection.

Perry, Peter, Jr., dir. 1967. *Mondo Mod*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.

Post, Ted, dir. 1973. *The Harrad Experiment*. United States: Cinerama Releasing.

Preminger, Otto, dir. 1968. *Skidoo*. DVD. United States: Olive Films.

Ray, Nicholas, dir. 1955. *Rebel Without a Cause*. Blu-Ray. United States: Warner Bros.

Robson, Mark, dir. 1957. *Peyton Place*. DVD. United States: 20th Century Fox.

Rothman, Stephanie, dir. 1973. *Group Marriage*. United States: Dimension Pictures.

Rotsler, William, dir. 1968a. *Like It Is*. Streaming.

Rotsler, William, dir. 1968b. *Mantis in Lace*. DVD. Seattle: Something Weird Video.

Rush, Richard, dir. 1967. *Thunder Alley*. DVD. United States: MGM.

Rush, Richard, dir. 1968. *Psych-Out*. DVD. United States: MGM.

Rush, Richard, dir. 1970. *Getting Straight*. DVD. United States: Sony Pictures Home
Entertainment.

Sears, Fred F., dir. 1956. *Rock Around the Clock*. DVD. United States: Sony Pictures.

Sefer, Amos, dir. 1972. *An American Hippie in Israel*. Blu-Ray. United States: Grindhouse
Releasing.

Seitz, George B., dir. 1938. *Love Finds Andy Hardy*. DVD. United States: MGM.

Shear, Barry, dir. 1968. *Wild in the Streets*. United States: MGM

Shulman, Max, creator. 1959-1963. *The Many Loves of Dobie Gillis*. Hollywood, CA: CBS.

- Silverstein, Elliot, dir. 1967. *The Happening*. Streaming.
- Sorkin, Aaron, dir. 2020. *The Trial of the Chicago 7*. Unreleased. United States: Paramount Pictures.
- Steckler, Ray Dennis, dir. 1964. *The Incredibly Strange Creatures Who Stopped Living and Became Mixed-Up Zombies!!?*. DVD. United States: Guilty Pleasures.
- Stern, Steven Hilliard, dir. 1974. *Harrad Summer*. United States: Cinerama Releasing.
- Strock, Herbert L., dir. 1957a. *Blood of Dracula*. DVD. United States: Lionsgate Home Entertainment.
- Strock, Herbert L., dir. 1957b. *I Was a Teenage Frankenstein*. DVD. United States: Media Collectables.
- Strock, Herbert L., dir. 1958. *How to Make a Monster*. DVD. United States: Lionsgate Home Entertainment.
- Taylor, Gilbert W., dir. 1970. *Dr. Frankenstein on Campus*. DVD. United States: Sinister Cinema.
- Taurog, Norman, dir. 1965. *Dr. Goldfoot and the Bikini Machine*. DVD. United States: MGM.
- Tenney, Del, dir. 1964. *The Horror of Party Beach*. Blu-Ray. United States: Severin.
- Viola, John, dir. 1971. *Angels Hard as They Come*. DVD. United States: Brentwood Home Video.
- Wadleigh, Michael, dir. 1970. *Woodstock*. Blu-Ray. United States: Warner Brothers.
- Watkins, Peter, dir. 1971. *Punishment Park*. Blu-Ray. United Kingdom: Eureka.
- Wendkos, Paul, dir. 1959. *Gidget*. DVD. United States: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment.
- Wexler, Haskell, dir. 1969. *Medium Cool*. Blu-Ray. United States: Criterion Collection.
- Williams, Paul, dir. 1970. *The Revolutionary*. DVD. United States: MGM

Yeaworth, Irvin S., dir. 1958. *The Blob*. DVD. United States: Criterion Collection.