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I. Introduction

I.1. Background and Objectives

The Sixties era (often confused with the shorter 1960s decade) was a time of rebellion, and hope for positive change, throughout many parts of the world. In the United States, it is most often remembered for the following: the African-American civil rights movement, student anti-war activism, and the hippie sub-culture (and thus my main focus in this dissertation). Eventually, all three of these groups were joined, more or less, together in a new type of “counter-cultural” community (often referred to as the “Movement”) that challenged the status quo in matters ranging from new sexual mores to power politics.1 Hippie fashions and values often had a major effect on all segments of the youth culture.2 Unfortunately, there has been a problem of not understanding the Sixties era holistically, meaning in its interconnected and contrary entirety. Instead of seeing all the favorable and unfavorable happenings of the time as being part of the Sixties era, the Altamont rock festival (and other events) have often been designated as the era’s end point because of the dissension, despair, hard drug usage, and violence that took place there (and the fact that it was held in December of 1969).3 The result has been that the Sixties era has been shortened; the early and mid-1970s have been cut off.

The Sixties era, like many other periods, has been chopped up and forced to conform into the concept of decades, which usually do not automatically coincide with their particular designations. In other words, history has frequently been simplified (to its detriment) and narrowed down to fit the particular decades of the calendar.4 Consequently, the most common form of justification (I claim) for shortening the Sixties era is one that is based upon a moral binary code of right or wrong. All Sixties-era events, developments, and incidents are judged (and filtered through) this dualistic perception, to see if they truly fit into our ingrained, Western, religious and philosophically preconceived, absolutist values.5 Subsequently, most liberal, left-leaning historians (especially those older who have
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2 Ibid., 56.
dominated Sixties scholarship until recently) tend to see the essence of the Sixties as a movement that was in the right (meaning on the side of good and what was needed).\(^6\) However, I claim that because of their deep-seated Western moral dualism, they tend to want to frame all relevant matters in an overly positive light. (I will not deal with conservative historians, or the very youngest, as the former view the entire Sixties with overt monolithic hostility, and the later, born after the era was over, never accepted many of the most cherished myths from the start). Nonetheless, the more progressive define the Movement as having had high ethical integrity, and the right moral standards of action on the part of its participants; this has had the unintended result of making it more difficult for them to accept (or add) the more negative elements of the era into their own discourse. To them, the Sixties were a magnificent time when there was great hope among many for their ability to change the world by various sorts of righteous, unified, non-violent direct actions. In this view, true Sixties activism has to uphold these high standards or be cast aside. As a result, all unpleasant personalities, events, or incidents that occurred are seen by such historians to be only aberrations, or blemishes of imperfection. Moreover, the antagonistic incidences that they do recognize almost certainly stem, as they see it, from those who opposed the Movement, i.e., the government, police, or the Ku Klux Klan.

On the other hand, these historians are not completely misguided, as the philosophy of adhering to absolute moralistic (basically Christian) standards was quite pervasive during the early portion of the Movement, i.e., reverend Martin Luther King within the African-American civil rights movement, many of the early student anti-war activists who always followed the trends of the black community, and even the hippies with their firm ethos of “peace and love.” However, what many scholars fail to take into account, first of all, is how the nature of ideals can never be lived up to—things are just never perfect. Secondly, not everyone within the Movement agreed on all the Sixties assumptions from the beginning, for example, the principle of non-violence. When asked about pacifism, Malcolm X, the influential Black Muslim minister (who followed the teachings of the Koran and not the Christian Bible) said, “I don’t mean go out and get violent; but at the same time you should never be non-violent unless you run into some non-violence. I’m non-violent with those who are non-violent with me. But when you drop that violence on me, then you’ve made me go insane, and I’m not responsible for what I

After all is said and done, when examining the Sixties narrative, there must come a
time for all historians when the opposite forces of despair, fragmentation and violence
must be acknowledged, primarily because they had always existed within the Movement,
and secondarily because it was an increasing trend. Nonetheless, the mistake most scholars
make is to use their own subjective tipping point (on how negativity had gained a
significant momentum in the Movement) and to then proclaim it (whenever that may be) as
the juncture in which the Sixties era had ended. In other words, since the Sixties are seen as
good, positive, and non-violent, any large measures of negativity generated by the
Movement must be looked upon as the era’s end. Interestingly, these death of the Sixties
declarations often seems to be based on the incessant need to close out the Sixties era by
the end of the 1960s decade (most often the specific incident chosen is Altamont, but some
writers use earlier events such as the break-up of SDS in June 1969). I claim that in order
to draw this line at (or towards) the end of 1969, most who write the history of the Sixties
do so by setting up the 1960s decade in direct binary opposition to the 1970s decade. As a
result, the 1960s are considered “good,” while the 1970s are considered “bad.” Or perhaps
more accurately, what is considered to belong to the Sixties is “good,” and what does not
(or should not) belong to the Sixties is “bad.” To elaborate, the 1960s are seen as a time of
hope, unity, and non-violence, while the 1970s (or the late 1960s) are seen as a time of
despair, fragmentation, and violence. Although little had changed in 1970, as compared to
1969, the change of decades was treated as something oppositional to what had been
happening. Thus, the last year of the 1960s and the first year of the 1970s were separated,
and the latter strictly redefined in terms of emphasizing the negative over the positive. In
other words, everything that happened during the actual 1960s decade is held up to a
standard that is based on an overly positive myth regarding both individual and group
actions, the tactics used, and the perceived outcomes. Contrarily, because of this imposed
ethical dualism, all conflicting behavior, opposing forces, and so-called negative
contradictions are not accepted into the normal Sixties-era discourse, accept as signposts
for its ending. Instead of seeing and acknowledging all behavior differences as being part
of a greater whole, what we find describing the progression of the Sixties era is an
unfinished two-part dialectic, starting from an asserted positive beginning, and shifting to
its opposite negative conclusion. As a result, we find over-idealization, positive illusions,
and wishful thinking applied to events during the early days, and overblown feelings of
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devastation, demonization, and bubbles bursting associated with events of just a few years later. As the story goes, what was at first all rosy and innocent soon became dreadful and flawed at Altamont. This interpretation of history is much too simplistic, and just not true. The problem is that there is no third step in the dialectic, no Hegelian-type synthesis of the contradictions. There is no going beyond the dualism, of seeing portions of the Sixties era as being neither overly positive nor overly negative. The complete picture must continually include both opposites: good and bad, positive and negative, non-violence and violence, hope and despair. If we weed out and disown what we call the negative from the early years of the era or fail to see the good during the later years, we distort the Sixties era not only by dismembering the early and mid-1970s, but by deceiving ourselves on how perfect the first few years of the Movement really were.

I.2. Literature Survey

While the beginning and the peak of the Sixties counter-cultural Movement is well documented by many articles, books, and movies, the post-peak and the last years are nearly always neglected (or even denied to have existed in terms of being a real part of the Movement). For example, many university courses, such as “The Sixties” at Sonoma State University in California, begin with the post-Second World War period of the late 1940s and end with Woodstock during the summer of 1969. In fact, it is very popular with most publications about the counter-culture to end with 1969, usually with the Altamont festival and the Charles Manson family killings in December (e.g., David Dalton’s “Altamont: End of the Sixties Or Big Mix-Up in the Middle of Nowhere?,” 1999). I claim that this is a distortion of the Sixties era, resulting in a peculiar predicament of often ending the Sixties storyline shortly after discussing its peak at the Woodstock festival (see Rob Kirkpatrick, 1969/2009, or Robert Santelli, Aquarius Rising: The Rock Festival Years, 1980). The significance is that many years of the Sixties era are excluded. Indeed, one of my major goals is to reassemble this greatly neglected part of history, the forgotten years of 1970 to 1976, and to show that, as every time period has a beginning and a build-up, it too must

---

8 Russell, Let It Bleed, 216.
9 The Sixties (Course syllabus, Liberal Studies 320, Sonoma State University, Fall 1987).
also have a decline and an end (William Strauss and Neil Howe, *The Fourth Turning*, 1997). Additionally, even if some publications or university courses do mention the 1970s, they usually merely touch upon either the first year of 1970 (Chapman University), or the first few years very superficially (University of Washington). Another important contribution I assert is to show how, in order for historians to fit the Sixties era into the 1960s decade, the Sixties are in a sense whitewashed of their inherent and underlining more negative features, at least until the authors find it useful to end it. The technique used to justify this sort of downplaying of flaws or failures consists of painting a very positive picture of the Movement throughout most of the sixties decade (as best as they can) until the dam bursts and the overwhelming negativity cannot be concealed anymore. I state that this awaking to Sixties negativity occurs arbitrarily at different moments in time for the various writers (some examples include Gene Anthony, *The Summer of Love*, 1980, alleging 1967 as the end of the hippie movement, Robert Houriet, *Getting Back Together*, 1972, declaring 1968 as the end of hope in the political activist movement; and Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines (eds.), “Takin’ it to the streets,” 2003, maintaining 1968 as the end of the African-American civil rights movement for most people). Nevertheless, when the dam breaks, watch out, as the rosy myth of the early years of the 1960s turns often quite suddenly, and dramatically, to its opposite characterizations. Whereas everything was unified, hopeful, and non-violent, it turns to fragmentation, despair and violence (see Ethan A. Russell, *Let It Bleed*, 2009). The end result of this binary dualism is to ignore everything that is after the cut-off line (usually after 1969). This is an error, as the early and middle 1970s was an extension of a period of time that must be called the Sixties, as it still consisted of the war in Vietnam, anti-war protests, hippie communes, rock festivals, and African-American and other peoples of color fighting for their liberation.

Not only are there many theories on when the overall Sixties era ended, but there are many on when each of the various aspects of the Movement concluded. Certainly one of the most popular explanations on the demise of the Sixties hippie movement derives from the horrible tale of Altamont. In Russell’s *Let It Bleed*, the Altamont festival was foreseen as being the next higher step after Woodstock, which had always up to this time gotten bigger and better. Nonetheless, here the love generation degenerated into an orgy of violence, murder, hard drugs, and insanity.\(^\text{20}\) As the story goes, youth after Altamont woke up for the first time and realized that they had lost it, that they were no better then anyone else, and had no chance (or ability) of changing the world. Altamont was so much of an opposite of Woodstock, just so devastating, that naïve hippie idealism ended right there and then. For Todd Gitlin in *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*, the dream of Aquarius was lost and “cracked into thousands of shards.”\(^\text{21}\) The problem with this celebrated version of history espoused by Russell and Gitlin (and countless others) is that it is caught up in this sudden negative turn of events as if it were something new. As I claim, these negative circumstances did not emerge at Altamont; they had always been part of the hippie scene. That goes for the Manson family hippie killers too. Way before the December 12, 1969 issue of *Life Magazine* (titled “The Love and Terror Cult”), those who were part of the scene (and would admit it) knew of the “dark edge of hippie life” (Curt Rowlett).\(^\text{22}\) Nonetheless, though usually swept under the rug, repugnant facts were reported early on by such authors as Lewis Yablonsky in his *The Hippie Trip* book from 1968. In his first-hand experiences from 1967, Yablonsky describes the new hippie subculture as already immersed in bitterness, disillusionment, hard drugs, hostility, violence, theft, rape, and even murder.\(^\text{23}\)

A typical timeline narrative for the African-American civil rights part of the Movement closely resembles that of Tom Head’s, *History of the Civil Rights Era (1954-1968)*, written in 2009: Brown v. Board of Education (1954); Rosa Parks and the Montgomery bus boycott lead by Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (1955-56); desegregation of Little Rock Central High (1957); Greensboro lunch counter sit-ins (1960); the Freedom Rides (1961); James Meredith admitted to the University of Mississippi (1962); the March on Washington for Jobs and

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 184-225.
Freedom, “I have a dream” (1963); Freedom Summer in Mississippi (1964); the Civil Rights Act (1964); the Voting Rights Act (1965); the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. (1968); and ending with the Civil Rights Act (1968). Indeed, the most common opinion held by historians conclude that the civil rights era ended with the murder of Martin Luther King on April 4, the riots in more than 100 cities that followed, and finally the passage of the 1968 Civil Rights Act on April 11. The rationale for this closure is said to be based on the truly great impact the loss of Martin Luther King had on the Movement. King, according to Andrew Gavin Marshall in *The American Oligarchy, Civil Rights and the Murder of Martin Luther King*, was “without a doubt the leader of the Civil Rights movement,” and was still in his last year steering it against poverty and empire. His death created a vacuum for strong national leadership, which, together with an already declining organizational strength, facilitated a weakening of the overall civil rights movement (Doug Mcadam, *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*, 1982). Moreover, by losing the biggest champion for non-violent direct action, the Movement quickened on its path towards a revolutionary struggle (which many historians such as Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward in *Poor People’s Movements*, 1977, do not include within the civil rights discussion). Instead, most historians, like Farber, agree with Martin Luther King (and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference) that upholding the principal of non-violence was essential for the survival of the black cause (as millions of whites angrily turned against the civil rights movement when black radicals began to riot). Martin Luther King (who after all was a Baptist minister) believed that any form of violence was incompatible with the Christian faith; however, with him now gone, there was much less debate on the matter. In fact, after King’s assassination, Stokely Carmichael (an “Honorary Prime Minister” of the Black Panther Party) proclaimed, “White America killed Dr. King last night. She made a whole lot easier for a whole lot of black people today. There no longer needs to be intellectual discussions, black people know that they

have to get guns.”

Thus, the purpose of civil rights struggle underwent a radical change, “from a peaceful reworking of social stratification into a forceful and violent destruction of white culture and the establishment of black power as dominant.” Nonetheless, these various forms of Black Power (black nationalism and black separatism) that were very popular in 1968/69 did not start then; in fact, many of the young and the more radical began entertaining these ideas (in full force) by the middle of the 1960s decade. Indeed, what set the Black Power movement apart from the earlier integrationist types was the notion of using violence (either in self-defense or as an offensive tactic). My question is, if black militant groups like the Black Panthers were already forming in 1966, and the Deacons of Self Defense existed as early as 1964, then how can we not include the 1970s black revolutionary struggles into the Sixties historical discourse on liberation? I claim that we can! Surely, violence was not new to African-Americans, as urban ghetto riots began in 1963 and increased throughout the 1960s decade. The great ideals and ethical standards of the non-violent strategy went out the door during these uprisings, “reason was gone and looting, arson, and terror took over.”

Those many commentators who focus more on the student anti-war (and other various political) aspects of the Movement end the history of the Sixties anywhere from the middle of 1968 to the end of 1969. For Terry H. Anderson, in his 1995 book called *The Movement and the Sixties*, the era ends in November of 1968 with the election of President Nixon, as it is seen as the victory for those who oppose the hippies, anti-war protesters, and black rioters—and the whole liberal agenda which the average man felt it had all emerged from. Similarly, the 2002 book called *Imagine Nation* (edited by Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle) states that Nixon’s election to the presidency (on a anti-counterculture platform) gave such a harsh dose of reality to the Movement that it caused severe discouragement and soon fragmentation. In “Takin’ it to the Streets,” Bloom and Breines make a case for the Sixties slowly ending in 1968, with a “decline in the quality of
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concepts, and morality” starting in that year, and followed by bitter infighting by 1969.\textsuperscript{33} While James Miller in Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago, 1994, places the end after the split of SDS in June of 1969.\textsuperscript{34} For Godfrey Hodgson in his America in Our Time, written in 1976, the end of the Sixties was a twofold process. First, on November 3, 1969, Nixon went on air and gave his famous “silent majority” speech, declaring that it was time for the majority of the people to regain its voice and “not permit U.S. policy to be ‘dictated’ by a minority staging ‘demonstrations in the streets.’”\textsuperscript{35} Secondly, twelve days later, on November 15, because of intense pressure from the Nixon administration, no live coverage was given by any of the television networks during the largest anti-war demonstration in history; this “convinced the American people that the peace movement was dead.”\textsuperscript{36} In other words, according to Hodgson, there was a deliberate attempt by Nixon (and many of the elite) to get the media to shift “away from emphasis on the militant Left . . . and toward the center and the Right.”\textsuperscript{37} Not surprisingly then is columnist Nicholas von Hoffman being quoted in IRWIN and Debi Unger’s 1998 edited book, The Times Were a Changin,’ who called the huge November 1969 Moratorium protest the last big one (discounting the ones in the 1970s) “It was the best, it was the biggest, it was the last of the anti-war (mass) demonstrations.”\textsuperscript{38} The problem with all the above authors is that they focus their attention on perhaps the beginning of the end of the Sixties, and not on the true end of the era. The Sixties era was far from over, even if there was a concerted effort to squash it. Although some of the above scholars do admit to various actions and activities still existing into the 1970s, they are either barely mentioned (Bloom and Breines), quickly skimmed through (Gitlin) or treated as belonging to a different time period, i.e., the 1970s (Unger and Unger). On the other hand, Anderson and Hodgson focus too much on the perception of mainstream America of the Movement during the 1970s, and not on the actual movement itself (I argue that nobody had truly filled in as thoroughly as I do on what was going on inside the Movement during the early and middle 1970s). While Braunstein and Doyle think too much in terms of the 1970s being nothing but competing small movements opposing each other, they lose

\textsuperscript{33} Bloom and Breines. (eds.), “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 532-533.  
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 382.  
\textsuperscript{38} Irwin Unger and Debi Unger (eds.), The Times Were a Changin’: The Sixties Reader (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998), 297.
the thread of seeing how all these various interest groups within the Movement still belonged to a greater whole.

Finally, there are those who do put the end of the political as well other aspects of the Sixties into the 1970s decade. For example, Gitlin called the Greenwich Village townhouse explosion that occurred on March 6, 1970, the end of the Sixties student movement. It was caused by the premature detonation of a bomb being built by members of the radical Weather Underground; three members died instantly. Wrote Gitlin, “What Altamont was for the (hippie) counterculture, the townhouse was for the student movement, the splattering rage of the ‘death culture.’”

For David Farber, in his *The Age of Great Dreams* from 1994, the Sixties narrative actually keeps on going until around the Vietnam War ceasefire in January 1973. While in Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin’s *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, 2011, the Sixties only end with the resignation of President Nixon on August 9, 1974 (I claim that even this is too early). Nonetheless, even authors who do place the end of the Sixties era into the 1970s decade, while putting tremendous emphasis on events that happened during the 1960s decade, only give trivial space to the 1970s decade. For example, Farber wrote over two hundred pages covering the years 1960 to 1969, and a mere seven pages about the 1970-1973 period. Gitlin wrote nearly four hundred pages covering the 1960s decade and less than thirty on the 1970s decade. Moreover, Isserman and Kazin similarly write only twenty pages on the five years of the 1970s that they claim as being properly part of the Sixties, after writing nearly three-hundred pages on the previous decade. It’s really the same story on the part of everyone, unless the book is specifically about the Seventies, in which case, the first half of the decade is skimmed through and the last half is thoroughly covered. In other words, the first six years or so of the 1970s always seems to be neglected. My dissertation is meant to fill in the blanks and show what was going on in the Sixties movement during its final years that spanned more than half of the 1970s decade.

Overall, there are three ways that most historians try to structure the American Sixties in order to resolve the problem of integrating the negative features of the era into its narrative. The first, which I have already covered (and which is the most common) begins brightly with the election of John F. Kennedy as President in 1960, continues hopefully during the early years of the Johnson administration (peak of civil rights success), and
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40 Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 263.
fades out somewhere in the late 1960s as the Movement turns increasingly negative (or non-Sixtyish). The second scheme divides the 1960s decade into two sections, labeling them as “good” or “bad.” The third arrangement, perhaps least often used, is called the “long Sixties,” which allows for the continuation of the Sixties era into the 1970s. My dissertation speaks out mainly against the first two methods.

The second method, I assert, is more extreme then the first. It not only separates the first years of the 1970s decade from the Sixties era (like the first method), but splits into two parts, distinguishing the 1960s decade in order for the Sixties to retain its alleged ethical and moral purity. Here, the line of where to end the Sixties era is moved back from 1968/69 to somewhere in the middle 1960s. In other words, more of the 1960s decade is not considered the Sixties (or the real Sixties). The “good Sixties” now refers to approximately the first half of the 1960s decade. An example of this is Gitlin, who separates the Movement into what was constructive and valuable from that which was unproductive and harmful. He considers the “good Sixties” to include the civil rights movement and the early stages of the student and anti-war movements (1960-1966), while the “bad Sixties” encompassed the formation of radical underground groups such as the Weather Underground and the Black Guerrilla Family, which focused on bombings and “armed struggle (1967-1969/70).”

Similarly, Paul Goodman, the famous American novelist and social critic of the time, considered the first half of the Sixties as worthwhile and important. He approved of the 1964 Free Speech Movement in Berkeley and said it was “making a lot of sense.” However, he too became disappointed with the loss of “moral integrity” and “political concreteness” that he saw in 1962 and 1963. By the late 1960s, Goodman, the intellectual, felt disconnected from hippie youth, urban riots, and the “bravado, into increasingly empty—or violent—talk of revolution.”

Goodman, like many others, makes a clear distinction: SDS at Port Huron in 1962 is good, while Yippies in Chicago in 1968 are bad; Civil Rights movement is good, Black Power movement is bad; SNCC invites white youth to Mississippi in 1964 is good, SNCC kicks whites out of the organization in 1966 is bad; New York folk music and early Bob Dylan is good, San Francisco psychedelic rock is bad.

Finally, Bernard Von Bothmer recently added a new dimension to this topic (a combination of methods two and three) into his book, *Framing*...
the Sixties: The Use and Abuse of a Decade from Ronald Reagan to George W. Bush, 2010.\textsuperscript{46} He states that politicians of today use the “good Sixties” and the “bad Sixties” concept for their own political gain. Allegedly, they too consider the 1960s decade to have consisted of two parts, the supposed idealistic early years when the Movement upheld its principles and was seen positively (or what we call the Sixties), and the despair, chaos, and violence that followed (or what we disown as not the Sixties).\textsuperscript{47} As a result, American politicians have began to play a game of claiming the “good Sixties” for their own political party, and pinning the “bad Sixties” onto the opposition. Wrote Bothmer, “What conservatives do is identify liberals with the bad Sixties. And what liberals try to do is identify themselves with the good Sixties.”\textsuperscript{48} Indeed, the Democratic party (the more or less liberal party) claims the Sixties (1960-1965) for itself, as it was the Democrats who controlled the executive branch from January 1961 to January 1969. For them, the Sixties consisted of John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, the Peace Corps, Martin Luther King, the integrationists, the civil rights movement, the March on Washington in 1963, the Civil Rights Act, and the Voting Rights Act.\textsuperscript{49} The Republicans, on the other hand, conjure up images of the “bad Sixties” to use against them. The picture they hold up consists of different years, not of the early 1960s (which they claim as part of the Fifties) but actions and incidences that occurred not only in the late 1960s, but even up to 1974 (the Republicans like to disown these years as it was they—Nixon—that held the office of the presidency from 1969 to August of 1974).\textsuperscript{50} In the end, the only real debate between the three authors is where to draw the line that separates the “good Sixties” from the “bad Sixties. For Goodman and Bothmer, the “bad Sixties” begin a little earlier (1965 vs. 1967), while for Gitlin, they include the whole escalation of the Vietnam War and its corresponding anti-war protests. Goodman and Bothmer do not make a distinction between the more peaceful demonstrations of the middle 1960s from the more violent, anti-American and pro-Viet Cong protests in later years, as does Gitlin. One note of interest is how Bothmer describes how Republicans use the first five years of the 1970s in the Sixties debate. According to him, the pinpointing of when the Sixties actually took place has more to do with the ideologies one holds than to “specifics.”\textsuperscript{51} Nevertheless, the problem with

\textsuperscript{46} Bernard Von Bothmer, Framing the Sixties: The Use and Abuse of a Decade from Ronald Reagan to George W. Bush (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010), 11-16.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Bothmer, Framing the Sixties, 12.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
this “good Sixties” verses “bad Sixties” conceptual model is that it continues to separate the positive from the negative. To not admit that the Sixties era was always a mixed bag of good and bad, right and wrong, hope and despair, and non-violence and violence only leads to continually shrinking the Sixties era even further, and not stretching it out as is needed.

The third method, called the “long Sixties,” does allow and include the continuation of the Sixties era into the 1970s (my dissertation is in this tradition, but with differences that I will mention later). The idea that the Sixties lingered into the next decade is not a new idea, but has been more or less a problem that many historians needed to solve. In fact, those using the first and second methods of shortening the Sixties have on occasion also admitted to certain Sixties themes remaining after 1969, but they either limited their work to a few pages attached to the end, or used the “good Sixties” and “bad Sixties” model in order to prove that those years were not really the Sixties anymore. In contrast, those who argue for a “long Sixties,” as I have done, do so in spite of the growing negativity and degeneration that was affecting the Movement (there were many positive things too) during the 1970s; however, I and others clearly see this only as a continuation of the trend that started in the 1960s decade. Moreover, if one stops and thinks, the first several years of the 1970s look identical to the late 1960s. The same issues and activities continued, for example: the war in Vietnam, the military draft, anti-war protests, black power, hippies, communes, and rock festivals. For Mark Hamilton Lytle, author of America’s Uncivil Wars: The Sixties Era from Elvis to the Fall of Richard Nixon, 2006, the Sixties not only continue after 1969, but start before 1960.⁵² Diverging from most historians, Lytle treats the roughly twenty years from the rise of Elvis Presley to the fall of Richard Nixon as one era. He identifies three distinct phases: the “cultural ferment” of the 1950s ending with the 1963 assassination of John F. Kennedy; the 1964-1968 “uncivil” wars with the rise of the Vietnam War, protests, hippies and racial violence; and finally the Richard Nixon years of “new value and identity movements,” including those of environmentalists, consumer advocates, feminists, gay, Latino, and Native American activists. My dissertation takes a different approach (besides not dealing with when the Sixties started), as I do not waver from my original three Movement groups: African-American liberation, student anti-war, and the hippies. I do not shift to newer groups during the 1970s, as is so common. Instead, I continue to follow my three original concerns, documenting their activities, while also incorporating the newer groups into this

ongoing alternative Sixties network. Perhaps of all the literature that I have read, Anderson, in *The Movement and the Sixties*, 1995, explains the Sixties era in a way in which I can agree with the most. He arranges the Sixties era in two parts: the First Wave called the Surge (1960 to 1968), and the Second Wave called the Crest (1968 to 1973).53

First of all, unlike historians that use the second method of structuring the American Sixties, Anderson does not try to label one part of the 1960s as “good Sixties” or another as “bad Sixties.” Although he divides the Sixties into two parts, he does not try to end the Sixties in the middle of the 1960s decade. Secondly, Anderson also does not look to cut off the first years of the 1970s, as do those who use the first method. In fact, Anderson calls the 1969 to 1973 years as the peak of the Sixties era! He states that although the Movement is seemingly fragmented into many smaller parts (i.e., environmental concerns, consumer issues, women’s issues, gay rights), the fact not to miss was that the Movement was still “expanding.”54 There were more people involved in the Movement during the early 1970s then ever before, as the younger part of the baby boomers were just coming of age.55

Nevertheless, I believe that both Lytle and Anderson end the “long Sixties” too early. For Anderson, the Sixties end in 1973 with the Vietnam War ceasefire in late January, noting that there was “no outpouring of support, no mass marches, no bus brigades heading for Wounded Knee” (during the American Indian Movement’s long standoff against the American government from February to May of that year).56 As for Lytle, he continues to call the 1970s the Sixties until the resignation of President Nixon in August of 1974. In my dissertation I make a case for ending the Sixties sometime during the latter part of 1976. Indeed, I believe that the most important part of my contribution to studying the history of the American Sixties era is the uncovering of historical events of the Movement that have been long lost to historians and lay persons alike. For example, I can prove with my work that Anderson is not correct in his claim about Wounded Knee. I discovered that there were marches and bus brigades that headed to Wounded Knee; in fact, one person who was shot by federal marshals was a member of the counter-culture who came to help. To conclude, I chronicle in great detail seven years (1970-1976) of countercultural Movement events and other activity. I feel that the further I researched into the 1970s, the more I realized that nobody has ever done what I have done. Thus I spent ever more time on the middle 1970s.
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I.3. Methodology

My dissertation consists of two major objectives: to prove that the Sixties era continued well into the 1970s decade, and to show how the various justifications for limiting the Sixties era within the 1960s decade are mistaken.

My research methodology consisted of the following steps:

1. A. To first determine why the Sixties era was cut short by so many writers of history, usually ending around late 1969.
   
   B. My conclusion was that there were several events (including the Altamont rock festival) that occurred during the later part of the 1960s that in some ways symbolized the opposite of what the Sixties supposedly represented.

2. A. To examine what happened at Altamont that made it perhaps the most common end point for terminating the Sixties.
   
   B. My conclusion was that three important ideals of the Sixties Movement were not present at the Altamont festival (which was supposed to be even “higher” than the Woodstock festival): unity, hope, and non-violence. A fourth factor that I include to a lesser degree (and only when analyzing the hippies) is that of drug abuse.

3. A. To determine when the lack of unity, hope, and non-violence began to creep into the Sixties Movement on the part of the participants.
   
   B. My conclusion was that the lack of unity, hope, and non-violence (in other words, the presence of dissension, despair and violence) had always been part of the Sixties Movement, but did continually increase with each passing year.

4. A. In order to show that dissension, despair, and violence had always been part of the Sixties Movement, in some degree, notable incidences were documented from 1960 to 1969.

5. A. Lastly, I turned to the 1970s in order to find out if the Sixties Movement had continued to exist after 1969.
   
   B. My conclusion was that the countercultural Movement, in all its aspects, not only still existed, but thrived in most cases (this I document in my 1970s part III section).

In part III, I traced the Movement occurrences chronologically for seven years after Altamont, especially relying on articles written on the day particular events occurred. I extensively used the San Francisco Chronicle and the Berkeley Barb newspapers to collect my information, and several others to a lesser extent. My major focus centered around the greater San Francisco Bay Area, as that is where various aspects of the Sixties
counterculture seemed to have started, first gained national attention, or were the strongest. This would include the student Free Speech and anti-war movements at the University of California at Berkeley, beat and hippie movements in the North Beach and Haight-Ashbury districts of San Francisco, and the Black Power movement of the Black Panthers from Oakland. The *San Francisco Chronicle* newspaper (also the *New York Times, Newsweek Magazine*, and others) provided me with the establishment’s mainstream perspective of events, while the *Berkeley Barb* (also the *Aquarian, White Lightning, Worker’s Power, the Yipster Times*, and others) gave me the underground movement’s point of view.

Overall, I surveyed all the issues of *The Aquarian* from October to December 1976; the *Berkeley Barb* from August 13, 1965 to July 3, 1980; the *San Francisco Chronicle* from January 1, 1965 to July 3, 1980; all 12 issues of the *San Francisco Oracle* (the psychedelic newspaper of the Haight Ashbury district) from September 20, 1966 to February 1968; *White Lightning* from February 1972 to December 1973; *The Workers’ Power* from December 1974 to January 1975; and the *Yipster Times* from January 1973 to December 1976.

II. The 1960s

II.1. Introduction

Many history books state that the Sixties counterculture ended at the failed Altamont Speedway Free Festival on December 6, 1969.\(^{57}\) It was supposed to be a day of peace and love—a "Woodstock West," patterned after the hugely successful Bethel, New York festival held four months earlier in August 1969.\(^{58}\) The Altamont concert was a one-day event held in northern California, between Tracy and Livermore. It featured bands such as Santana, Jefferson Airplane, The Flying Burrito Brothers, and Crosby, Stills & Nash, and culminated in a performance by The Rolling Stones.\(^{59}\) Unfortunately, the concert is remembered more for its violence than for the music. Three people died accidentally, a six-months pregnant woman suffered a skull fracture when an empty beer bottle flew out of nowhere and hit her in the head, and a Hells Angel motorcycle club member fatally
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stabbed 18-year-old Meredith Hunter after he pulled a gun and pointed it at the stage.\textsuperscript{60} The Grateful Dead, who helped organize the festival and were also scheduled to perform, declined to play due to the increasing fear and tension at the venue.\textsuperscript{61}

According to Sixties pundits, Altamont signaled the end of an era, because it shattered the countercultural dream of creating a better world. The violence showed that those who appeared devoted to the dream were no better than anyone else.\textsuperscript{62} The Altamont concert was supposed to be the next upward event of the youth explosion, “a steady, ascendant line from the early 1960s to this moment . . . always gotten bigger, always gotten better, and always gotten higher.”\textsuperscript{63} Instead, the Age of Aquarius was “befouled with murder.”\textsuperscript{64} This supposedly burst the Sixties Movement’s bubble about itself permanently. It is said that “if Woodstock was the dream, Altamont was the nightmare!”\textsuperscript{65} The media quickly contrasted Altamont with Woodstock and created a myth of good versus bad, and a peak versus an ending. Woodstock, which had its own share of disasters, forever represented “peace and love” and the triumph of the counterculture, while Altamont came to be viewed as all evil and mayhem, the end of the hippie era, and the “de facto conclusion of late-1960s American youth culture.”\textsuperscript{66} Nevertheless, one could also explain this part of history in another manner. More accurately, both events as portrayed were but symbols for the extremes within the same movement. There was plenty of youthful exuberance clamoring for peaceful change, but with it there were volatile emotions turning easily to frustration, anger, and destruction. This is not to mention that some within the Movement (from anti-war protesters, Diggers, and Yippies to various black liberation/revolutionary groups) openly supported the strategy of violence to achieve their aims. In reality, Woodstock was no more peace and love than Altamont was, as there were many of the same festival-goers, bands, stage manager, producer, and leaders of the counterculture at both events.\textsuperscript{67} This media-generated parable of “light ending in darkness” was but an easy way to end an era. Altamont conveniently took place in the last days of the
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1960s decade. No matter how one wants to read the events and effects of Altamont, one thing is certain: rock festivals, communes, hippies, black power, and the anti-war movement (and the rest of the counterculture) continued for many more years, which I will document in the last part of my dissertation. In other words, the Sixties did not end in late 1969 but continued well into the 1970s. First, however, I will show how the various Sixties movements were far from their mythic ideal, and always contained their opposite (negative) characterizations/realities. Hence, I will explore the themes of dissension, despair, and violence (and to a lesser extent, drug abuse) within the hippie, African-American, and student movements. Secondly, I will explore why the Altamont festival was such a failure. And finally, I will examine the erroneous belief that the Hells Angels were somehow part of the same subculture as the hippies, and thus could have ended the Sixties era solely by their behavior.

II. 2. Hippies:

The Myth of Peace, Love, and the Sanctity of Drugs

To start, I will explore the hippie movement, which more than anywhere, emerged out of the Haight-Ashbury District of San Francisco in the middle 1960s. Contrary to legend, the hippie scene did experience, from its inception, the same negative problems that the Altamont festival would be associated with a few years later, namely: dissension, despair, drug abuse, and violence. Thus, the hopeful and magical years of 1966 and 1967 will be given extra attention here because of the misconception most people have about the purity of the Movement at this early stage in time. Only by filling in the missing information can we finally go beyond the myth of Altamont and see the festival for what it was, not as an ending to something, but as an example of the dark side of the Sixties era.

The first theme that I will explore will be that of dissension. One of the most basic myths of the hippie movement was that it consisted of a monolithic unity, that everybody who first came to Haight-Ashbury, or later to other similar bohemian enclaves, was on the same psychedelic trip of self-discovery and that their personal revelations and interactions were the basis for a new sociocultural model for the entire “straight” world to follow.68 However, there were problems with these presumptions, as not all of those who came to
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the Haight were there to transform the world and themselves. Moreover, the hippie scene consisted of several subgroups with differing ideas on how to implement change. Finally, the nature of psychedelic drugs tended to suppress the mind’s ability to discriminate, giving perhaps a false sense of hope for those who took them.

The Sixties-era counter-cultural road to Altamont was said to have started during the summer of 1965, when a small community of “new beatniks” began to form in the Haight. Many had recently left the original beatnik area of North Beach because it had become too commercialized. Nonetheless, while they were rooted in the post-World War II beat movement, times were changing: the Vietnam war started in earnest; rock music was replacing both folk and jazz as the music for the young “hip” underground; LSD was increasingly used to explore one’s mind; and by September the word “hippie” was first used to refer to these new generation of beatniks. While there were many differences early on, they were usually ignored, or thought unimportant, because of how fast the population was growing.

In the beginning, unlike Altamont, all differences seemed to fade from view in the excitement of the community’s growth. The Haight-Ashbury sub-culture exploded in size from about 800 people in early 1966 to 15,000 by the end of the year. Throughout the spring and summer there were at least two rock dance concerts each weekend night, all marked by the same accepting spirit that presumed that anyone who came was “hip” to psychedelic drugs, and probably on them. The experience of being immersed in a sea of hundreds of like-minded people produced an intoxicating feeling of optimism. With the growing movement, there became a vision of destiny about changing the world radically. In fact, by the summer of 1966, the Haight-Ashbury type counter-culture was already beginning to spread around the world, as witnessed by the English folk rock star Donovan.

---
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singing about the hippie scene in one of his songs. The emphasis was not to pay attention to differences, as the world was thought to be close to an evolutionary breakthrough in consciousness, and besides, psychedelics had shown that all distinctions were illusory anyway.

The press had a great part in the growth of the hippie scene. It advertised “free love, free lunch in the Panhandle, tolerance for the crazy and the outcast, and a New Age governed by the power of love and innocence.” However, it brought in not only “visionaries” but all types of young people, some insecure and unable to find a place for themselves, others who wanted to drop out of society and saw the Haight-Ashbury as an easy place to survive on only the basics of life. Furthermore, many of the new arrivals had some sort of psychological problems, or were actual criminals that came to prey upon the young and the naive. One example of the latter was Charles Manson, who would later emerge as an infamous “hippie mass murderer” shortly before Altamont. While things on the surface seemed homogeneous, there were basic differences, and what had seemed infinitesimally small to the hippie community was waiting to explode. According to a 1967 questionnaire by sociologist Lewis Yablonsky, out of 436 hippies who responded, 87 had been locked up in mental hospitals and 270 had been in jail before arriving to the San Francisco hippie center.

The community in the Haight-Ashbury had tried from the beginning to practice absolute tolerance and non-exclusiveness. As a result, a wide variety of groups could be found living there: psychedelic Christians, mystical surrealists, Krishna devotees, new leftists, teeny boppers, HIP merchants, Diggers, Pranksters, Satanists, weekend hippies, and plan old druggies. With this type of a hodgepodge, it would not be surprising that disagreements simmered underneath the surface. An initial example of discord was related to economics. The hip shop owners and merchants believed in making money for themselves, while the Diggers (an anarchist guerilla street theater group) believed that everything should be free, and eventually started free stores in which everything was free.
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Nevertheless, people in the Haight felt they did not have the time to spell out the
differences among themselves, or to reporters, insisting on “not getting hung up on
words.” The point was that anybody who was in the Haight was surely searching for the
same things: keys to world peace, or peace of mind. The thought that someone might only
be there among them to only find friends didn’t much matter either; somehow it was
explained away as being the same thing in the end. Moreover, superficially, it became
even harder to see contradictions as the newcomers were eager to conform to ready-made
models of what it was to be a hippie, and quickly adopted the same dress and lingo of the
“old timers.” Nevertheless, the old time hippies (those who had joined the scene only
some months before) discounted the inexperience of the newcomers, as they felt that if the
new people also took LSD, they must be on the “same trip” as themselves; in other words,
they were going through the same experiences and were thus just like them.

Hippies considered LSD a positive drug, a “deconditioning agent” suitable for
“destroying the roots of war, racism, fascism, and all other evils based on narrow
mindedness and repression.” It was considered a sacrament of the highest order; the key
to understanding the new reality of which they were creating. Nonetheless, the nature of
the psychedelic experience could create confusion, too. Experiences from drugs like LSD
and mescaline caused one to focus too intensely on certain things, while ignoring many
other details. Moreover, after a couple of hours, dissolution of boundaries occurred in
which the nature of the self and all of reality became as one being. LSD users often
described the trip in positive terms relating to “lack of individualization and discord”:
peace, love, oneness, harmony, beauty, bliss, and freedom. The drug allegedly opened
one up to the vastness of ultimate reality, “all the way to the white light in which the
individual was no more.” This was essentially a religious experience that bordered on

---
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either pantheism or solipsism.\textsuperscript{96} (Pantheism is a belief in which God and the universe are the same thing, and is present in all natural forms. Solipsism is a system of thought that admits only the Self as something existing or knowable). After such a profound LSD experience, earthly problems were seen as a “come down” and something to be avoided.\textsuperscript{97} Hippies would rather sing, “We are one in harmony living in celebration” then to deal with real existing problems.\textsuperscript{98} Being all part of Oneness, somehow everything would work out by itself. Nonetheless, most hippies soon realized that the earthly realm also existed, and differences that had been suppressed began quickly to be ever more pronounced throughout the years leading up to Altamont.

The following is a brief chronology of incidents that expose the lack of unity within the early Haight-Ashbury hippie community, and between other parts of the wider San Francisco Bay Area Sixties-era movement and beyond.

- Fall of 1965 - The new left political activist types, from across the bay in Berkeley, thought of psychedelic drugs as “just another thrill.” Haight-Ashbury to them was either an example of “bourgeois self-indulgence” or a “plot to keep American youth from studying Marxism-Leninism.”\textsuperscript{99}
- October 16, 1965 - Sonny Barger, president of the large Oakland chapter of the Hells Angels (who created most of the violence at Altamont four years later), decided to not only oppose the peace march that they had initially supported, but attacked it physically. The Angels formed a solid wall that stopped the marchers at the Oakland city line.\textsuperscript{100} Ken Kesey, and his bus full of people, could not even get close enough to the Angels to talk to them. Kesey, who was the leader of the Merry Pranksters, was the man most responsible for bringing the bikers into the budding psychedelic movement. The whole movement was thrown into confusion by this turn of events. “The Angels were the biggest villains in California, but here they were defending the city of Oakland from the bearded Vietniks of Berkeley.”\textsuperscript{101} In other words, they switched sides, at least momentarily, and the hippie/anti-war
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movement became their enemy. The following month Sonny Barger offered President Johnson the Hells Angels’ services as a “crack troop of trained gorillas” in Vietnam.\(^\text{102}\)

- January 3, 1966 - The Psychedelic Shop opened as a store that would sell everything an “acid head” might be interested in, but on opening day, an anonymous note was slipped under their door denouncing them for selling out the psychedelic revolution.\(^\text{103}\)

- January 21 - 23, 1966 - Acid Test and Trips Festival, one of the first major hippie happenings, was a success. However, there were already tensions between the three main organizers: Bill Graham (former manager of the political satire theatre group the San Francisco Mime Troupe), Ken Kesey and his Merry Pranksters, and Stewart Brand (later of the *Whole Earth Catalog* fame). Graham exploded in anger at Kesey for letting in people free, while Brand and his partner squabbled with Kesey about not writing on the overhead projector.\(^\text{104}\)

- Early spring of 1966 - The San Francisco Mime Troupe experienced great polarization, and split into two parts after a serious political rap session. Known for having open factionalism, one part started to refer to itself as the Diggers.\(^\text{105}\)

- September of 1966 - Haight-Ashbury hippies demonstrated outside the Park Police Station over a recent drug bust by carrying signs reading “Blue Fascism.”\(^\text{106}\) Other hippies (led by *Oracle* editors Allen Cohen and Michael Bowen) condemned this approach by stating that if this kind of confrontation continued, the new community would be trapped in “old forms,” in which the police always held the physical advantage.\(^\text{107}\) Instead, they began to plan a celebration, a “Love Pageant Rally” rather than a protest for October 6.

- October of 1966 - The Diggers, led by Emmett Grogan, began to attack the psychedelic *Oracle* newspaper, in return, for being too otherworldly.\(^\text{108}\) The Diggers addressed a sense of dissatisfaction that some had with the psychedelic lifestyle, based on the observation that religious visions were no cure to worldly

---
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problems. Richard Alpert called this problem “how to come down from an LSD trip.” The Diggers’ philosophy was that “after getting stoned and walking in the woods, we have to return to the world of society and its competitive games.” Unlike the Oracle group, which concerned itself with esoteric things, to them the social and the political did count. In fact, Diggers believed that the hippies who only believed in living in the psychedelic realm were the enemy. The Diggers called the Oracle an “old cut rag of misinformation, outdated news, psychedelic bullshit art, and premasticated verbal masturbation about what we already know.” It challenged the paper to report instead upon “the high incidences of police arrests for nonexistent charges” and exorbitant rents that had been starting to skyrocket in the past year. On the other hand, they thought the hip stores were essentially no different from General Motors. The continued believing in handing out free food, “not because it’s charity, but because it’s yours.”

- January 14, 1967 - The First Human Be-In was held at Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. This event really made America and the world conscious of the existence of a hippie movement. Two days after this momentous event of unity, the Diggers and the Hare Krishnas were on bad terms. Both groups were recruiting in the Haight, and both were offering free food. However, the real conflict was philosophical, as the Diggers were “pro senses,” the opposite of the Krishnas’ sense denial.

- January 26, 1967 - The Berkeley Barb denounced Dr. Timothy Leary’s Psychedelic Celebration, which had received “glowing reviews in the East Coast.” They called Leary “a self-appointed leader of the psychedelic revolution” who “suggested dropping some acid in an unguarded coffee cup to turn on straight people.” His message was supposedly a little too positive for the rest of the
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Movement people, in that it created a “too reassuring picture of harmless hippies
doing no wrong.”

- February 8, 1967 - There were great uncomfortable tensions between hip merchants
and the Diggers, who threatened to dynamite the stores if they did not convert into
nonprofit cooperatives. Diggers warned that the merchants had to get serious
about their responsibilities to the psychedelic community. After being accused of
being “rich exploiters,” the merchants started to put up signs in their windows
showing their balance sheets. They revealed all their gross income, all the way
down to covering losses to shoplifters. On the other hand, some of the merchants
began to claim that the Straight Theater was a “Mafia front” while the Straight
crowd suspected the Diggers of being a “Mafia theft ring.” The Diggers also
accused another hippie group, the Love Conspiracy, of being part of “some type of
Mob.”

- Mid - February of 1967 - Ramparts, a political radical newspaper, put the Haight-
Ashbury down by linking hippies with young Republicans and the John Birch
Society and fascism. The Second Annual Tribal Stomp was held for the first
anniversary of Chet Helms’s Family Dog productions. It was said that the party
spirit of the old time Dog Dances were supposedly being “diluted by
nonparticipants.”

- March 3, 1967 - First Annual Love Circus brought down the wrath of those Diggers
who had not left town to live out in the country. They charged that the dance
promoters, the Love Conspiracy Commune and High Society Family, were
charging an exorbitant rate at $3.50 and they called for picketers. Shortly
afterwards, the residents at a Digger crash pad in the Haight charged that a group of
people from the Love Conspiracy Commune broke into their place and threatened
violence if the Diggers picketed. Later it became known that the Chapel Hill
Mafia, a group of drug dealers from the University of North Carolina, financed the
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Love Conspiracy Commune. The Diggers’ public image had changed a lot in the last six months since so-called “counterfeit Diggers” appeared. Now, there were several groups calling themselves Diggers. One such group with 150 members did picket against the Love Circus. In a leaflet that they passed out while picketing outside Winterland, they stated that all hippie events had been free (or had asked for donations) and that this event was a sellout. It read: “Whose trip are you paying for? How long will you tolerate people (straight or hip) transforming your trip into cash? Your style is being sold back to you. New style, same shuck, new style, same shuck, new style, same shuck. The Diggers will not pay for this trip. As you buy a ticket, you kill the Digger in yourself—you yourself.” Both sides took their quarrel to the pages of the Berkeley Barb.

- March 15, 1967 - Diggers organized a picket line against the psychedelic rock bands that are now starting to get rich.
- April of 1967 - The formation of the Summer of Love council began. Hugh crowds of newcomers were coming thick and fast. The media-fueled hysteria created an invasion of those who believed the Haight to be a “New Jerusalem” of sorts. These “Johnny-come-lately types” wore clothes to match what they saw in national news media photos. However, the newcomers could never feel the same ease about their membership into this hip community, as they were joining something that had been established before their arrival; a division between the original hippies and these new ones emerged. One way they thought to combat elitism was to take more drugs than anybody ever did before them. Hippie styles were becoming diluted. Revered Indian holy man Meher Baba wrote against LSD as being a “false religion.” Hopi Indians were not interested in a “Grand Be-In” with hippies who made a bad impression. There was disharmony at the gathering
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of the four elder statesmen of psychedelia: Timothy Leary, Alan Watts, Gary Snyder, and Allen Ginsberg. Famous folk rock protest band Country Joe and the Fish could not get a concert gig in San Francisco because they were from Berkeley. Psychedelic guru Richard Alpert spoke out against the Diggers’ aggressive anarchism. He said that focusing on police brutality is not the individual human being rising above it all, “reality is a bring down man.”

- April 15, 1967 - The leadership of Mobe (National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam) was bitterly divided on the issue of allowing marchers to carry pro-Vietcong banners and signs. Hippies criticized the anti-war movement for “talking about peace instead of being peace” (like themselves), while the Diggers were “gnashing their teeth at the politicos.”

- May 2, 1967 - There was a debate as to whether the most popular psychedelic rock band, the Jefferson Airplane, was “merchandising love” by singing “Somebody to Love,” which had just become one of the top songs in the country.

- May 13, 1967 – “San Francisco (Be Sure to Wear Flowers in Your Hair)” was released on this day. It was a song written by John Phillips of the Mamas & the Papas and sung by Scott McKenzie. It became an instant hit, reaching #4 on the Billboard Hot 100 in the United States and #1 in the United Kingdom and most of Europe. The song is credited with bringing thousands of young people to the “Summer of Love” in San Francisco. Meanwhile, the Diggers’ scornful response was “wear a flower in your hair and if San Francisco doesn’t work out we can always do it in London.”

- June 10, 1967 - There was a music festival on Mount Tamalpais. “Old time hippies” criticized how “hardly anyone danced.” There was already an attitude of comparing new events to the past and noting that the new ones were not measuring up.
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• June 20, 1967 - The Diggers announce that the Be-In had been a “shuck,” slang for worthless.\textsuperscript{145}

• June 26, 1967 - Two people quit the council for the “Summer of Love” accusing it of being “establishment.” The council was composed of The Family Dog, The Straight Theatre, The Diggers, The San Francisco Oracle, and approximately twenty-five other people.\textsuperscript{146}

• July 2, 1967 - There was “paranoia” among shop owners in the Haight over theft and violence.\textsuperscript{147}

• August 7, 1967 – There was a large meeting on the Hippie Hill part of the Golden Gate Park. It ended like other sporadic public meetings that had occurred since spring; it quickly got “bogged down in an inconclusive exchange of irreconcilable viewpoints.”\textsuperscript{148}

• September 11, 1967 - The Summer of Love was ending. For a week, there had been “throngs of hitchhikers at the Oak Street Freeway on ramp.”\textsuperscript{149} Counter to the myth, most original Haight-Ashbury hippies, if still living there at all, were not sad that the “spare change panhandlers” were disappearing from Haight Street along with the tourists.\textsuperscript{150} They said yes to “fewer grimy lost looking teenagers huddled in doorways clutching lost looking puppies or kittens.”\textsuperscript{151}

• October 6, 1967 - The Death of the Hippie mock funeral began with services at sunrise in Buena Vista Park. Later there was a procession that went down Haight Street with “pallbearers carrying a trinket filled casket,” ending at the Golden Gate Park Panhandle.\textsuperscript{152} The event was in part a Digger theater show aimed at regaining what was “lost to the hordes of people” who started coming during the months leading up to the Summer of Love.\textsuperscript{153} Nonetheless, after the funeral was over, the Haight continued along the path it was already on, drawing in new residents as it grew steadily uninhabitable. The Death of Hippie press release showed a huge effort to “save the psychedelic dream from its publicity,” but not everyone joined
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the project. Some openly doubted that hippies were actually going to “tear off their beads” as the Death of Hippie rhetoric suggested, and would become something called “the Free Man.” The I and Thou coffee shop people ridiculed the project of “declaring the hippies dead,” especially since new hippies were still arriving into the Haight every day.

- December of 1967 - The Yippies (Youth International Party), a politically radical hippie organization, started at the end of the year. They later became famous for fighting the police in the streets of Chicago during the Democratic National Convention in August of 1968. The Yippies grew out of the Digger archetype (in fact calling themselves the East coast Diggers) that had always tried to bridge the gap between the more esoteric, otherworldly sorts of hippies and the political anti-war activist types. While the Diggers were famous for handing out free food at the Golden Gate panhandle from 1966 to 1968, a less known fact was that many of them began to own guns by early 1967.

- Summer of 1968 - The Haight-Ashbury District was still attracting hundreds of runaways every week, but it was a changed neighborhood. The mood was darker; hard drugs continued to increase, and violence exploded. The old Fillmore dance hall was also closed in favor of the less personable Fillmore West.

- August 22-24, 1969 - The summer of 1969 was the summer of rock festivals. Woodstock, often considered the peak of the Sixties, was by far the biggest and the most famous, but every region had a major event of some kind or another. Ironically, San Francisco, where the 1967 Human Be-In had given birth to the idea of outdoor festival celebrations, did not have one because their giant event was canceled at the last moment. The three-day rock festival called the Wild West Show would have been held only a week after Woodstock, featuring the same bands. The reason for the cancellation was debate of over “community representation and control,” which had long cursed other hippie endeavors such as the Straight Theater and the Family Dog. The Wild West Festival failed because of the insistence on
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the part of many hippie and radical types that it should be put on free. On the other hand, organizers such as Bill Graham pointed out that the sound system, lights, and security were not at all free.\textsuperscript{161} When it all collapsed, in part due to repeated threats of violence, there was a wave of public hostility throughout the San Francisco hip community. Graham publicly threatened to close his Fillmore West concert hall and quit the rock business altogether.\textsuperscript{162} With the Wild West Festival not happening, Woodstock in New York State remained the crowning achievement of the hippie gatherings. Thus, Altamont was an effort to wrest back the title to the San Francisco Bay Area, were the Movement had begun.

The second theme that I will explore will be that of drug use and abuse. Another basic myth of the Sixties era was that hippies used mainly psychedelic drugs (DMT, DOM - known as STP, LSD, marijuana, mescaline, and psilocybin), which resulted in usually positive experiences; and that hard drugs (amphetamines - known as speed, barbiturates - known as downers, cocaine, heroin, methedrine, morphine) came later (as in Altamont) and likewise signaled the end of the era.\textsuperscript{163} During the optimistic early years, while Timothy Leary (and other acid gurus) talked enthusiastically about the benefits of LSD, they usually neglected to mention the potential hazards associated with its usage.\textsuperscript{164} As mentioned before, the hippie counter-culture considered psychedelic drugs as being good because of the possible great knowledge that could be derived from them. The focus was primarily on how psychedelics could reveal ultimate truth to humanity and forever end all wars, inequalities, and other injustices.\textsuperscript{165} On the other hand, as the so-called psychedelic revolution continued to grow, so did the increase in drug causalities. The unspoken reality was that increasing numbers of people were having problems with these drugs; things were not just rosy.\textsuperscript{166} Some individuals incurred actual physical injuries during their psychedelic experiences, while others had difficult psychological encounters (or bad trips).\textsuperscript{167} As it turned out, LSD’s psychological effects could vary greatly from person to person and from one session to another. For a psychedelic trip to go well, it depended on several factors,
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including state of mental and emotional readiness and the dose strength.¹⁶⁸ A list of potential dangers consisted of the following: being susceptible to accidents; adverse reactions from mixing drugs; panic and anxiety attacks; temporary or permanent psychosis; and flashbacks.¹⁶⁹ Besides psychedelics, the reality was that hard drugs were much more prevalent in Haight-Ashbury than is commonly remembered. Contrarily to legend, a large number of hippies tried every type of drug known to man, from amphetamines to heroin.¹⁷⁰

The story of how the hippies at Altamont were suddenly seen to be strange, damaged, unbalanced, and spaced out was merely a shift in perception, and not of reality.¹⁷¹ Hard drugs and drug burnouts had always been part of the countercultural scene from the beginning. By the end of 1969, drug problems had not only been acknowledged, but overly exaggerated.

While there had been no documented deaths from LSD overdose, many who had taken LSD died from accidents or suicides. LSD could temporarily impair the ability to make sound judgments and understand common dangers leading to personal injury.¹⁷² One infamous example occurred on October 4 1969, when radio and television personality Art Linkletter’s daughter, Diane, allegedly jumped out of her sixth-floor kitchen window while on LSD.¹⁷³ Moreover, increasing the risk of harm was the mixing of psychedelics with certain classes of antidepressants (such as lithium and tricyclics) that triggered a “dissociative fugue state” in which individuals wandered around aimlessly without being aware of their actions.¹⁷⁴ Perhaps LSD could open an individual to transpersonal states of consciousness, but it was equally possible that the same person would not see a car coming, or even be aware that he or she was standing in the middle of a road.

Sandoz laboratories of Switzerland introduced LSD as a psychiatric drug in 1947.¹⁷⁵ By the 1950s and the 1960s it was used in American psychiatry to enhance psychotherapy. Some psychiatrists believed LSD was especially useful at helping patients
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“unblock their repressed subconscious minds.” However, this was all done under a professionally controlled and supervised environment. In the book *The Psychedelic Experience*, precautions for taking and preparing for an LSD trip were carefully explained: “[LSD] acts as a chemical key – it opens the mind, frees the nervous system of its ordinary patterns and structures. The nature of the experience depends almost entirely on set and setting. Set denotes the preparation of the individual, including his personality structure and his mood at the time. Setting is physical – the weather, the room’s atmosphere; social – feelings of persons present towards one another; and cultural – prevailing views as to what is real.” In the Haight-Ashbury, young people took LSD without any guidance or care, which often resulted in negative trips. Disturbing experiences ranged from feelings of vague anxiety and alienation to profoundly disturbing states of unrelieved terror. Without a guide, users could be overwhelmed with fear that they were going insane and would never return to reality. In extreme cases, the individuals would attempt to harm themselves or others around them. There were some cases of LSD inducing a psychosis in people who appeared to be healthy, but the psychosis-like reactions were usually short in duration. For those that developed long-term psychosis, it was not known whether the LSD itself induced these reactions, or if it had triggered a latent condition that would have eventually manifested. Finally, many people reported “flashbacks.” In these phenomena, a psychedelic trip-like experience was re-lived by the person weeks or even months after last taking the drug. Things like alcohol, cannabis, and stress triggered the flashbacks or sleepiness; however, no definitive explanation has ever been worked out on why this happens.

Parts of the hippie counterculture were very critical of hard drugs, especially amphetamines that had been around for many years previous to the hippie era. Even the Beat Generation writers had used amphetamines. Jack Kerouac was a particularly avid user of this drug because it was said to have provided him with the stamina needed to work

---

176 Ibid.
178 Yablonsky, *The Hippie Trip*, 263.
179 Ibid., 307.
181 Ibid.
182 Ibid.
on his novels like *On the Road* for extended periods of time.\(^{184}\) The most commonly reported drug effects were a sense of well-being, feeling of exhilaration, self-confidence, and lessened fatigue in reaction to work.\(^{185}\) However, the psychological effects could also include increased irritability, aggression, grandiosity, anxiety, excessive feelings of power and invincibility, repetitive and obsessive behaviors, paranoia, and with chronic and/or high doses, amphetamine psychosis could occur.\(^{186}\) In an interview with the *Los Angeles Free Press* in 1965, beat writer (and one of the first hippies) Allen Ginsberg commented early on (as Haight-Ashbury was just starting out) that “speed is antisocial, paranoid making, it’s a drag . . . all the nice gentle dope fiends are getting screwed up by the real horror monster Frankenstein speed freaks who are going round stealing and bad-mouthing everybody.”\(^ {187}\) This trend continued to grow during San Francisco’s 1967 Summer of Love as thousands of young people poured in, not always for love and mind-expansion, but for drug “kicks.”\(^ {188}\) Marijuana and LSD faded somewhat into the background as speed took over. By September 1967, one-third of the residents who took the survey in the Haight-Ashbury area had already injected amphetamines intravenously at least once.\(^ {189}\) Another 1967 questionnaire sampled several major hippie centers (San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury, New York’s East Village, and the Los Angeles areas of Venice, Fairfax, and Sunset Strip) and found that 57% used amphetamines at least sometimes and 46% used methedrine at least sometimes. Heroin was at this point only reported as being used by 2.8%, but quickly rising.\(^ {190}\) However, other surveys revealed that one in four had tried heroin too by now. In addition, marijuana use was reported by 96%; LSD and other psychedelics by 87%; amphetamines (speed) by 76%, opium by 58%, and cocaine by 36%.\(^ {191}\)

The following is a brief chronology of incidents that expose the use and abuse of drugs (and the related result of lack of hygiene and disease) within the early Haight-
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Ashbury hippie community, and between other parts of the wider San Francisco Bay Area Sixties-era movement and beyond.

- 1965 and 1966 - During these years, the modern world for many young people seemed like a “meaningless menacing place of atomic war and harsh competition where it was too hard to find peace.” Instead, those who became “hippies” tried to follow the ways of the American Indian with his “stone age ways and peyote worship.” Dealing marijuana was the economic base of the early Haight-Ashbury hippie community; nearly everyone sold a little grass. However, some became larger dealers who were expected to handle a full line of drugs, especially as the Haight-Ashbury grew and became a central drug market. It was said that amphetamines remained big until late in 1965, and reemerged in 1967, if they every went away.

- November 27, 1965 - The first Acid Test was held in Santa Cruz, California, a town 115km south of San Francisco. It was the first of a series of public parties put on by Ken Kesey and his Merry Pranksters that were centered entirely on the experimentation with LSD, also known as acid. Musical performances by the Grateful Dead were commonplace (starting with the second Acid Test) along with black lights, strobe lights, and fluorescent paint. The Acid Tests were notable for their influence on the new LSD-based counterculture in Haight-Ashbury; it became the subsequent ingredient for the transition from the beat generation to the hippie movement. These were no spiritual type events per se, as Kesey tried to make everybody’s trip as “strange and weird” as possible. For example, Kesey and the Pranksters would take turns yelling into the microphone, saying things like “The room is a spaceship and the captain has lost his mind.” The whole event was sheer madness that tested the boundaries of sanity, not unlike something out of Kesey’s 1962 novel called One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest.

- December 4, 1965 - The second Acid Test was held in San Jose, California at a private house. Leaflets advertising the event read, “Can You Pass the Acid
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With a crowd of four hundred people, the Pranksters played their “mind games” on more people than ever before. It was said to be huge, warm, crowded, intense, and confused scene.

- December 17, 1965 – The Fourth Acid Test was held at Muir Beach Lodge at another summer home encampment in Marin County north of San Francisco. Owsley Stanley, who supplied the LSD, started “freaking-out” and screamed at Kesey, accusing him of “draining his acid and his money.” He sent a chair screeching across the floor before leaving the log cabin, only to crash his car on the side of the road. The Test was so scary that it brought back all the old rumors about how Kesey’s scene created “hospitalizations and potential suicides”!

- January 23-24, 1966 - The seventh Acid Test was called the Trips Festival, the only one that lasted two days. However, on the part of many who had already experienced a lot of acid, there surfaced a disappointment of realizing that the LSD trip wasn’t the “one true reality itself” that some had proclaimed it to be. The user always had to come back down afterwards. The belief that an individual could escape this mundane reality through a “chemical door” and “stay high forever in a Garden of Eden” was now seen by most as not being true. Instead, LSD only allowed one to glimpse the higher realms, which then needed to be integrated into one’s ordinary life. Many hippies felt cheated and rebelled at this cosmic dualism. As early as 1966, some began to turn to either Satanism or hard drugs like heroin. The attitude was, “If you can’t win, you might as well sell out big, to the very ruler of this evil universe.” Heroin made one feel “contentment, giddiness, and detachment,” in a sense numbing the pain of mundane existence.

- February 12, 1966 – The Los Angeles Acid Test held on this date did not work out too well. “There were lines of frightened people at every pay phone calling their friends or doctors.” Out in the middle of the floor a young woman sat for hours screaming, “Who cares? Who cares?” and the Pranksters amplified her voice

---
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throughout the hall on loudspeakers.\textsuperscript{207} By the end of the night, seven people were committed to hospitals. For once, the Pranksters had been unable to save a “ticklish situation,” and so they split up, with some heading for Mexico.\textsuperscript{208}

- March of 1966 – Confirming that amphetamines were indeed being used by the early hippie community, an article appeared in the San Francisco newspaper stating that twenty-four people were arrested at a “party pad” for using not only marijuana, but methedrine.\textsuperscript{209}

- Spring of 1966 - Owsley Stanley, the first producer of large quantities of LSD, moved back up to Berkeley from Los Angeles. He at first had put a little methedrine into his early LSD, because acid guru Timothy Leary claimed that “amphetamines added clarity to an acid trip.”\textsuperscript{210} Nevertheless, soon Owsley turned against amphetamines in any form.\textsuperscript{211}

- Late May 1966 - The Velvet Underground rock group from the avant-garde part of New York City played in San Francisco. Many thought their performance “wasn’t too high,” as they sang only about heroin addiction, perversion, and vanity.\textsuperscript{212}

- June 10, 1966 - Janis Joplin, described as “a moody little speed freak,” joined the local San Francisco band called Big Brother and the Holding Company.\textsuperscript{213}

- February of 1967 - San Francisco General Hospital reported an average of four victims of bad LSD trips a day (85% coming from the Haight). More police drug raids began in the Haight.\textsuperscript{214}

- February 26, 1967 – A nineteen-year old girl fell to her death from her third-floor apartment in the Haight, “stark naked and holding a tube of toothpaste in her mouth.”\textsuperscript{215} She had left behind an incomprehensible note in her typewriter that read as if she had been striking keys at random.\textsuperscript{216}

- March 16, 1967 - Fear passed through the psychedelic community when an article in \textit{Science} magazine claimed that LSD-dosed rats suffered chromosomal changes.
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The research implied that the use of LSD “could lead to retardation and other abnormalities” in the unborn.217

- March 24 1967 - San Francisco’s city health director announced that he would order intensive health inspections in the Haight-Ashbury. Hepatitis and gonorrhea were already reported in the neighborhood, and epidemic meningitis and the bubonic plague were possibilities as well resulting from drug use and lack of hygiene.218

- March 27, 1967 – Eight teams of health inspectors descended on the Haight, visiting 691 buildings. They issued five-day warnings for sanitary repair to 39 buildings. The Digger place got fifteen citations for violations ranging from absence of doors on bedrooms to dog shit on the floor. The health inspectors caught a twenty-eight year old named Spider “butchering a deer in one of the houses.”219

- April of 1967 - Down in Big Sur, California police were knocking down lean-tos, abandoned cabins, and other potential shelters to keep Diggers and other Haight-Ashbury emigrants from establishing whole camps of “half-naked flute players in the canyons.”220 Big Sur officials cited the danger of hepatitis, lice, and scabies.221

- April 19, 1967 - New Jersey Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., proposed two new acts to Congress aimed at “those banana-smoking beatniks who seek a make-believe land.”222

- January to May 1967 - The city had already removed six times as much refuse and garbage from the panhandle of the Golden Gate park in Haight-Ashbury as in all of 1966.223

- May of 1967 - Marijuana supply was drying up in the Haight, “a mysterious grass shortage,” and the use of amphetamines was on the rise.224 Amphetamines were popular because they guaranteed a positive mood and “enough aggressiveness to deal with any amount of hassle on the crowded street.”225 The result was to make the neighborhood even more tense and hassled: “The more people took speed to
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deal with the street, the more crazy speed freaks there were on the street.”

- May 3, 1967 - Eight persons associated with the Love Conspiracy Commune were arrested for the sale of methedrine. The lab also manufactured DMT, a strong psychedelic drug whose effects lasted but half an hour.
- June 8, 1967 - The cops in Marin County busted a mescaline factory.
- June 9, 1967 - The Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic was established to help the thousands of young people on the streets in the Haight-Ashbury District whose lives were affected by “drug and alcohol abuse, mental and physical problems.”
- June 11, 1967 – The hippie magazine called Inner Space praised STP as “pure molecular energy, beyond mysticism, beyond love, beyond Maya: IT.” However, this strong psychedelic was known to “making the vocal chords vibrate manically and causing the body to arrange itself into spontaneous yoga postures.” The bad trip percentage was said to be 60 percent.
- June 26, 1967 - There were scare stories about STP, 10,000 doses of which were said to have been distributed free. The danger was that convulsions could result if the tranquilizer thorazine were taken together with STP. Hippies during 1967 were reportedly already carrying LSD in one pocket and thorazine in the other for bad trips.
- June 30, 1967 –There appeared a new drug on Haight Street, an animal tranquilizer named phencyclidine or PCP.
- July 4 1967 - After the Santa Rosa, California Press-Democrat published a series of articles on Morning Star Ranch commune, it was greeted with a lot of local interest.
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hostility. Lou Gottlieb was given a “cease and desist order” by the health department.\textsuperscript{237} It gave him twenty-four hours to cease operations as an “organized camp.”\textsuperscript{238}

- July 16, 1967 - There were three Free Buses (including a yellow-painted Digger Bus) running up and down Haight Street. One of the drivers told the \textit{San Francisco Chronicle} that there were “as much as five hundred meth freaks in the Haight who’ll get on the bus going anywhere.”\textsuperscript{239}

- August of 1967 - Marijuana was still in short supply, and there was more LSD than anybody wanted. Haight Street became “Speed Street now” with half the hippies in the neighborhood shooting methedrine.\textsuperscript{240} One out of five had tried heroin, which they used as freely as tranquilizers or barbiturates to overcome the feeling of depression that followed week long sleepless “speed runs” of methedrine-fueled activity.\textsuperscript{241} If they became junkies they became thieves, but as speeders, they could be physically dangerous. After a couple of days without sleep, they started to “space,” to fall into moments of unconsciousness while remaining physiologically awake.\textsuperscript{242} Speed freaks developed hallucinations as if the mind were struggling to dream in the absence of sleep. Often these hallucinations tended to be paranoid and violent.\textsuperscript{243}

- August 2, 1967 - The \textit{Berkeley Barb} reported that LSD Rescue, a “bum-trip talk down service” that had claimed to have talked down four hundred people a week in December of 1966, had now been revived.\textsuperscript{244}

- August 3, 1967 - Dr. Ellis D. Sox pronounced Haight-Ashbury restaurants the “likeliest in town to have hair or bacteria in their food.”\textsuperscript{245}

- August 12, 1967 – A hippie came into the Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic and stole penicillin tablets, disposable syringes, and a bottle of tablets used to test urine samples for sugar. Later he was seen passing everything out in the streets, including
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the urine tablets that contained a highly poisonous mixture of copper sulfide and caustic soda.246

- August 20, 1967 - San Francisco General Hospital reported that the number of drug abuse victims went up from 150 in February to 750 in July of 1967.247
- August 27, 1967 - Beatles manager Brian Epstein overdosed on drugs and died.248
- October 4, 1967 - Only 40 percent of the drug busts in the Haight were for marijuana; most were for speed and heroin.249 The drug most despised by psychedelic believers was really coming on by the summer of 1967 when people like Emmett Grogan of the Diggers started using it. At first, it was initially used as a ready antidote for the depression that followed a couple days of shooting amphetamines.250 Quickly it turned into a habit, as it became cool to be high on heroin. Timothy Leary himself spoke of “all drugs as yoga’s.”251
- Summer of 1969 - The Haight seemed to hit rock bottom. Thirty-six storefronts were vacant and the remaining eighteen or so had metal gratings or boards over their windows. Needle freaks, speeders, and junkies were allegedly hunting cats for food. There were hard drugs, hustlers, murder, rape, and satanic cult groups.252 Besides the so-called positive psychedelic drugs, more than 33 percent of the hippies now shot heroin, or methedrine.253 Haight Street was unpleasant and dangerous even by noontime. Jerry “Blind Jerry” Sealund ran his health food store on Page Street until 1969, but moved out after being robbed twelve times in eleven months.254 After a brief spurt of positive energy between 1966-1968, the Haight neighborhood soon became as bad as a neighborhood can get, “a heroin infested slum where somebody could get knifed for a bag of groceries.”255 Meanwhile, the
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Hells Angels made a lot of money from the dope trade. A few years later, in 1972, the California Attorney General called them “a massive dope ring.”

The third theme that I will explore will be that of violence. Another basic myth of the 1960s states that the hippie counterculture was solely tranquil. The famous slogans were “peace and love” and “make love not war,” while the symbol of a two-fingered “peace sign” was a common sight. At the Altamont festival there was a lot of turmoil involving mostly the Hells Angels and the audience fighting each other near the stage. The Angels, who had been hired to be security, claimed to be justified in their actions, including the stabbing death of a black man waving a gun nearby as the Rolling Stones played. A big deal was made of the violence in the media and many since then have called it the end of the Sixties. However, Altamont was far from being the first incidence of agitation in the hip community; like dissension and drugs, it had a long dark history from the start. Perhaps it stemmed from a subconscious attitude of members of the community seeing themselves as victims, “full of fear and resentment” towards the squares. Moreover, the counterculture also had a basic worldview that they described as killing the intellectual and the white man in themselves. They identified much more with the poor minorities of the world than with their own Caucasian middle class. While many in the hip counterculture were against overt political protest, still they managed to demonstrate their dissatisfaction in ever more confrontational ways. The two seemingly opposite poles of the Sixties movement were the hippies and the political activists types; however, there was a mixing from the start. Eventually, the hatred towards the Vietnam War became a justification for everything from pornography to terrorist bombs.

The following is a brief chronology of incidents that expose all sorts of disturbances, confrontations, and violence within the early Haight-Ashbury hippie community, and between other parts of the wider San Francisco Bay Area movements and

---

258 Kirkpatrick, 1969, 262-263.
beyond. The perception that all the young people who first gathered in Haight-Ashbury were nice, sensitive people that would never hurt anyone is not the whole story.

- June of 1965 - Ken Kesey invited the Hells Angels to his private La Honda, California acid party, right after several of them were arrested on gang-rape charges.\(^{263}\)

- August of 1965 - In Virginia City, Nevada, a couple of new-generation bohemians (with ties to the San Francisco Bay Area) open an Old West bar with folk music called the Red Dog Saloon. It became a hangout for a “colony of exotic people” soon to be called hippies, whose “fancy for guns” led to trouble.\(^{264}\)

- September 25, 1965 – The song “Eve of Destruction” became the number-one song on the pop charts in the United States. Contrary to the 1960s myth of youth optimism, this top song contained lyrics that gave warning of imminent apocalypse.\(^{265}\)

- November of 1965 - The third Family Dog dance, called The Appeal, turned “edgy and unpleasant.”\(^{266}\) Hostile teenagers from all over San Francisco had heard about these early psychedelic dance benefits being held at a loft on Howard Street to help the Mime Troupe raise money. There were fistfights in the parking lot and in the hall itself. One of the plate-glass doors was smashed.\(^ {267}\)

- January 17, 1966 – Ken Kesey scuffled with police before being arrested on drug charges and possessing drugs while in the company of a minor.\(^ {268}\)

- July and August of 1966 - Gangs of Haight-Ashbury neighborhood kids occasionally made trouble for the hippies, as did the Hells Angels who had started hanging out there.\(^ {269}\)

- Mid-October of 1966 – Ken Kesey was out on bail planning his last acid test called “LSD Graduation Ceremony” for Halloween night.\(^ {270}\) Rumors about Kesey began to circulate about his “supposed dark plans” at the California Democrats State
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Convention to elect the California governor.\textsuperscript{271} Ever since the beginning of the Pranksters, Kesey had “an aura of danger about him” and his acid parties.\textsuperscript{272} The story was that he now was going to get the Democrats stoned by putting LSD in the plumbing or leaving things painted with LSD so that it would go through the skin. Some people were irritated that Kesey might bring down retaliation onto the hip community.\textsuperscript{273}

- October 31, 1966 – On this day there was also a Diggers event called a “Full Moon Public Celebration,” which was an “experiment in psychedelico-political theater and provocation.”\textsuperscript{274} The leaflets had announced an “intersection game” that would teach the “Digger theory of ownership of the streets.”\textsuperscript{275} It consisted of walking across the intersection in different directions to form various “polygons,” relying on the pedestrian’s right of way over automobiles.\textsuperscript{276} Tying up traffic was a modification of the civil rights sit-in technique directed against automobiles. The Diggers claimed that the “streets are public” and the “streets are free.”\textsuperscript{277} Police responded to the traffic jam and several people were arrested, while two-hundred more booed and chanted “Public, public.”\textsuperscript{278}

- January 14, 1967 – The day of the First Human Be-In, it was announced that the Hells Angels were guarding the generators. At the edges of the Be-In a few “knots of hostile teenagers” from Mission High School and Polytechnic High (Latino and blacks) got into confrontations with hippies.\textsuperscript{279} Haight Street that evening was less mellow than the Be-In. Around nine at night, a crowd of hippies obstructed traffic and a surprisingly swift police raid followed; nearly fifty people were arrested.\textsuperscript{280}

- February of 1967 - Black teenagers had discovered that hippies were easy to push around.\textsuperscript{281} Moreover, the realization that most black people who “should be our brothers but come after us with big muscles, hard fists, and clever knives” probably

\textsuperscript{271} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{272} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{273} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{275} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{276} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{277} Braunstein and Doyle, \textit{Imagine Nation}, 83
\textsuperscript{278} Ibid., 83.
\textsuperscript{279} Ibid., 84
\textsuperscript{281} Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 219.
resented them for abandoning exactly what they themselves would have liked to obtain.\textsuperscript{282}

- March of 1967 - Confrontation was in the air as the Communication Company passed out a leaflet asking people in the Haight to “devise violent but harmless activities to cool out those among their new tribal brothers who didn’t happen to be non-violent.”\textsuperscript{283} The Diggers and a civil rights activist close to the Diggers, called Roy Ballard, planned a “Black Man’s Free Store” for the Fillmore ghetto bordering the Haight-Ashbury District.\textsuperscript{284} Nonetheless, Ballard delivered a fearful warning: “If the Diggers do not receive the help they are asking for, in advance, as far as the black community is concerned, there will be no riot this summer – there will be war.”\textsuperscript{285}

- April 2, 1967 – There was another “walk-in” on Haight Street, with traffic again being tied up. Hippies and Krishna devotees walking in the crosswalks chanting, “Streets are for people, Haight is love” and “We are free.”\textsuperscript{286} The Diggers, who had published an earlier flier reading, “Haight Street is ours to play on till we feel it beautiful to stop,” planned this disturbance.\textsuperscript{287} With the streets again immobilized by a traffic jam, the police appeared. The crowd first took off towards the Golden Gate Park, and then continued to go another mile and a half towards San Francisco’s main city artery with chants of “We want Market Street” and “Mayor Shelley’s house.”\textsuperscript{288} Forty riot-squad police appeared with a hundred police officers and five paddy wagons. While some hippies threw firecrackers, the police started beating them with nightsticks and arrested thirty-two people.\textsuperscript{289} Meanwhile, in the Haight-Ashbury, unknown parties who “spilled paint cans and broke doors and furniture” vandalized several Digger pads.\textsuperscript{290}

- April 22, 1967 - The Communication Company printed the following in their newsletter: “Pretty little sixteen-year-old middle-class chick comes to the Haight to
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see what it’s all about & gets picked up by a seventeen-year-old street dealer who spends all day shooting her full of speed again & again, then feeds here 3000 mikes [micrograms of LSD, 12 times the standard dose] & raffles off her temporarily unemployed body for the biggest Haight Street gang bang since the night before last. Rape is as common as bullshit on Haight Street.”

Just three months after the Be-In, Haight-Ashbury was already described as a “ghastly trap with no escape,” a place “as bad as the squares say it is with drug burns and beatings.”

Emmett Grogan, meanwhile, one of the main leaders of the Diggers, was accused by other Diggers of “lusting for publicity and of being on a violence trip.” Additional original hippies began thinking about moving out to the country, as they could no longer ignore the “presence of evil in the psychedelic swarm.”

- April 23, 1967 - When the police arrived to unplug an impromptu “Rain Festival” on the sidewalk, on the corner of Haight and Ashbury, the crowd pelted them with vegetables and raw eggs. The cops retaliated with a sweep of the street, arresting fifty people. The crowd then cut the valve stems of three tires of the lead police paddy wagon, delaying the transportation of those arrested.

- May 13, 1967 – The San Francisco police arrested two hippies for indecent exposure, and one for spitting on an officer. However, the cops were busy elsewhere in the city as there was a riot with “race-war overtones” at a beach amusement park.

Peter Cohen spoke at the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood council, stating, “The hippies are the fruit of the middle class and they are telling the middle class they don’t like what’s been given them. As things are shaping up now, we are really heading toward a revolution of violence.”

- Late May of 1967 – The Diggers charged that the promoters of the soon-to-be-legendary Monterey Pop Festival were “scheming to get them for riot control purposes,” saying that the event would be a “rich man’s festival” and not a true
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countercultural event. Moreover, the Diggers announced that they would continue to put on free events, and start donating free printing for the Black Panther Party. The Communication Company published a broadside reading, “An Armed Man Is a Free Man.” The Diggers, like a number of people in the Haight by spring, had started carrying guns!

- June 8, 1967 – The Diggers for the third time commandeered the Gray Line bus. Hippies climbed aboard and forcefully took over, telling the passengers that, “You’re all free.”

- June 16, 1967 - Today was the first day of the three-day Monterey Pop Festival, touching off the legendary Summer of Love. Behind the scenes, however, there were worries and prophecies of riots and catastrophes if something was not done with both crowd control and creating camping space for 100,000 people. On the last day, with the crowds evermore menacing, master of ceremonies Peter Tork nervously asked that the gates be opened to let in the huge mass of people from outside the stadium, thus averting the possible ruin of this highly regarded first large festival of love. Many claimed that the Monterey Pop Festival was similarly peaceful to the Be-In, or the Fantasy Fair & Magic Mountain Music Festival held the week before. Others, however, pointed to a “heavier vibrations” that included security precautions that needed to be doubled around the stage, Pete Townshend’s ritual destruction of his guitars, followed by Jimi Hendrix’s kneeling down in front of his guitar and setting it on fire.

- June & July of 1967 – “Fun loving hippies” were calling in false fire alarms almost daily. A new drug called PCP, an animal tranquilizer that induced violence, made its appearance in Haight-Ashbury.

- July 9, 1967 – A major riot in Haight-Ashbury exploded as tourists’ presence was making life even more difficult for hippies, as some tourists came to “gawk at what
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they despised.”308 Some would get out of their cars and walk around insulting
people, and the hip merchandise in the stores. Crowds of hippies retaliated, in an
ugly mood; they cornered the tourists, “trying to tear off their neckties.”309 Around
7:30 p.m. there was a second attempt by the hippies to stop traffic. This time they
drove a couple of cars onto Haight Street, stopping them and getting out. Other
hippies then goofed around among the stalled tourists’ cars, jumping on the
bumpers and pretending to take photographs. When the police showed up,
somebody threw a bottle that missed the police and hit a hippie girl. Shouts of
“fascist bastards” and “police brutality” could be heard.310 Twenty police patrol
cars arrived, and during an hour-long melee, nine people were arrested and four
badly injured. The police broke the jaw of a girl who had shouted “Revolution,
revolution, get the cops.”311

- July 17, 1967 - During race riots in Newark, New Jersey, the Fillmore District near
the Haight threatened to erupt. People in the Haight debated whether to “stay
indoors when the riot came or whether to get guns and stand their ground.”312

- July 26, 1967 - Emmett Grogan, of the Diggers, addressed “the Congress of the
Dialectics of Liberation” in London. The aim of the congress was to “create a
genuine revolutionary consciousness by fussing ideology and action.”313 In San
Francisco, there were firebombings in the Fillmore District, and rumors that riots
would start in the Haight at 6:30 that evening. Bikers passed the word that as far as
they were concerned, “nobody had better make trouble.”314 Many stores in the
Haight removed their window displays just in case. On the other hand, stoned
hippies hoping to watch a riot took LSD to “get the most out of the experience.”315
In the end, while firebombs were thrown as close as Haight and Fillmore (nine
blocks east of Haight and Ashbury), the awaited “apocalyptic race war” did not
erupt.316
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• July 27, 1967 - Stokely Carmichael, the former leader of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), called for a “Vietnam type war of resistance in the black ghettos.”

• August 3, 1967 – John Kent Carter, known as Jacob King or Shob, one of the best-known acid dealers in the Haight-Ashbury, was found dead. He had been stabbed twelve times, once through the heart. His right arm had been cut off cleanly above the elbow and removed. No matter who did it, the main idea was that “somebody had been killed in the Haight.” As would happen at the Altamont festival more than two years later, murder reared its ugly head and created disillusionment.

• August 6, 1967 – Just three days later, Superspade, another famous Haight-Ashbury acid dealer, was found murdered, this time near the Point Reyes Lighthouse. He had been shot in the head and stabbed in the left chest.

• August 7, 1967 – Eric Frank Dahlstrom told police he had killed Shob Carter in self-defense “during an argument over bad LSD” that he had bought from Carter. The next day his lawyer entered a plea of innocent, on the ground that “Dahlstrom had lost his mind on LSD.”

• Early August 1967 – The disharmony between vision and reality had become clear for still more hippies. Many asked if acid dealers killing each other were “what the New Age promised.” The early positive vision now seemed to contain its negative opposite. Ecstasy turning to horror, good changing to evil, perhaps they were two sides of the same coin. For those of the original psychedelic community, the question turned to wondering “if their experiment would fail.” However, much of the original Haight crowd was already in Sonoma County or northern New Mexico. For those who remained, the question turned to wondering if “perhaps it was time to get a gun of your own.”

319 Ibid.
August 12, 1967 – The Morning Star Ranch commune called Sonoma County sheriffs to deal with a “biker problem,” as a group of Gypsy Jokers had moved onto the ranch and had ordered everybody out of the big, shared communal house.325

August 28, 1967 - In Golden Gate Park, “riotous behavior” exploded at Chocolate George’s funeral on the part of several motorcycle gangs, including Hells Angels, Gypsy Jokers, Nomads, Vagabonds, Satan’s Slaves, Cossacks, Misfits, and Saints Executioners. Hippies stayed away until the music started to play; however, by the end “four hippies were stomped” by the bikers.326

September 2, 1967 - Police stopped a Jefferson Airplane concert in Bakersfield, California despite guitarist Paul Kanter attempting to arouse the audience by shouting, “Come on, there’s only five of them and five thousand of you.”327

September 7, 1967 - Gunfire was reported at Morning Star Ranch commune due to a rivalry over a seventeen-year-old hippie girl.328

September 21, 1967 – During the night, there was an event honoring the birthday of “English Satanist” Aleister Crowley. The event was called “Invocation of My Demon Brother” after “Lucifer Rising,” a work in progress of the satanist filmmaker Kenneth Anger. Anger and his “shadowy” “Brotherhood of Lucifer” rented the Straight Theater on Haight Street for a guarantee of 700 dollars, and built a satanic altar on the floor. The event did not draw a large crowd but the “satanic mood was beyond dispute.”329

Late September of 1967 – Although the Summer of Love was over, “peace and love” did not return to the “battered neighborhood.”330 On the contrary, amphetamines and heroin were bigger problems than ever. The Haight had become a restless, fearful place. Page Street east of Masonic had always been considered rough, but as the nights grew longer, “an aura of strong arm crime seemed to seep out of it into the rest of the neighborhood.”331
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• September 29, 1967 - The free city collective (the new name for the Diggers) published the first issue of *Free City Newsletter*, which included instructions on “how to build a firebomb.”

• October 6, 1967 – Today was the first anniversary of the anti-LSD law. There was a Death of the Hippie funeral procession, which was about “the feeling that the Movement had gone wrong and needed to be cleansed.” That afternoon the police began regular daily sweeps on Haight Street to pick up runaways and draft evaders. The Free Clinic and the Free Store were burglarized.

• October 8, 1967 - Two girls from the East Bay testified that when they ran away to the Haight a man “imprisoned them” and allowed his friends to “rape them” and also tried to “turn them out on the street as prostitutes.”

• October 9, 1967 - In New York City two young hippies, named Groovy and Linda, were found murdered in an East Village crash pad run by a “quasi-Digger” named Galahad.

• End of 1967 – Haight-Ashbury proprietor Don McCoy began a commune near Novato, California, in Marin County. By 1968 there were two arrests, a fire, and two drownings.

• February of 1968 - There were riots between hippies and the police Tactical Squad. The optimism about creating a new community based on love began to disappear. The hippie capital began to experience hand-to-hand combat with police cars and buildings burning. Dr. Smith of the Free Clinic reported that he saw the police continue to beat a young man who was already unconscious. When Smith ran out into the street to give first aid, he himself was attacked with a riot stick.

• April of 1968 - After a white man assassinated Martin Luther King, hope for peaceful race relations in the Haight was shattered along with every store window on the street. The atmosphere of violent crime that spread over the Haight-Ashbury had multiple roots, including “the presence of naive potential victims and population pressure of blacks being forced out of the Fillmore District by a
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redevelopment project." The Straight Theater folded after one and a half years, and so did Free City and other neighborhood groups. With the passing of time more merchants began to move out, and the positive term “flower children” had already changed to a more derogatory term “street people.”

- December 1, 1969 – During the same week as the Altamont rock festival, investigations into a one-time Haight-Ashbury resident named Charlie Manson had begun in connection with a series of ritual murders. A Manson associate, Bobby Beausoleil (who had been a bouzouki player for the Diggers band called Orkustra), was already in jail for murder.

- December 6, 1969 – Finally, the Altamont festival, which was expected to be the West Coast answer to the Woodstock rock festival in August, turned into a day of nasty atmosphere of panic and hostility near the stage, and finally the stabbing death of a black man with a gun. Ramparts and Rolling Stone magazines helped label this event as a symbolic end of the 1960s, by describing it as “Dance of Death,” something out of the “Dark Ages.” However, after documenting the dark side of the hippie movement from its beginnings, can we truly call Altamont the end of an era? Did something new actually occur there or was it what it always had been, a mixture of beautiful dreams and occasional ugly realities?

II.3. African American Freedom Movement:

The Myth of Non-violence and Consensus

As the story or myth goes, what made the Sixties movements special, in the first place, was their strict adherence to the concepts of non-violence. The only right way to live and change things, it was believed, was through peaceful methods. Some expected that the social movements would only take the moral high road, and not emulate the war-like behaviors of the “establishment” that they were trying to transform. It did not matter if the reaction on the part of the government or other members of reactionary society was
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often brutal; they would keep to their pacifistic ideologies. Moreover, they would overcome and be victorious, because history was on their side. However, after many years of frustration and disappointment, we are told, things began to shift. Finally, at decade’s end, when the non-violent call for change of the early idealistic 1960s had turned towards a violent confrontation with the state, and movement people were turning upon other movement people, the individual movements disintegrated, thus ending the Sixties era conveniently around 1969.

Indeed, most history books do follow this commonly stated trajectory of non-violence turning suddenly violent at decade’s end. For the anti-war movement, the peaceful demonstrations of the mid-1960s are shown to have devolved into police and military confrontations in just a few a short years. The tranquil hippie counter-culture of its innocent early days transformed to “nasty, mean stoned people” by the end of the decade, while the African American civil rights movement, based on Martin Luther King’s famous non-violent direct action, metamorphosed into black power and revolution.

In this section, I will use the African American freedom movement (a broader term that I will use interchangeably with the civil rights movement) as an example, to illustrate how this popular perception of the Sixties is not completely accurate, and thus distorts when the Sixties era truly ended. While I concede that there was an overall general trend from an espousal of non-violence towards ever more violence throughout the American 1960s decade, I will present information showing that there were already inherent violent tendencies, beliefs, and incidents within the wider African American freedom movement from its inception. This was true even before the rise of the black power movement in the mid-1960s. Indeed, not everyone agreed with Martin Luther King’s strict Gandhian and integrationist idealism of non-violent direct action. In fact, the early modern civil rights/freedom movement was less unified than is commonly portrayed. There were many disagreements based on religious moral values, tactics, strategies, “bargaining
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flexibilities,” and even ultimate goals within the Movement.\footnote{Devashree Gupta, “Radical Flank Effects: The Effect of Radical – Moderate Splits in Regional Nationalists Movements,” Cornell, \url{http://falcon.arts.cornell.edu/sqt2/pscp/documents/RFEgupta.pdf}. Accessed May 8, 2010.} In actuality, there were numerous individuals and groups who were less inspired by King’\textsuperscript{\textperiodcentered} s suffering without fighting back and more inspired by aggressive liberation movements of decolonization and separatist philosophies of Pan-Africanism, Black nationalism, and the beliefs of Black Muslims.\footnote{Robert F. Williams, \textit{Negroes with Guns} (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998), xii.} These latter ideas were much more prevalent than is normally acknowledged in poor American black working-class neighborhoods or ghettos.\footnote{Ibid., 78.} What is often not told is that the masses simply thought and acted differently than what was envisioned for them by famous and acceptable, mainstream civil rights leaders. Often the organizations led by these leaders were funded by white Christian liberals, and not by the black community itself.\footnote{Hill, \textit{The Deacons for Defense}, 2-3.} Finally, counter to the non-violent ethos, I will argue that those more radical also contributed to the civil rights/liberation cause by creating what sociologist Herbert H. Haines calls a “positive radical flank effect” on political affairs.\footnote{John Lofland, \textit{Social Movement Organizations: Guide to Research on Insurgent Realities} (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter, 1996), 294.} This means that the black radicals made the more moderate civil rights groups much more appealing to politicians who were deliberating particular legislative agendas. My goal here is to re-integrate, and thus give understanding and legitimacy, to those important currents of thought and action outside the non-violent framework of the African American freedom movement: the right to self-defense, and the right to assert offensive militant violence in the name of throwing off oppression.

For most people, the Movement towards African American freedom (or the civil rights movement) was considered to have started with the Montgomery bus boycott on the first of December, 1955, when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on the still-segregated public bus.\footnote{Bloom and Breines, \textit{“Takin’ It to the Streets.”} 4.} The protest campaign lasted a little over a year and was ultimately successful, when the United States Supreme Court decision declared the Alabama and Montgomery laws requiring segregated buses to be unconstitutional. Thrust into the spotlight, Martin Luther King, Jr., a learned minister with advanced degrees in theology and philosophy, led the boycott and immediately helped found the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in early 1957.\footnote{Unger and Unger, \textit{The Times Were a Changin’}, 117.} The SCLC was quickly formed by 60
black ministers and leaders who sought to direct the moral authority and organizing power of the black Christian churches towards conducting protests for civil rights reform. As there were many different divergent ideas in the black community on how to achieve results, the formation of the SCLC had an important role in welding the civil rights movement to the moral belief in non-violence. Nonetheless, in a short time, it was openly criticized for its lack of militancy and integrationist approach by both Black Muslims and younger activists in such groups as the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) (in 1960 and 1961, these younger activists would start the mass sit-ins and Freedom Rides throughout the South).

Although most visible in the media, King and his SCLC represented just one faction of the larger African American freedom movement.

Martin Luther King’s belief in non-violent activism stemmed from his early mentor and civil rights leader, theologian, and educator Howard Thurman. A classmate of King’s father at Morehouse college, he had personally met and conferred with Mahatma Gandhi while doing Christian missionary work in India. Martin Luther King was so inspired by Gandhi’s teachings, and the success of India gaining independence from Great Britain, that he visited Gandhi’s birthplace in 1959. The trip affected King in a profound way, deepening his own understanding of non-violent resistance. In a radio address made during his final evening in India, King reflected, “Since being in India, I am more convinced than ever before that the method of non-violent resistance is the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for justice and human dignity. In a real sense, Mahatma Gandhi embodied in his life certain universal principles that are inherent in the structure of the universe, and these principles are as inescapable as the law of gravitation.” Afterwards, King and SCLC became evermore convinced that this strategy of non-violent protests would succeed in the U.S. too, that it would be similarly effective against the Southern segregation laws known as Jim Crow laws. The idea was
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that non-violent direct action would garner support and sympathy from the majority of Americans, much as Gandhi had altered British public opinion.\textsuperscript{365}

The wide appeal of Martin Luther King was his mainstream values concerning non-violence. For most pacifists, Christian or otherwise, violence was to be opposed on both moral and practical grounds. But what usually inspires pacifists to become pacifists is the ethical or religious principles stating that killing is inherently immoral (evil) and that life should never be violated.\textsuperscript{366} Martin Luther King’s conviction came from the Christian Bible, “No murderer hath eternal life abiding within him” (1 John 3:15), while Mahatma Gandhi’s outlook stemmed from the Hindu law of karma.\textsuperscript{367} Nonetheless, King and Gandhi were both joined by their belief in absolute, fixed, and immutable moral laws and structures built into the universe. However, their views faced ready challenges from critics. They proposed the question, for example, “If human life has such important value, then should it not be defended when necessary?”\textsuperscript{368} In other words, if violence is inherently evil, as is often pointed out, then it would be an evil act to kill one person to prevent that person from killing ten or a thousand persons. The limitation of non-violent absolutism for many seems to be that it assumes that a violent act can be judged apart from its circumstances, intentions, and consequences.\textsuperscript{369} Paradoxically, however, the practitioners of non-violent direct action ran the risk of provoking violence towards themselves.

The key to the non-violent strategy was to stay non-violent in the face of mass arrest, police brutality, and white citizen backlash. The hope was that these direct actions would produce a crisis situation that would lead to extensive media coverage, and the understanding that there needed to be changes.\textsuperscript{370} The belief that daily televised footage depicting deprivation and indignities suffered by southern blacks, and the harassment of civil rights workers and marchers at the hands of segregationists, would affect the moral consciences of the majority in society.\textsuperscript{371} In many respects, the strategy worked as far as desegregation and gaining voting rights in the American South. However, the cost was high, as African Americans suffered great physical and emotional humiliation. From police dogs sinking their teeth into unarmed, non-violent protesters to jeering and hostile mobs,
there was just so much that even the most disciplined and dedicated non-violent activist could take.\textsuperscript{372} “Even some of King’s oldest followers were tired of going to jail, being abused and shot.”\textsuperscript{373} Ultimately, these non-violent direct actions created an enormous reaction, lead most infamously by such groups as the Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens Council.\textsuperscript{374} Unfortunately, the revulsion towards desegregation involved the average person as well. Response varied from economic reprisals to outright terrorism towards the civil rights movement.\textsuperscript{375}

Martin Luther King was aware of the building tensions, pent-up resentments, and frustrations (on both sides) that were close to exploding.\textsuperscript{376} However, as a Christian minister, he took the examples of Jesus, and Gandhi, and continued to preach that non-violence was the only way.\textsuperscript{377} Furthermore, he called it the path of self-purification. “We will match your capacity to inflict suffering,” he stated, “with our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we will not obey your evil laws. We will soon wear you down by pure capacity to suffer.”\textsuperscript{378} Additionally, he tried to channel the impatience and the anger, on the part of the activists, and mold it into a morally inspiring demand for justice that would uplift each human personality, positively declaring “that non-violence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek.”\textsuperscript{379} Nonetheless, in 1963 he warned that “I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is the force of complacency, made up in part of negroes who, as a result of long years of oppression, are so drained of self respect and a sense of ‘somebodiness’ that they have adjusted to segregation . . . . The other force is one of bitterness and hatred, and it comes perilously close to advocating violence . . . this movement is made up of people who have lost faith in America, who have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and who have concluded that the white man is an incorrigible ‘devil.’”\textsuperscript{380}

Indeed, many African Americans in the civil rights movement never had the patient humility, nor the desire, for King’s Gandhian methods. Instead, they took their inspirations from the successes of the decolonization efforts raging around the world at the time.\footnote{Skolnick, \textit{The Politics of Protest}, 144.} Not surprisingly, what was happening in mother Africa, starting in especially the 1950’s, did not go unnoticed. These triumphs of black liberation affected the racial dignity and pride of African Americans.\footnote{Ibid., xxii.} While the emancipation of India from British rule was very encouraging, its so-called non-violent approach was not the norm.\footnote{Gelderloos, \textit{How Non-violence Protects the State}, 24.} What happened in India during the 1940s was more of an exception, and may had involved much more violence than is normally admitted.\footnote{Ibid., 8.} Instead, it was the frequently violent revolutionary armed struggles of African decolonization, and elsewhere, that gave both hope and concrete examples of how to achieve liberation for the African race in America.\footnote{Ward Churchill, \textit{Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America} (Oakland, California: AK Press, 2007), 79.} Seeing victory by force (or at least force as an option) happening within one former colony after another against their former white European oppressors gave much contextual credibility to the ideas of Malcolm X, a member of the Black Muslims in America. He famously affirmed, “We declare our right on this earth . . . to be a human being, to be respected as a human being, to be given the rights of a human being, in this society, on this earth, in this day, which we intend to bring into existence by ANY MEANS NECESSARY.”\footnote{“Malcolm-X Quotes,” Malcolm-x.org. \url{http://www.malcolm-x.org/quotes.htm}. Accessed May 30, 2010.} There was no begging and crawling for Malcolm X. He and others influenced by Pan-Africanism and black nationalism were exceedingly aware of what was going on in the black world. He cautioned, “The white man knows what a revolution is. He knows that the Black Revolution is worldwide in scope and in nature. The Black Revolution is sweeping Asia, is sweeping Africa, is rearing its head in Latin America. The Cuban Revolution - that’s a revolution. They overturned the system. Revolution is in Asia, revolution is in Africa, and the white man is screaming because he sees revolution in Latin America. How do you think he’ll react to you when you learn what a real revolution is?”\footnote{Ibid.}

The history of this non-white decolonization can in a sense be said to have started in 1941, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met to discuss the postwar world. The result was the Atlantic Charter, one of provisions of which stated that, “all peoples had a right to self-
determination.” Though Britain and the Empire emerged victorious from the Second World War, the effects of the conflict were profound. Much of Europe, which had dominated the world for several centuries, was now in ruins. Moreover, Britain was left virtually bankrupt. At the same time, anti-colonial movements were on the rise in the colonies of all the European nations. The Winds of Change speech by British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan on the third of February, 1960 restarted the policy of decolonization for Britain and speeded up its disengagement. In the speech he said, “The wind of change is blowing through this continent (Africa). Whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact.” After World War II, finally, the old movements of black nationalism and Pan-Africanism were gaining strength and success.

Decolonization was a political process that frequently involved violence. Even Martin Luther King said, “We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor, it must be demanded by the oppressed.” Indeed, the process of decolonization was difficult; in extreme circumstances, there was a war of independence, sometimes following a revolution. More often there was a dynamic cycle where negotiations failed, then minor disturbances ensued, resulting in suppression by the police and military forces, escalating into more violent revolts that led to further negotiations until independence was granted (a process many not involved in the non-violent movement in America could easily envision). Thus the days of imperialism and Empire began to crumble as (at the very least) boycotts, strikes, civil disobedience, and rioting began in many colonies at approximately the same time.

On the whole, Britain adopted a policy of relative peaceful disengagement, in contrast to other European powers such as France in Algeria (1954-1962), or Portugal in Guinea-Bissau (1963-1974), Mozambique (1964-1974), and Angola (1961-1975), which waged costly and ultimately unsuccessful wars to keep their empires intact. British exceptions included Southern Cameroon (1960-1961) and Kenya (1952-1960). The worst violence in Kenya was perhaps in 1956, when 50,000 British soldiers fought against the
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Kikuyu political group, called Mau Mau, killing 12,000 Africans and imprisoning 100,000.\(^\text{396}\) Other important decolonization movements around the world involved the French in Vietnam (1946-1954) and Madagascar (1947-1948).

It is not a coincidence that the timeline for African decolonization closely parallels that of the African American civil rights/liberation movement. Indeed, the two must be seen as part of a larger world-wide clamor for black separation and liberation, involving both non-violence and violence.\(^\text{397}\) Both movements were inspired and linked to each other. The main world-wide thrust was not integration into white society (i.e., Martin Luther King), but to push away from white exploitation and towards economic and political self-sufficiency – key objectives of both black nationalism and Pan-Africanism.\(^\text{398}\)

The following is a list of African countries in order of the date they received their independence from colonialism, and their yearly correspondence to the African American civil rights movement: 1951 - Libya; 1953 - Egypt; 1956 (the year of Montgomery bus boycott) - Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco; 1957 (SCLC formed) - Ghana; 1958 (NAACP Youth Council conduct the largest successful sit-in to this date on drug store lunch-counter) - Guinea; 1960 (the year civil rights movement really gets going with the Woolworth’s lunch counter sit-ins) - Cameroon, Senegal, Togo, Mali, Madagascar, DR Congo, Somalia, Benin, Niger, Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire, Chad, Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Nigeria, Mauritania; 1961 (start of the Freedom Riders to integrate interstate buses) - Sierra Leone, Tanzania, South Africa; 1962 (Albany Movement to register black voters in Georgia) - Rwanda, Burundi, Algeria, Uganda; 1963 (March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom) - Kenya; 1964 (Mississippi Freedom Summer voter registration) - Malawi, Zambia; 1965 (Selma to Montgomery marches) - Gambia; 1966 (James Meredith March Against Fear) - Botswana, Lesotho; 1968 (Poor People’s Campaign) - Mauritius, Equatorial Guinea; 1973 (Combahee River Collective, a Black feminist group established) - Guinea Bissau; 1975 (African American boss of white Americans for the first time on TV) - Mozambique, Cape Verde, Comoros, Sao Tome and Principe, Angola; 1976 (Black History Month founded) - Seychelles.\(^\text{399}\)


\(^\text{397}\) Skolnick, The Politics of Protest, 141.
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Keeping an eye on Africa has had a long history for African Americans. In fact, W. E. B. Du Bois (1868-1963), an American civil rights activist (co-founder of the NAACP in 1909), sociologist, historian, author, and editor, was considered the father of Pan-Africanism (circa 1900), and an active member in the black nationalism movement. The social-political world view of Pan-Africanism seeks to unify native Africans and those of African heritage into a “global African community.” A related movement, black nationalism tries to unite all blacks in their own country and/or to form eventually their own independent country. However, Pan-Africanism calls for the political unity of all of Africa, not as separate black countries, but as one country. While black nationalism advocates a black national identity (as opposed to the multiculturalism of someone like Martin Luther King) in their own country, the future of Africa is seen as being central to their ambitions too, although some in America believe in the creation of a separate black American nation in the deep South. Pan-Africanism as an ethical system traces its origins from ancient times, and promotes values that are the product of African civilization and the struggles against slavery, racism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. Black nationalism stresses the need to separate from whites (not integrate) and build separate communities that promote strong racial pride and also to collectivize resources (i.e., Black Muslims). Finally, Pan-Africanism is usually seen as a product of the European slave trade. Enslaved Africans, no matter their origins, set aside cultural differences to assert the principality of their common experience of being exploited. With a large number of violent slave insurrections, by the end of the eighteenth century, a political movement developed across Americas, Europe, and Africa to create solidarity and put an end to the oppression of blacks. Thus most Pan-Africanist are also black nationalists and must be seen together as an emergence of black consciousness, pride, and affirmative identity.

The most successful organization for African unity was the OAU, the Organization of African Unity. It was established 25th of May 1963 (and disbanded on July 9, 2002). It
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had two primary aims: to promote the unity and solidarity of the African states and act as a collective voice for the African continent, and to eradicate all forms of colonialism.\(^{409}\)

There were two blocks or groups with different opinions on how best to achieve more unity. The Casablanca bloc, led by Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, wanted a federation of all African countries. Aside from Ghana, it was comprised of Algeria, Guinea, Morocco, Egypt, Mali and Libya. The Monrovian bloc, led by Senghor of Senegal, felt that unity should be achieved gradually, through economic cooperation. It did not support the notion of a political federation. Its other members were Nigeria, Liberia, Ethiopia, and most of the former French colonies.\(^{410}\)

Total Pan-African unity was difficult to achieve, as the former French colonies were still dependent on France, while other countries supported either the USA or the USSR. However, the Organization of African Unity did play a pivotal role in eradicating colonialism and minority rule in Africa. For example, it gave weapons, training, and military bases to colonized nations fighting for independence or majority rule. They gave aid to groups such as the ANC and PAC, fighting apartheid, and ZANU and ZAPU, fighting for the independence of Southern Rhodesia.\(^{411}\)

Perhaps the most influential Pan Africanist/black nationalist ever to reside in the USA (for at least part of his life) was Marcus Garvey (1887-1940).\(^{412}\) He was a publisher, journalist, entrepreneur, and orator. Born and raised in Jamaica, he founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League (UNIA-ACL).\(^{413}\) He too advocated the involvement of the African diaspora in African affairs, starting a global mass movement called Garveyism. He influenced African Americans to connect with their roots in Africa. Promoted by the UNIA as a movement of African Redemption, Garveyism would eventually inspire many groups, ranging from the Nation of Islam (Malcolm X) to the Rastafarian movement (which proclaims Garvey as a prophet).\(^{414}\) The goal of the Movement was for those of African ancestry to “redeem” Africa and for the European
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colonial powers to leave it. The purpose was to unite all people of African ancestry of the world to establish a country with a government of their own.\textsuperscript{415}

In 1916 Garvey went to the United States and undertook a 38-state speaking tour promoting social, political, and economic freedom for blacks. He stayed in America for the next 11 years, moving to New York City, where he formed the first UNIA division outside of Jamaica in 1917.\textsuperscript{416} Publishing a newspaper called \textit{Negro World}, by 1919, Garvey’s organization claimed over four million members. In August of 1920 the International Convention of the UNIA was held. With delegates from all over the world in attendance, over 25,000 people filled Madison Square Garden on the first of August to hear Garvey speak.\textsuperscript{417} Convinced that blacks should have a permanent homeland in Africa, he sought to develop Liberia (which was founded and colonized by freed American slaves with the help of a private organization called the American Colonization Society in 1821-1822, on the premise that former American slaves would have greater freedom and equality there).\textsuperscript{418} That year he launched the Liberia program, where he intended to build colleges, universities, industrial plants, and railroads as part of an industrial base from which to operate. In essence the UNIA was the largest Pan-African movement at the time.\textsuperscript{419} Unfortunately, Garvey was considered “an undesirable alien” and charged by special assistant to the attorney general and head of the General Intelligence Division (or “anti-radical division”) of the Bureau of Investigation or BOI (name later changed to FBI) J. Edgar Hoover with mail fraud, and sent to jail for five years.\textsuperscript{420} Upon release he was immediately deported back to Jamaica; nonetheless, Garvey’s place in black history is well known. In June of 1965, even an integrationist like Martin Luther King, and his wife
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Coretta, visited his shrine in Jamaica, where he spoke of the passing of a old colonial order, and the need for a worldwide brotherhood to fight injustice.\textsuperscript{421}

Marcus Garvey’s Pan-African and black national influence was passed directly to Malcolm X, and the modern civil rights era, as Malcolm X’s parents met at a UNIA convention in Montreal.\textsuperscript{422} Malcolm Little’s (1925-1965) father Earl was the president of the UNIA division in Omaha, Nebraska, and sold the \textit{Negro World} newspaper. His mother Louise was a contributor to the same publication. Malcolm X was an African American Muslim minister, public speaker, and human rights activist. Those who admired him were most likely, at least, somewhat influenced by either black nationalism or Pan-Africanism. To them he was a courageous advocate for the rights of African Americans. Others who were more identified with Martin Luther King and non-violence accused him of preaching racism, black supremacy, anti-Semitism, and violence.\textsuperscript{423} Either way, he has been described as one of the greatest and most influential African Americans in history, and in a sense, the polar opposite of King.\textsuperscript{424}

While serving a sentence of eight to ten years in jail for larceny and breaking and entering, in 1946 Malcolm X joined the Nation of Islam. The Nation is considered one of the most important expressions of separatist impulse in twentieth century America, though it has also been accused of black supremacy.\textsuperscript{425} Others have described the Black Muslims as the African Americans’ alternative to pacifist Eurocentric Christianity.\textsuperscript{426} Mainstream Muslims, moreover, consider the Nation of Islam to be a separate non-Islamic independent religion that has adopted Islamic terminology, but has different beliefs about God, race, and prophecy.\textsuperscript{427} Founded in Detroit in 1930 by Wallace D. Fard Muhammad, it set out with the goal of improving the spiritual, mental, social, and economic condition of African men and women of America.\textsuperscript{428}
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Malcolm X, after his parole in 1952, became one of the Nation’s leaders and chief spokesmen. For nearly twelve years he became the public face of the Nation of Islam (until tension arose between him and Nation of Islam leader Elijah Muhammad in 1964). He taught the beliefs and theologies of the Black Muslims, which said that black people were the original people of the world, and that white people were a race of devils. In his speeches, Malcolm X said that black people were superior to white people and that the demise of the white race was imminent. While Martin Luther King’s part of the civil rights movement fought against racial segregation, he advocated the complete separation of African Americans from white people. In black nationalist fashion, he proposed the establishment of a separate country for black people, until African Americans could return to Africa. Finally, Malcolm X also rejected the civil rights movement’s strategy of nonviolence, advocating instead that all black people use any necessary means of self-defense to protect themselves from attack, as they did in Africa.

Malcolm X had a powerful effect on the average black person, especially those living in the Northern and Western American cities who were tired of being told to wait (and suffer) for freedom, justice, equality, and respect. Many blacks felt that he, and the Nation, articulated their complaints better than the mainstream Christian civil rights leadership did. They could relate to Malcolm X’s criticism of the civil rights movement’s ideology of non-violence. Many agreed when Malcolm X said, “I believe it’s a crime for anyone being brutalized to continue to accept that brutality without doing something to defend himself.” Moreover, he described non-violent civil rights leaders as “stooges” for the white establishment and said that Martin Luther King was a “chump.” Speaking sarcastically in 1963 after the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, he said, “Who ever heard of angry revolutionists all harmonizing ‘We shall overcome... Suum Day’... while tripping and swaying along arm-in-arm with the very people they were supposed to be angrily revolting against? Who ever heard of angry revolutionists swinging their bare feet together with their oppressor in lily-pad park pools, with gospels,
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and guitars and ‘I have a dream’ speeches? And the black masses in America were - and still are - having a nightmare.”

The differences between Martin Luther King and Malcolm X can be seen in the context of religion. There are vast distinctions between Christian and Muslim ethics. The New Testament teaches that Christians are morally forbidden from using violence or force. They are told to “turn the other cheek” when smitten (Matt. 5:39). That is why Martin Luther King always preached the values of non-violence and integration (integration being connected to brotherly love). Muslims, on the other hand, have no such pacifistic rules. The Qu'ran says that it’s better to forgive than to attack another; however, it does allows violence in cases of defending one’s religion, one’s life, and one’s property. Complicating it more, there is still much interpretive debate about when to forgive and when to aggressively attack or defend. That is why Malcolm X could declare, “If ballots won’t work, bullets will” without breaking any moral Islamic laws. The justification was that the violent attack would be carried out in defense of one’s way of life, or in retaking what belonged to the attackers that had been stolen.

Though Islam was the religion for only 20% of all slaves brought over from Africa during the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, the Nation of Islam has taught that it is the only true religion for all black man. It has pointed out how “Christianity teaches the white Jesus, white Virgin, and the white angel, but the black devil.” Whereas the mainstream civil rights movement was based on Christian principles such as love and forgiveness, the Black Muslims were mostly angry and revengeful. For them to forgive without requiring the other to change was considered not only self-destructive, but ensured that a dysfunctional relationship would remain. It was felt that allowing mistreatment would only keep the old inequalities in place. However, Nation of Islam leader Elijah
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Muhammad took this position to still another level by stating that “the white devil’s day is over, he was given six thousand years to rule. . . . He’s already used up most trappings and murdering the black nations by the hundreds of thousands. Now he’s worried, worried about the black man getting his revenge.” He continued later to say that unless the white man gave Muslims separate territory for themselves, Muhammad had said, “Your entire race will be destroyed and removed from this earth by Almighty God. And those black men who are still trying to integrate will inevitably be destroyed along with the whites.” Elijah Muhammad and the Nation of Islam gained wide support among those segments of the black community that no one else had represented: the Northern, urban, lower classes.

Another early African American believer in armed black self-defense (but not a Black Muslim) was Robert F. Williams (1925-1996). He was more representational of the small-town Southern black. He was a civil rights leader, author, and the president of the Monroe, North Carolina National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) chapter in the 1950s and early 1960s. Williams called himself a “black internationalist.” He traveled north for work during World War II and witnessed the huge race riots of 1943 in Detroit. Drafted in 1944, he served for a year and a half in the segregated services before joining the U.S. Marine Corps. His story really begins in 1955 when he returned home to his home town of Monroe, and joined the local chapter of the NAACP. In 1956, the triumph of the Montgomery Bus Boycott provoked Ku Klux Klan rallies of crowds of 15,000 all through the South. “The echo of shots and dynamite blasts,” reported the *Southern Patriot* newspaper in 1957, “has been almost continuous throughout the South.” The KKK and the White Citizens Council made it their business to locate any NAACP chapters in their vicinity and find out who their members were. Threats of violence and economic sanctions were applied to make sure people would withdraw their membership. The Monroe NAACP dwindled to six members who then contemplated disbanding. When Williams, the newest member, objected, they elected him president before they all left. Finding himself alone as a one-man NAACP chapter, he first turned to
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the 40 black veterans with whom he had once stood up against the Klan with rifles at a funeral in 1946.\textsuperscript{450}

In less than a year, Robert F. Williams built his NAACP chapter to 200 members, and launched a campaign to desegregate the local country club, which had barred black kids from swimming at the pool. Quickly, the Ku Klux Klan jumped into action, blaming the new chapter vice president, Dr. Albert E. Perry, for the resurgent black activism in town. However, when the Klan attacked his house with a heavily-armed motorcade, Williams’s black veterans greeted the nightriders with sandbag fortifications and a hail of disciplined gunfire.\textsuperscript{451} Afterwards, the Monroe city board immediately passed an ordinance banning KKK motorcades, a measure they had refused to consider prior to the gun battle. Williams stated in 1957 “that since the city officials wouldn’t stop the Klan, we decided to stop the Klan ourselves. We started this action out of the need for defense because law and order had completely vanished.”\textsuperscript{452} Indeed, Williams had already started the Black Armed Guard with the National Rifle Association’s blessings, to defend the local black community.\textsuperscript{453}

In 1958, Williams became friends with Malcolm X, who invited him to speak at Harlem’s Black Muslim Temple Number 7, the purpose being to raise money to buy military weapons for the Monroe NAACP.\textsuperscript{454} Despite the official adherence to the philosophy of non-violence, many blacks had taken upon themselves to defend their lives and their property with whatever weapons they could muster. Not striking back while participating in a public protest was quite different from not defending one’s home, church, or community center from imminent attack.\textsuperscript{455} In the late spring of 1959, two incidents raised the anger of even normally non-violent blacks throughout the South: a lynching of a man in Mississippi, an ordeal at Florida A&M, involving four black college students in which two 18-year-old black men were forced to kneel at gunpoint while their girlfriends were undressed, then later kidnapped and gang raped by four white gunmen.\textsuperscript{456} In the wake of these notorious outrages, Mississippi NAACP field secretary Medgar Evers told his
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wife, “I’d like to get a gun and start shooting.” NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins conceded that, “I know the thought of violence has been much in the minds of Negroes.”

Williams told wire service reporters that it was time to “meet violence with violence . . . since the federal government will not stop lynching and since the so-called courts lynch our people legally.” The next day, banner headlines screamed that there was, “a new militancy among young Negroes of the South.” Thus in 1959, before the 1960s decade of non-violence had even begun, militancy was said to be on the rise.

Indeed, the Sixties had not yet begun, yet in 1959, the greatest debate in the civil rights movement that year was “the question of violence vs. non-violence as instruments of change.” In a series of public debates, Williams faced Martin Luther King, A. J. Muste, Bayard Rustin, David Dellinger, and others. He drew large audiences to his debates with the pacifists. While espousing the case for flexibility, he said, “Non-violence is a very potent weapon when the opponent is civilized, but non-violence is no repellent for a sadist.” Furthermore, he pointed out, “nowhere in the annals of history does the record show a people delivered from bondage by patience alone.”

Martin Luther King conceded that white violence had brought the Movement to “a stage of profound crisis.” In February of 1960, the civil rights movement received new energy with a student sit-in at a Woolworth’s store in Greensboro, North Carolina. Four students sat down at a segregated lunch counter to protest Woolworth’s policy of excluding African Americans. As students across the South began to “sit-in” at lunch counters, parks, beaches, libraries, theaters, museums, and other public places, local authority figures sometimes used brute force to physically escort the demonstrators away. In April, the student activists who led the first sit-ins held a conference at Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina, which led to the formation of the first student civil rights organization, called Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The following year they took these tactics of non-
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violent confrontation further, to help start the so-called Freedom Rides. Six years latter they would drop the “non-violent” part of their name altogether.\textsuperscript{466}

The Freedom Rides were journeys by civil rights activists on interstate buses into the segregated southern United States to test the United States Supreme Court decision that had ended segregation for passengers engaged in inter-state travel. The first Freedom Rides left Washington D.C. on May 4, 1961, and were scheduled to arrive in New Orleans on May 17. The goal of the activists was to travel through the Deep South and integrate seating patterns and desegregate bus terminals, including restrooms and water fountains.\textsuperscript{467} It proved to be a dangerous mission. In Anniston, Alabama, one bus was fire bombed. In Birmingham, Alabama, the Public Safety Commissioner allowed the Ku Klux Klan members fifteen minutes to attack and severely beat any incoming group of Freedom Riders before providing police protection for them.\textsuperscript{468}

During the summer of 1961, Reverend Paul Brooks, employed by King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and James Forman, soon to become president of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, came to Monroe in the company of 17 Freedom Riders fresh out of jail in Jackson, Mississippi. The young activists came to Monroe to launch a non-violent campaign against segregation in Robert Williams’s home town. It was never admitted by the leadership why they came there, but one of the activists proclaimed later that, “If the fight for civil rights is to remain non-violent, we must be successful in Monroe.”\textsuperscript{469} Williams took this as a challenge and an opportunity to show that what King and other non-violent pacifists were preaching was “bullshit.”\textsuperscript{470} After two weeks of picketing at the Union County Courthouse, things got dangerous for the non-violent Freedom Riders. On August 28, crowds of hostile white onlookers grew larger and larger, until 5,000 angry white people attacked the 30 demonstrators, badly injuring many. The non-violent campaign deteriorated into mob gun battles. Afterwards, Williams and his family fled first to Canada, then on to Cuba.\textsuperscript{471}

The highlights for the Civil Rights Movement, in 1962, were the Albany movement and the desegregation of the University of Mississippi. On October 1, 1962, James H. Meredith became the first black student at the University of Mississippi. His enrollment
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was firmly opposed by Governor Ross Barnett, and many others. Federal U.S. marshals and federal U.S. Army military police were sent in to stop the rioting in which two people died.\footnote{Carson, \textit{In Struggle}, 58.} In Albany, Georgia, Martin Luther King and a desegregation coalition had relatively little success against a police strategy of mass arrests, but no dramatic violent incidents that always attracted the national media. Frustrations grew as few concessions were achieved from the city, even though thousands of black citizens were mobilized.\footnote{Ibid., 60.} In Birmingham the following year, there was no such problem, as thousands of bystanders began to throw rocks and bottles at the police.\footnote{Gelderloos, \textit{How Non-violence Protects the State}, 12.}

On May 5, 1963, in Birmingham, Alabama, non-violence was abandoned for the first time at a Martin Luther King non-violent direct action.\footnote{Ibid., 437.} Signaling a dramatic change in the “rules of the game” in race relations, non-violent direct action became harder to sustain for the national leaders.\footnote{Ibid., 376.} There were 2,543 demonstrators arrested on that day. Then on May 11, after 2 bombings of black organizers’ homes, 2,500 more blacks rioted. ACMHR vice president Abraham Woods claimed later that the rioting in Birmingham set a precedent for “Burn, baby, burn,” a cry used in later civic unrest throughout the country.\footnote{“Keep on Movin’ Toward Freedom: The ‘Free’ State’s Struggle with Equality,” Annie E. Casey Foundation, (2005), \texttt{http://mdcivilrights.org/Timeline.html}. Accessed June 18, 2010.} In fact, days later, a string of riots and incidents exploded in Cambridge, Maryland, the worst day occurring on June 14.\footnote{Kwame Ture and Charles Hamilton, \textit{Black Power: The Politics of Liberation} (New York: Random House, Inc., 1967), 155.} So in fact, just the fourth year into the sixties, the secret had come out into the open that, if things would not change for the African Americans, then at least some were willing to play the game in other ways.

With the rise of armed self-defense units such as the Deacons for Defense and Justice (1964), the Black Panthers (1966), the Black Guerrilla Family, and riots, from here on in things would be different.\footnote{Ibid., 370-374.} And for many years to come, each summer would signal the beginning of another round of violent hot summers filled with inner city rioting – the following is but a partial list:

1964 - July 18-23, Harlem riot, New York City, New York

1964 - July 24-25, Rochester, New York

1964 - August 2-4, Jersey City, New Jersey
1964 - August 11-13, Paterson, New Jersey
1964 - August 11-13, Elizabeth, New Jersey
1964 - August 16-17, Chicago, Illinois
1964 - August 28-30, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1965 - August, Watts riot, Los Angeles, California
1966 - July 18-24, Hough riots, Cleveland, Ohio
1967 - July 12-17, Newark, New Jersey
1967 - July 14-21, Plainfield, New Jersey
1967 - July 24, Cambridge, Maryland
1967 - July 23-29, Detroit, Michigan
1968 - March 28, Memphis, Tennessee
1968 - April, Wilmington, Delaware
1968 - April 4-8, Washington, D.C.
1968 - April 6-12, Baltimore, Maryland
1969 - July, York, Pennsylvania

In the United States there has been a myth called peaceful progress. The idea is that political violence has always been rare, unnecessary, and irrational.\(^{480}\) The myth of peaceful progress offers intellectual support for existing political arrangements and validates the suppression of protest. It also serves to conceal the role of official violence.\(^{481}\)

If the Sixties era was considered over when violence first emerged (during some protest action), then perhaps that era never happened. The reality is that from the beginning of the modern civil rights movement, there were always those like Malcolm X and Robert F. Williams who did whatever needed to be done in the name of equal rights, freedom, and liberation. Even before the 1960s decade started, not everyone agreed with non-violence. In fact, the idea of violent resistance is not foreign to African Americans. African American history is filled with numerous slave (or otherwise) uprisings and revolts. According to one source, there were some four hundred slave uprisings during the period between 1750 and 1850, often with plans to kill all men, women, and children.\(^{482}\) Royan Burris, an early civil rights leader, advised, “I said anybody hit you, hit back. Anybody step on your feet, step back. Anybody spit on you, spit back.”\(^{483}\)

\(^{481}\) Ibid., 18.
II.4. Student/Anti-War Movement

The Myth of Unity, Hope, and Pacifism

The student and the anti-war/peace movements of the 1960s (like those of the hippie counter-culture and the African-American social movements) often too were filled with dissension, despair, and violence since at least close to their beginnings (contrary to the overly positive Sixties myth of unity, hope, and non-violence throughout the 1960s decade).

As mentioned previously, the politically active white students often mirrored (and some even participated) in the ongoing African American civil rights movement no matter the type of strategies used.\(^{484}\) Therefore, not surprisingly, during the height of Martin Luther King’s popularity in the early and up to the mid-1960s, most white student politicos professed his “non-violent civil disobedience” tactics.\(^{485}\) However, especially by 1966, “black power” had begun to replace King’s non-violence with militancy, “incendiary rhetoric,” and “nihilistic” violence; impulses that were not new but now more common.\(^{486}\) Therefore, as the years passed and frustration and rage grew within the African American civil rights movement, so too did the student anti-war movements become increasingly radicalized. As within the civil rights movement and the hippie counter-culture, explosive and destructive forces (based in large portion on fluctuating hope) gradually increased. Violence and other negative attributes did not just suddenly appear at the end of 1969 to “end the Sixties dream”; they were always inherently part of these social movements.\(^{487}\) They were in reality always present to a greater or smaller degree (even according to the U.S. government’s own initiated “Task Force Report” on the “causes and prevention of violence”) as shown by the very fact that the idea of “peaceful progress” in the United States was a myth.\(^{488}\) This report stated that those in power do not easily share or turn over power to “powerless outsiders as the myth of peaceful progress suggests.”\(^{489}\) Therefore, the report suggested that an escalation of violence was normal and that throughout history
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social revolution usually “turns from peaceful reform to violence when it encounters brutal, mindless resistance to change.”

Student dissent, like most of the other aspects of the Sixties movement, had its modern roots in the 1950s. The new left, the ideological driving force behind much of the student movement (with its 1962 “Port Huron Statement”), had its basis in what it saw as failures of the pre-war leftist parties to present a unified response to the de-Stalinization of the Soviet Union and the invasion of Hungary in 1956. Many young Marxists, who were opposed to centralization and authoritarianism, began to develop a more democratic approach to politics, often called “democratic socialism” or “social democracy.”

The term “new left” was popularized by sociologist C. Wright Mills in an open letter written in 1960 entitled “Letter to the New Left,” claiming that “the proletariat were no longer the revolutionary force; the new agent of revolutionary change were young intellectuals [i.e., including the students] around the world.”

One of the earliest, and by far the largest and arguably the most important new left organization was the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) (who wrote the “Port Huron Statement”). They in essence started in January 1960, after changing their name from the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), the youth branch of a long-time socialist educational organization called the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). The SDS, in its statement, called for the young generation (referred to as “maybe the last generation in the experiment with living”) to struggle against what they saw as intertwining matters of “racial bigotry” and the nuclear “bomb” (others quickly linked civil rights, disarmament, and poverty into a new doctrine of radicalism).

Indeed, by 1962, university students had begun to take an active role in both the civil rights movement and the anti-nuclear/peace issue (and as time went, on the student movement began to increasingly blend with both the counter-culture and the African-American black power movements). But first, in February 1960, sit-ins against segregation started at “dime-store lunch counters” in North Carolina by “negro students” and spread throughout many southern states to include public libraries, public parks, and public
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swimming pools. 496 No matter the violence, these actions created sympathetic reactions in white Northern students, who started picketing and boycotting Northern branches of Woolworth’s and Kresge’s. 497 By April of 1960, one of the first student-led civil rights organizations called the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was formed by 126 student delegates from “58 sit-in centers in 12 states,” delegates from 19 northern white colleges, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR), the National Student Association (NSA), and the SDS. 498 Although SNCC started as a non-violent civil rights group (which played a major role in voter registration drives, sit-ins, the 1961 Freedom Rides, the 1963 March on Washington, the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer, and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party), as early as 1965 SNCC executive secretary James Forman said he didn’t know “how much longer we can stay non-violent.” 499 Many in SNCC had “grown skeptical” about the tactics of non-violence over the preceding years (as optimism for real change faded) and had already split on the issue after the Democratic National Convention of 1964. By June of 1966, Stokely Carmichael, the new head of SNCC, declared “black power” and began to move towards “revolutionary ideologies,” expelling all whites from the organization and officially dropping the “non-violent” from its name (changing it to the Student National Coordinating Committee) in 1969. 500 H. Rap Brown, who succeeded Carmichael, stated, “I say violence is necessary. It is as American as cherry pie,” and “If America don’t come around, we’re gonna burn it down.” 501 Thus SNCC, the largest and most influential student civil rights organization, fragmented and turned to “using any force necessary” by the mid-1960s, which contributed to its rapid decline. 502 The white students, on the other hand, increasingly turned their attention to the issue of war and peace, especially after Vietnam escalated into a full-blown war in early 1965 (for blacks, Vietnam became more of an issue a few years later).

In the meantime, students had already begun to organize protests against the nuclear arms race, nuclear testing, and civil defense. Here again, during the early 1960s, it was not SDS per se that led the way (although their presence was felt and their leadership would emerge in earnest in 1965), but another nationwide student organization called the Student Peace Union (SPU). The SPU was more liberal than socialist, but had many members who joined from the Young People’s Socialist League, who (like SDS) tried to give it a “third camp” direction, rejecting both Western capitalism and Soviet communism as equally imperialist. The SPU was active from 1959 to 1964, and was considered the largest student activist group during those years (ten times larger than the SDS in 1962). The SPU took the lead, in late 1961, in organizing protests in Washington D.C. and indeed “consciously” used early civil rights techniques of non-violent direct action. During the first protest of its kind, in November, President Kennedy sent his “disarmament advisers” to meet with the “picket leaders” (who handed them their petitions), raising optimism briefly within the student ranks that some sort of influence and accomplishment could be achieved by them when dealing with the government. These anti-nuclear protests culminated in the “Washington Peace March” of February 1962 (the first national student demonstration in several decades). However, marchers were already disappointed with the hostile response of many of the Congressmen who rejected their efforts to elicit a “meaningful dialogue.” They were amazed at how some of the Congressmen reacted “almost violently” to their eight-page “policy pamphlet,” which spelled out a program of “unilateral initiatives for a stable peace which would not threaten the nation’s deterrent.” Although 5,000 students attended the Washington Peace March (which was co-sponsored by TOCSIN (an affiliate of the SPU), Student SANE, the American Friends Service Committee, and the SDS) many left with their hopes dashed, and began to wake up to their earlier held naivety in thinking that they could influence those in power by talking to them rationally. Nonetheless, the SPU continued its protests against nuclear testing in the spring of 1962, but this time engaging in the “first confrontation between police and anti-
war protesters of the decade in New York.510 During the “Cuban Missile Crisis” in October of 1962, the SPU sponsored demonstrations across the country, including “a march in front of the White House that drew 2,000 people,” but were deemed “isolated” after the president handled the crisis successfully (although coming dangerously close to a nuclear war). However, the goal of limiting nuclear testing was achieved, as the “Nuclear Test Ban Treaty” was signed into law in August of 1963. Nevertheless, because of “factional struggles” within the SPU (concerning whether to enter into the Democratic party as socialists, or some sort of labor party, to merge with Student SANE, or to support peace candidates and questions over foreign policy), the largest student peace activist organization dissolved during the spring of 1964.511

Interestingly, counter to Sixties mythology, the summer of 1963 (only the fourth year into the 1960s decade) was said to have been the “high point of optimism” for the student movement (as it was for the civil rights movement) in regards to “the responsiveness of authorities” towards real change.512 Undoubtedly, it was a good moment in history, not only because the nuclear test ban treaty had been signed, but because on August 28, 250,000 to 300,000 people attended the huge civil rights “March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom,” where Martin Luther King delivered his inspiring “I Have a Dream” speech calling for racial equality and an end to discrimination. While the treaty prohibited nuclear weapons tests under water, in the atmosphere, or in outer space (and pledged to work towards ending the armaments race), the march was widely credited with helping to pass the “Civil Rights Act of 1964” (banning discrimination in employment and public accommodations) and the “Voting Rights Act of 1965.”513 Moreover, also in the summer of 1963, the SDS began to mobilize students for community organizing in poor white and minority neighborhoods to fight poverty and unemployment, which helped influence President Johnson’s “Great Society” program of eliminating poverty the following year (all these above mentioned legislations and programs were first proposed by the Kennedy administration in 1963).514 Nevertheless, cracks in optimism began to noticeably emerge, first in May 1963 with riots in Birmingham, Alabama (where non-violence was abandoned for the first time at a Martin Luther King non-violent direct
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action), and then again with race riots in Cambridge, Maryland the following month.\textsuperscript{515}

However, it was after the assassination of President Kennedy, in November 1963, that hopefulness began to “wane.”\textsuperscript{516} No matter Kennedy’s shortcomings, he seemed to be leading the country in the right direction. JFK was described as “the voice of hope, opportunity, and the future, uplift towards a better America.”\textsuperscript{517} The news of his assassination shocked the nation; “It was a death that touched everyone instantly and directly; rare was the person who did not cry that long weekend.”\textsuperscript{518} However, shortly after the initial mournful trauma had begun to wear off, the “brightest and best” being lost, the sense that a gloomy “sinister conspiracy” had occurred began quickly to take hold among a growing minority (many of which were students).\textsuperscript{519}

A large percentage of people had a sense of doubt and confusion concerning the assassination from the start. One reason was that initially there were many radio and TV reports on how the president had been shot in the head (“the back of Kennedy’s head was blown away”) from the front (including statements from doctors who examined Kennedy’s body).\textsuperscript{520} These widely broadcast reports disappeared from the news within 24 hours even though over 50 witnesses had stated that at least one bullet was fired from behind the picket fence, which was up on the grassy knoll (and on the front and side of the president).\textsuperscript{521} In fact, all information that contradicted the immediately constructed official story (of a lone gunman firing three bullets from the Texas School Book Depository building located behind the President) was suppressed.\textsuperscript{522} Then exactly 48 hours later, on national television, 75 million people (many in disbelief) watched Lee Harvey Oswald (the alleged killer of the president) get shot and killed by Jack Ruby while in the police station, conveniently eliminating a trial in which “potentially explosive information might have come to light.”\textsuperscript{523} Not surprisingly, with the passage of time (and rational thought on the matter), more and more people refused to believe what they felt were government lies, and
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began to lose respect towards their government. Infuriated, many students began to think along the lines that if “the Presidency of the United States is being decided by bullets fired by rifles rather then ballots casted by citizens we have indeed been taken over by a whole new form of government.” This distrust of the government was reinforced once again, in late September of 1964, with the release of the government-authorized 889-page “Warren Commission” report, which concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in killing Kennedy and wounding Texas Governor John Connally and that Jack Ruby also acted alone when he killed Oswald a few days later. Warren Commission conclusions were based on obvious fabrications, misrepresentations, distortions, deletions and unbelievable assertions such as there being a “magic bullet.” The effect of the Warren commission report was said to of been one of “disenchantment and disillusionment of that college generation” that came of age during the mid-1960s.

The Warren Commission, established by President Johnson, on November 29, 1963, was bent on formulating a theory of a “lone gunman,” instead of seeking the truth on what had taken place. In order to help explain how a single bullet could cause the non-fatal wound to the president and all the wounds to Governor Connally (seven wounds in total), Arlen Specter, the staff attorney for the Warren Commission, invented the so-called “magic bullet.” Michael T. Griffith described the magic bullet theory in his article from 2000: “The theory says that a bullet, known officially as CE 399, struck Kennedy in the back, transited his neck without leaving any metal fragments whatsoever, exited his neck, hit Governor John Connally near his right armpit, tore through his chest, smashing rib bone in the process, exited his chest, struck his right wrist and shattered a tough radius bone in the wrist, exited the wrist, and then stuck itself halfway into Connally’s left thigh. Yet, amazingly, after supposedly doing all this damage, CE 399 emerged with its lands and grooves intact, with no damage whatsoever to its nose, and with no more than 3-4 grains lost from its substance. The only damage to the bullet is at its base, where there is deformation that is not even visible unless viewed from certain angles.”
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knowledgeable people later pointed out that it was a group of lawyers (headed by Specter) and not ballistic experts who came up with the single-bullet theory in the first place, which could never be replicated when tested by “experienced and qualified ballistic experts.”

Just to name a few of the endless shortcomings (and outright lies) of the Warren Commission report: there was no investigation into the background of Oswald (who was portrayed as a lone nut but in fact was some sort of government informant, agent, or spy); distorted information, for example, when commission member (and later President) Gerald Ford moved Kennedy’s back wound (in the “Ida Dox illustration (F-20)” to the back of the neck (to make the single-bullet theory more believable); the forging of a paper trail that would show Oswald buying the murder weapon; no examination of why the secret service protecting the president violated its own protection codes before and during the motorcade (and covered up key evidence afterwards); and failure to explain why their own unpublished records were sealed for 75 years – why there was a need to conceal and classify tremendous amounts of documents in the name of “National Security concerning various evidence.”

It was not surprising that students and adults alike became skeptical and suspicious of a government that closed the book on the assassination of their beloved president based on fictitious and illogical nonsense. The only conclusion drawn by many was that there had been a conspiracy perpetrated by the highest level of government.

Young people interviewed years later said, “that’s when they stopped being young,” or that’s when they lost their idealistic belief that “one could make changes politically,” and that’s when “hope was taken away.”

As stated before, the summer of 1963 was seen as the height of optimism in the student (and civil rights) movements; afterwards it continually experienced ups-and-downs with increasing amounts of turmoil and resistance.

It was during this period, somewhere after the Kennedy assassination, that social critics such as Paul Goodman later divided the 1960s decade into “the good sixties and the bad sixties.” In 1970, he wrote how as the decade proceeded both the new left and the
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Movement as a whole gradually lost its “moral integrity” and descended into destructive “fits of rage, seduced by grandiose notions of revolution.” Increasingly losing faith in the system, by the second half of the 1960s decade, young people began to either drop out (as in the counter-culture) or fight back. Ironically, many who write too optimistically about the Sixties only begin their narrative with the first student “uprising,” which took place at the University of California at Berkeley during the Fall of 1964, in what became known as the “Free Speech Movement (FSM).” Seen as a bridge between the civil rights movement and the anti-war crusade, the FSM started when UC Berkeley Dean Katherine Towle announced, on September 14, that existing university regulations “prohibiting advocacy of political causes or candidates, outside political speakers, recruitment of members, and fundraising by student organizations at the intersection of Bancroft and Telegraph Avenues (bordering school property) would be strictly enforced.” The reason for this announcement was that student activists who had traveled to Mississippi during the summer to register African American voters in the “Freedom Summer” project had set up information tables on the Berkeley campus and were soliciting donations for civil rights causes. On September 30, 1964, after five students were requested to appear for disciplinary action, over 500 students held a sit-in and encircled the Dean of Students’ office in protest. One possible reason for this passionate show of force stemmed from the eye-opening experience some students had gone through in Mississippi as civil rights volunteers that summer. Well over 1,000 mostly white, out-of-state students had participated and witnessed the injustice and brutality in which four young civil rights workers were killed (including James Chaney, a black CORE activist from Mississippi, white CORE organizer Michael Schwerner, and white summer volunteer Andrew Goodman (the last two from New York), at least three Mississippi blacks were murdered and four critically wounded because of their support for the civil rights movement, eighty Freedom Summer workers were beaten, 1,062 people were arrested (many of them volunteers), and thirty-seven black churches and thirty black homes or businesses were bombed or burned. When the next day, October 1, UC Berkeley campus police arrested former graduate student Jack Weinberg (sitting at the CORE table) for refusing to show his
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identification, all bottled-up fury exploded. Spontaneously about 100 and later up to 3,000
students surrounded and trapped the police car (with Weinberg inside) for 32 hours. The
car was used as a speaker’s podium starting with protest leader Mario Savio “removing his
shoes and climbing on top,” followed later by the student senate (ASUC) President Charles
Powell (who dropped out of the protest several hours later after disagreements over
strategy). Meanwhile, continuous pressure on the part of the students continued from
11:45 a.m., all day, all night, and most of the next day until the charges against Weinberg
were dropped (although the university agreed not to press charges, he was still later booked
by the police for trespassing). Confrontational highlights included Savio and Powell
negotiating many hours for Weinberg’s release (and the termination of several other
student suspensions), and after their failure, at 4:00 p.m., 400 students blocked the door of
the Dean’s office, not allowing anyone out; at 6:15 p.m. a violent encounter took place at
Sproul Hall between 100 angry students and police (“two police officers were pulled to the
floor,” one bitten on the leg) touching off a near riot; at 11:15 p.m. another faction of
students, about 2,500 “anti-demonstration demonstrators,” confronted the FSM
demonstrators, causing a near free-for-all between the two sides, which “degenerated into a
shouting, singing, swearing and egg throwing contest. The demonstrators sang ‘We Shall
Overcome!’ The anti-demonstration forces shouted ‘Mickey Mouse!’” By 1:30 a.m.,
only UC Berkeley’s resident Catholic priest, Father James Fisher, could stop this other near
riot from exploding, he too having to mount the police car. Soon things quieted and an “all-
night vigil” began with the entire area filled with sleeping bags, blankets, and even a “pup
tent.” All next day various students spoke from atop of the now “sagging” police car
until evening, when negotiations concluded between University President Clark Kerr,
Chancellor Edward W. Strong, members of an informal faculty group, student leaders, and
nine demonstrations spokesmen. At 7:30 p.m., October 2, Savio climbed the “flattened”
police car one last time and announced the end of the demonstration. By this time, 7,000
onlookers had gathered, and 500 policemen had assembled, called in to start arresting
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everyone if negotiations had failed.\(^{546}\) At the end of the day, though, the students had won little with Jack Weinberg taken by police, all suspended students remained suspended, and the University rules remaining unchanged.\(^{547}\) However, the Free Speech issue on the right to conduct political activity on college campuses was far from over; the Free Speech Movement continued.

On October 5, 1964, approximately 1000 students gathered in the mall between Sproul Hall and the Student Union to listen to the protest speakers, including Mario Savio, who explained that “although the whole war is far from over, we have won the biggest battle” by gaining “jurisdictional recognition” from the university president to negotiate for “free speech.”\(^{548}\) On November 9, the FSM issued a statement saying that its “self-imposed moratorium” (since early October) on further activity would end the next day, seeing that the “Campus Committee on Political Activity” (created by the university after the October 1-2 protests) was “deadlocked over the issue of political advocacy.”\(^{549}\) Indeed, the following day 200 students participated in a demonstration after FSM and eight other off-campus organizations set up tables with “donation cups and sign-up sheets” in violation of university regulations.\(^{550}\) On November 20, a mass student rally of more than 3,000 people was lead by folk singer Joan Baez, as FSM leaders Arthur Goldberg and Mario Savio were placed on probation for the rest of the semester.\(^{551}\) Otherwise, while there was another mass rally in Berkeley on November 23, by the following week (November 30) the free speech demonstrations had spread to several other universities throughout California (including Santa Barbara, UCLA, and Davis).\(^{552}\) Finally, December 2-3 turned out to be the climax of the Movement, as 1,000 persons (including some faculty members and non-students) packed into Sproul Hall after a huge rally for an all night sit-in occupation. At the
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December 2 rally, Mario Savio gave his legendary speech, in which he said: “There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can’t take part; you can’t even tacitly take part, and you’ve got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you’ve got to make it stop. And you’ve got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you’re free, the machines will be prevented from working at all.” Afterwards Baez told the demonstrators to take over Sproul Hall “with love in your hearts,” and began to sing the famous civil rights song “We Shall Overcome.” Before sunrise the following day 635 police officers started clearing the building, which took 12 hours, arresting 768 demonstrators who had gone “limp” and had to be dragged out. On December 4, the third day of the “student strike,” 5,000 people attended a huge rally next to Sproul Hall to hear protest leaders and faculty members “condemn Governor Brown, the Regents, President Kerr, Chancellor Strong and the police.” Nevertheless, the Free Speech Movement had more or less won. On December 7, 16,000 students and faculty members gathered to hear University President Clark Kerr speak about the “new liberalized political action rules” (details voted on later that day and thus not fully known to the students until the next day), which stated: “The content of speech or advocacy should not be restricted by the university. Off-campus political activities shall not be subject to university regulation. On-campus advocacy or organization of such activities shall be subject only to such limitations as may be imposed under Section 2” (meaning “the time, place, and manner of conducting political activity on the campus shall be subject to reasonable regulations to prevent interference with the normal functions of the university”). Professor Joseph Tussman summarized the new resolution: “Anything that is illegal in the community at large is still illegal on the campus. The question is: Should
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the university impose more restrictions on its students in the area of political activity than exist in the community at large? The Senate said: No.”

Seen as a victory for student ability to protest various issues, the Free Speech Movement helped open the door for the soon-to-follow anti-war confrontations against the Vietnam War. Nevertheless, contrary to Sixties myth, not all politically active students, and surely not all the other students at Berkeley or other universities, supported the Free Speech Movement, or if they did, they did not necessarily support their tactics. Many student groups disagreed with FSM’s leftwing political ideology, others with its methods in creating change. Students from various parts of the political spectrum (i.e., liberal, middle of the road, and conservative) saw FSM as a “tool of the communist left”; others did not like how the student protests “all but shut down the university.” ASUC President Powell denounced FSM’s “insatiable hunger for full capitulation,” which he called “needless” since the Regents had already basically “granted the FSM the privileges it requested.”

The university “Young Republicans” formally withdrew from the Free Speech Movement, stating, “What the FSM is asking, in effect, is that the administration cease to be an administration.” The California Alumni Association issued a statement on how the FSM represented only a fraction of the students, saying that “the overwhelming law-abiding majority of students, faculty and alumni have privately deplored the threatened state of anarchy sought to be imposed on a great university by relatively few agitators and malcontents and their misguided sympathizers.” In the end, even members of the Free Speech Movement were not unified in their beliefs regarding what had transpired, if it had been a success or not, or what their future direction would be. On January 4, 1965, the Free Speech Movement held its “first legal rally”; nonetheless, folk singer Joan Baez and various FSM spokesmen still expressed dissatisfaction and, among other things, denounced the new rules for campus political activity for not going far enough. Divided, the FSM soon started to fall apart. In April of 1965, Mario Savio, the leader of the Free Speech Movement, himself quit, saying that “he was disappointed with the growing gap between
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the leadership of the FSM, and the students themselves.” The FSM disbanded two days after Savio left. Just as the Free Speech Movement disintegrated, the “Vietnam Day Committee (VDC)” took its place in Berkeley (while the SDS rose in prominence nationally) and was seen as one of the major starting points for the anti-Vietnam war movement (and in many accounts the start of what is now called the Sixties). Indeed, by the spring of 1965, the feeling of being “misled” and “betrayed” by President Johnson was very much on the minds of many students. Both the old and new left had actively supported Lyndon Johnson in his 1964 presidential campaign against Barry Goldwater, because he had positioned himself as the “candidate of peace.” Moreover, following Johnson’s victory in November, students had even refrained from any anti-war rhetoric to “avoid alienating the president and possibly endangering the social programs of the Great Society.” Nevertheless, in a little over two weeks after being sworn into office (on January 20, 1965), Johnson began the bombardment of North Vietnam on February 7 in what was called “Operation Flaming Dart”; on March 8, 3,500 U.S. Marines landed to begin the American ground war. All this happened on the heels of Kennedy’s assassination, which occurred just after he had signed (October 11, 1963) a new directive called NSAM 263 to withdraw 1,000 troops a month from Vietnam, and 17,000 out by the end of 1964 (and all troops out by 1965). Instead, only four days after Kennedy’s death (and one day after his burial) Johnson reversed Kennedy’s Vietnam disengagement policy (on November 26, 1963) with his NSAM 273 to expand the war, increasing troop strength to over 550,000 by 1968 (before 1965 Vietnam had been a CIA-run covert war, only turning into the “bigger war” when handed to the military in 1965).
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Years later, some would speculate that if Kennedy had not been killed, there most likely would not have been a war in Vietnam. On the other hand, others argued that since the United States (with Kennedy’s approval) had participated in the overthrow of the South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem on November 2, 1963, it had already committed itself into a deeper involvement, especially since afterwards the following military juntas were ineffectual in fighting the war against the North.\textsuperscript{572} Either way, the road towards a seemingly needless war was set, as Johnson only two days after becoming President had already pledged his support for the Vietnamese conflict stating, “The battle against communism . . . must be joined . . . with strength and determination.”\textsuperscript{573} On August 4, 1964, President Johnson went in front of the American people to report “renewed hostile actions” by North Vietnam (in two separate Gulf of Tonkin incidents), and to “immediately request the Congress to pass a resolution,” which it did three days later.\textsuperscript{574} The facts that Johnson failed to mention were that the U.S. had spied on, sabotaged, and attacked North Vietnam for years, and that the second of the so-called Gulf of Tonkin incidents never even happened (questioned by “influential” journalist I. F. Stone in a matter of weeks, it was confirmed by National Security Agency declassified documents in December of 2005 that no second attack occurred on August 4 and that the August 2 attack took place “under questionable circumstances”).\textsuperscript{575} Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon described the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution: “It’s a resolution which seeks to give the President of the United States the power to make war without a declaration of war.”\textsuperscript{576} But still, Johnson’s presidential campaign of 1964 implied that if people didn’t vote for him, his Republican Party

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
opponent Barry Goldwater would be much worse; he in fact might cause a nuclear war.\footnote{Trevor Parry-Giles, “1964-Three Ads from LBJ-Taylor Sachs,” Presidential Campaign Rhetoric (April 22, 2011), \url{http://campaignrhetoric.wordpress.com/2011/04/22/1964-three-ads-from-lbj-taylor-sachs/}. Accessed November 14, 2012.} In his famous “Daisy Girl” TV attack ad airing September 7, Johnson tried to capitalize on comments made by Goldwater about the possibility of using nuclear weapons in Vietnam.\footnote{Ibid.} As a nuclear firestorm raged in the advertisement, a voiceover from Johnson stated, “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.”\footnote{“Famous ‘Daisy’ Attack Ad from 1964 Presidential Election,” online video clip, Youtube (October 30, 2010), \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dDTBnsqXZ3k}. Accessed October 3, 2014.} All-out war erupting in early 1965 helped exacerbate a “deep personal bitterness” within many young people.\footnote{Skolnick, The Politics of Protest, 37.}

In 1965, the handful of protests against the budding war in the previous year quickened immediately, starting in February and March as the war heated up and the SDS organized marches on the Oakland Army Terminal (the departure point for many troops bound for Southeast Asia).\footnote{Mark Barringer, “The Anti-War Movement in the United States,” Modern American Poetry (1999), \url{http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/vietnam/anti-war.html}. Accessed November 14, 2012.} Moreover, on March 24-25 at the University of Michigan, the first “teach-ins” were held to “educate large segments of the student population about both the moral and political foundations of U.S. involvement.”\footnote{Ibid.} The event was attended by about 3,500 people including Michigan faculty members Anatol Rapoport and Charles Tilly. This particular format spread to other campuses around the country, bringing faculty members into increasing anti-war participation.\footnote{David L. Anderson, The Human Tradition in the Vietnam Era (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000),183.}

On April 17 the first of several national anti-war marches (sponsored by both the SDS and the SNCC) were held in Washington, D.C., with a “surprising large turnout” of 15,000 to 25,000 protesters.\footnote{Mark Barringer, “The Anti-War Movement in the United States,” Modern American Poetry (1999), \url{http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/vietnam/anti-war.html}. Accessed November 14, 2012.} In a speech at the rally, Paul Potter, the president of the SDS, said that “something had gone very wrong with America,” that the war in Vietnam was a “sign of the failure of democracy.”\footnote{Ibid.} Moreover, he stated that the “last vestiges of illusion” concerning morality and democracy as the guiding principles of American foreign policy had ended. Potter named this failure as stemming from an interlocking “financial,
technocratic, and military elite” he called “the system.”

And it was time to “challenge” this “military-industrial complex,” as former President Eisenhower had called it in his farewell address. Some would comment that Potter’s “name the system” speech encouraged a “darker impulse” within the Movement that helped weakened and even destroy both “cultural authority and political legitimacy.” From this time on, a still small but rapidly growing radical element (separating the world into “bad elites” and “good people”) began profoundly to affect and divide the anti-war movement.

Contrary to Sixties myth, the anti-war movement (like the aforementioned movements) was never unified, although a number of groups attempted to organize and lead a national movement. As historian Charles DeBenedetti said, “No one was in control of the anti-war movement” because of its diverse elements. At its core, the organized anti-war movement clustered around two poles, the liberal and radical camps. The liberal side consisted of organizations such as the Fellowship for Reconciliation, the American Friends Service Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, the Catholic Worker, the Committee for Non-violent Action, the Women’s Strike for Peace, and SANE. They generally opposed the escalation of war on moral grounds and advocated some sort of cease-fire and negotiation. However, most liberals supported the continuation of the strategy of containment in stopping the spread of communism. Moreover, SANE leaders stressed responsible criticism that would enlist broad support and were eager to express the fact that they were not aligned with Soviet Russia or any other communists. Liberal tactics included the “teach-ins,” public education, petitions, lobbying, and electoral politics. On the other hand, the radical side (who for the most part identified themselves as constituents of the new left) advocated “Out Now.” It included organizations such as the SNCC, the May 2nd Movement, the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Northern Student Movement, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, the Vietnam Day Committee, and the SDS. For the radicals, the Vietnam War was seen as another example of American imperialism. Their approach consisted of creating political confrontation using tactics such as large-scale demonstrations, draft resistance, and civil disobedience. These methods,

588 Ibid.
589 Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 139.
590 Ibid.
591 Ibid., 140.
593 Ibid., 146.
594 Ibid.
moreover, attracted many within the budding hippie counter-culture, which resulted in a media coverage that largely stereotyped the whole movement in their image.\textsuperscript{595}

Thus from the beginning of the escalation of the war there already existed a great division within the anti-war movement. Even before the first really large demonstration of April 17 (the day before Easter), liberal anti-war leaders A. J. Muste, Norman Thomas, and Bayard Rustin already issued a statement calling for “an independent peace movement, not drawing inspiration of direction from the foreign policy of any government”.\textsuperscript{596} The \textit{New York Post} added that there would be “no justification for transforming the march into a frenzied, one-sided, anti-American show.”\textsuperscript{597} The SDS and SANE argued over the participation of members viewed as Vietcong sympathizers or communists, with SANE eventually refusing to sponsor the demonstration.\textsuperscript{598} Potter, like many radical leaders, however, assumed that the Vietnamese revolutionaries were a “more victimized and better organized version” of themselves.\textsuperscript{599} The new left increasingly began to believe that there was one all-encompassing system behind the “establishment” that aimed to dominate the world, and that this unified oppression could be resisted by a single world-wide revolution to overthrow bourgeois capitalism and create a classless and stateless society (socialism).\textsuperscript{600} For these radicals, the ideological foundation from which the system was to be confronted was very clear, and it was not liberalism but resistance (and later the overthrow) of that system.

Nonetheless, the April 17, 1965 protest not only ignited hope and enthusiasm in the new left for the possibility of radical change in America (by splitting from the liberals), it also caused an eventual disagreement between older and newer radicals as (clearly seen at the June SDS convention).\textsuperscript{601} The SDS had already experienced a break at their summer convention in 1964 between those who were “campus-oriented” and those who supported working in the ghettos through their “Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP).”\textsuperscript{602}

In 1964, “old guard” Paul Potter was elected SDS president; however, with the emergence of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement in the fall, it became clear to many in the Movement that the “truth of American society” and with it the university “did not live up
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to its claims.” Potter, who himself allegedly did not believe in militancy, nonetheless opened the door towards more aggressive and drastic tactics against the U.S. government because of his speech, creating “reformist/radical disagreements.” This later division especially involved the emerging baby boom generation who were just coming of age (first entering university during the fall of 1964). These latest young student demonstrators (born after World War II) first of all opposed liberal protesters (like all radicals) with their fierce disapproval of “the Establishment,” which for them consisted of “President Johnson, his advisors, the Pentagon, Washington bureaucrats, and weapons manufacturers.”

Secondly, although inspired by the historic April “March on Washington,” they however did not passively join the SDS but instead began to pressure the original members towards an increased identification with ever more confrontational tactics that Potter had alluded to.

These new recruits who joined the SDS (and other student protest groups), for the most part, did not come from the traditional Eastern, urban, professional, Jewish, intellectual, professional classes that had been drawn to protest groups early on. Their family backgrounds (pointed out protest veterans) consisted of little past political involvement, and thus they tended to be not only ignorant of the history of the left but “downright uninterested.” Instead, they were more likely to come from working-class families who were “less intellectual and less articulate,” growing up in either the Midwest or other “frontier country.” The new young students, instead of dressing in nice jackets and slacks, wore blue work shirts, denim jackets, and cowboy boots and they tended to be “more violent, more individualistic, more bare-knuckled and callus-handed, than . . . the early SDSers.” In a further example of this dichotomy, it was clear that the original SDS had believed in the tactic of non-violence as written in their 1962 Port Huron Statement manifesto. It stated that “we find violence to be abhorrent because it requires generally the transformation of the target, be it a human being or a community of people, into a depersonalized object of hate. It is imperative that the means of violence be abolished and

603 Ibid., 99.
605 Strauss and Howe, An American Prophecy, 189-190.
607 Gitlin, The Sixties, 186.
608 Sale, SDS, 137-138.
609 Ibid.
610 Ibid.
611 Ibid.
the institutions – local, national, international – that encourage non-violence as a condition of conflict be developed."612 The new members, however, did not always hold these views so strictly, as they saw the hypocrisy of justifying the violence used by third-world liberation forces while condemning any sort of violence in their own movement at home.613 As a result, not only was there an ideological split, but a serious generational chasm opened up within the student movement as early as the spring of 1965. Moreover, perhaps impossible because of the enormous cultural differences, the “old guard” itself did not help their situation when they “failed to take these prairie peoples into their old-boys networks,” which eventually lead to their own marginalization, or in some cases their own transformation towards accepting certain forms of upheaval.614

The overly positive Sixties myth of unity, hope, and non-violence pervading the overall movement during these early days is false, as the Movement was already seeded with dissension, despair, and violent tendencies. Not only were there the above-mentioned chasms, but deep feelings of resignation and frustration permeated the anti-war movement, which was still haunted by the 1963 Kennedy assassination.615 The discouragement and anguish of many protesters in 1965 involved to no small part the diversion of Great Society funds into war spending.616 Then, after years of social injustice and the sense that their cause was taking a back seat to the war, blacks in the cities began to explode in violent riots (while the Black Liberation Front, caught on February 16, plotted to bomb the Liberty Bell, the Statue of Liberty, and the Washington Monument), helping to push the anti-war movement also towards the edge of desperation and alienation617 Finally, when 22,200 American troops invaded the Dominican Republic on April 28, even “old guard” Todd Gitlin (the former SDS president from 1963-1964) said that it was from this point on that he felt a part of a resistance in which he belonged to a “we.” Gitlin wrote, “The U.S. was throwing its armed might against us. I felt for the first time that I belonged to a ‘we’ that had no choice but to fight against America’s armed power.”618

Contrary to myth, the
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“obstructionist action” on the part of pacifists was already plentiful by this time.619 Continuing, Gitlin said, “The United States started acting like an empire and that fraternity with revolutionaries abroad had become compelling for a growing faction of the budding anti-war movement.”620 Thus, throughout the year, the pessimism that grew over the expanding war and the possibility of genuine social reform in the university and society as a whole became uncertain helped fuel the tactics of confrontation.621

In the month of May, meanwhile, major anti-war activity led by the VDC erupted in Berkeley, California. The VDC was formed by local Berkeley activists Jerry Rubin, Paul Montauk, Abbie Hoffman, and Stew Albert (all but Montauk were latter founding members of the “outrageously” radical Yippies).622 They were a wide-ranging coalition made up of left-wing political groups, student groups, labor organizations, and pacifist religions. In one of their first agitations, the VDC on May 5, 1965 marched several hundred students from the university on to the Berkeley Draft Board, where the staff was given a black coffin as a gift, and a number of students set alight their draft cards. Soon, from May 14-22, the VDC organized the “National Vietnam Week,” held at UC Berkeley, which included a 35-hour protest involving 35,000 people held May 21-22.623 Among those who gave speeches at this huge rally included novelist Norman Mailer, socialist leader Norman Thomas, philosopher Alan Watts, civil rights activist Bob Moses, and former Free Speech Movement leader Mario Savio.624 At the conclusion of this event (a little after midnight on early May 22), the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) led a sizable group of people to once again confront the Berkeley draft board and provocatively hang the effigy of President Lyndon Johnson while burning 19 draft cards.625

In June, only four months after the start of the war (and the start-up of protests), the SDS held its annual conference near Kewadin, Michigan, resulting in the previously mentioned conflict between the old guard (veterans of Port Huron) and the “prairie power”

620 Gitlin, The Sixties, 187.
At the convention, 500 members clashed, with the new mid-western types charging the original members (with among other things) of “elitism” and the lack of democracy. Another disagreement was between the new members wanting “to build a movement solely around the Vietnam War” versus the old guard who wanted to build a movement around “interracial organization of the poor directed toward basic social change.” While Potter wanted the SDS to return to its original spirit of dealing with domestic change, nonetheless, with all the new members streaming into the organization, the conference fell into disarray and in preference elected Carl Oglesby, an angry, persuasive radical, as their new president. Split in different directions, “the thrust of anti-war activity was left unorganized” as the SDS was unable to focus on a policy that might mobilize the massive numbers of college students. Since the SDS was credited with organizing the most demonstrations throughout the country, the result was that the entire anti-war movement remained a disorderly coalition of numerous groups (the same situation that many historians use to proclaim that the sixties were over after 1969). On a practical level, the Kewadin convention failed to provide for any cohesive national program, which forced each chapter to rely on local initiatives, resulting in the national office’s leadership falling into “ineffectual chaos.” SDS activist Paul Booth later recounted the opportunity to make SDS the “organizational vehicle of the anti-war movement,” but they “really screwed up,” and “defaulted on Vietnam.” Instead, because of “prairie” members’ obsessive “anti-centralism,” it became harder to carry out serious political discussion and decision making on “what was to be done” because of anti-hierarchical pressures that culminated in the motion for the abolishment of the SDS offices of president and vice president (which was seriously if inexplicably brought up for consideration).

The old guard point to the June 1965 convention as marking the SDS’s “long march away from its origins.” They called it a “loony” convention, in which many began to smoke marijuana, focus on the talk of “morals and values, honesty and courage, action not
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ideology.”635 They were angered by the war and had “rage and disillusionment” and a moral impulse to create something better, but these new SDS members were less into theories than the founders had been, and more into the act of confrontation.636 For the older members, everything seemed to have been up for modification as the new constituents of the SDS began to increase their confused vehement support for all foreign revolutions and revolutionaries. While not believing in any definite political framework, the new arrivals changed the SDS’s membership provision by “striking out the anti-communist exclusion clauses from its constitution,” and paradoxically welcomed in all kinds of “disciplined cadre organizations” like the Progressive Labor Party (the “old guard” had originally aimed to create a new left “untethered to either Marxist ideology or the labor union politics”).637 638 On October 4, 1965, these changes severed the relationship between SDS and its parent organization LID (who though only nominally sponsoring them gave tax exemption) once and for all.639 The emergence of this new trend within the student activist community was critically examined in the summer of 1965 issue of Dissent magazine. An article entitled “New Styles in Leftism” described the “New Left in revolt” as having “an extreme sometimes unwarranted hostility toward liberalism . . . an impatience with the old debates about Stalinism . . . a vicarious indulgence in violence . . . unconsidered enmity toward a vaguely defined establishment . . . an unreflective belief in the decline of the West . . . a crude unqualified anti-Americanism . . . and an increasing identification with that sector of third world in which radical nationalism and communist authoritarianism merge.”640

By 1965, furthermore, the Martin Luther King-led early civil rights movement belief in the “pure Gandhian theory of non-violence,” of “loving your enemy while suffering his violence,” was clearly fading in popularity with the focus now on fighting the “Establishment.”641 The anti-war movement also became more confrontational with the war makers by this early date. Protesters from the beginning burned their draft cards, challenged draft boards, and blocked troop trains.642 Still, to add to the confusion (and contrary to the myth of homogeneity), great differences and divisions in both ideology and strategy continued to persist and co-existed within anti-war groups (throughout the
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Vietnam War era). Another example of this was the June 3, 1965 anti-war rally at New York City’s Madison Square Garden, where SANE and SDS clashed repeatedly. While liberal speakers Wayne Morse, Benjamin Spock, and Norman Thomas labeled President Johnson’s “policy of escalation” as mistaken and called for negotiations, radical spokesman Clark Kissinger vehemently disagreed, stating that the president’s actions were not blunders, but an established interventionist type foreign policy. He also added that “our problem is in America, not in Vietnam.” Contrary to the other myth of the Sixties ending because of the anti-war movement fragmenting in 1969, the fact of the matter was that the anti-war movement was already fragmented in many different ways in as early as 1965 (the first real year of the war). In reality, the Movement always consisted of a number of independent interests, “often only vaguely allied and contesting each other on many issues, united only in opposition to the Vietnam War.” Stated in another way, “its members could agree only that the war was bad and that the U.S. should withdraw if possible.” However, the real trend towards increasing violence did serve to add still another point of contention within both the black civil rights movement and the white student/anti-war movements.

During the mid-1960s, as the over-all direction in the struggles of blacks metamorphosed into radical militancy (as stated before), this militancy began to influence the attitudes and strategies of the anti-war movement and white student behavior in general (this did not start in 1969/1970, as the end of the Sixties myth suggests). Foremost, it was the black youths that increasingly rejected their “elders’ moderate path of cooperation, racial integration and assimilation” with each occurrence of police brutality watched on television. For example, millions witnessed “Bloody Sunday” in Selma, Alabama, on March 7, 1965, as state troopers and local law enforcement officers attacked peaceful demonstrators with “billy clubs, tear gas, rubber tubes wrapped in barbed wire, and bull whips.” Such inhuman incidences especially galvanized impatient young blacks (and whites) to shun the notion of “appealing to the public’s conscience” or following any other of Martin Luther King’s Christian religious creeds. Instead, the young began to adhere more to the teachings of Nation of Islam minister Malcolm X (who was assassinated on
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February 21, 1965), and/or the famous nineteenth-century black abolitionist Frederick Douglass, who said that “power concedes nothing without demand, it never did and it never will.” Douglass further wrote: “Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet depreciate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.” Similarly, Malcolm X had argued that the non-violent tactics of King were not feasible options for black people, and said “I am for violence if non-violence means we continue postponing a solution to the American black man’s problem just to avoid violence.” Concerning the war in Vietnam he stated, “If violence is wrong in America, violence is wrong abroad. If it is wrong to be violent defending black women and black children and black babies and black men, then it is wrong for America to draft us, and make us violent abroad in defense of her. And if it is right for America to draft us, and teach us how to be violent in defense of her, then it is right for you and me to do whatever is necessary to defend our own people right here in this country.” Before long, white student activists increasingly incorporated these more assertive ideas from black leaders into their own anti-war cause.

On August 11, 1965 (just days after President Johnson signed the 1965 Voting Rights Act), the second worst riot in United States history erupted in Watts, the black ghetto of Los Angeles. The six-day uprising resulted in 34 deaths, 1,032 injuries, 3,438 arrests, and over $40 million in property damage. United States Attorney General from Ramsey Clark stated at the time that “the days of ‘We Shall Overcome’ were over.” This and other similar ghetto rebellions greatly affected not only the civil rights movement, but the anti-war student movements as well. With fires burning out of control and blacks in the streets chanting “Burn, baby, burn,” a great sense of hopelessness and bitterness helped
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fuel the escalation towards violence. As it was impossible to separate the anti-war movement from the student movement, it was inescapable for young white activists to not be influenced by the civil rights movement’s turn towards “black power” by its younger members. The SNCC justified this new attitude by stating that “racist people had no qualms about the use of violence against black people in the U.S. who would not ‘stay in their place,’ and ‘accommodationist’ civil rights strategies had failed to secure sufficient concessions for black people.”

As the battle raged in Watts during the week of August 11 to 17, white folk-rocker Barry McGuire’s song “Eve of Destruction” entered the top 40 sales charts, a pessimistic tune prophesying a possible upcoming apocalypse It was a stark contrast to the “bouncy” top 1964 hits such as the Shangri Las’ “Leader of the Pack,” the Beach Boys’ “Deuce Coupe” and “California Girls,” the Supremes’ “Baby Love,” and the Beatles’ “A Hard Day’s Night.” The bitter, brooding hopelessness of “Eve of Destruction” resonated with a great many teenagers of the day, contrasting with the Sixties myth of high optimism; its popularity was not by accident. The lyrics were the following:

The eastern world, it is exploding
Violence flarin’, bullets loadin’
You’re old enough to kill, but not for votin’
You don’t believe in war, but what’s that gun you’re totin’
And even the Jordan River has bodies floatin’

But you tell me
Over and over and over again, my friend
Ah, you don’t believe
We’re on the eve
of destruction.

Don’t you understand what I’m tryin’ to say
Can’t you feel the fears I’m feelin’ today?
If the button is pushed, there’s no runnin’ away
There’ll be no one to save, with the world in a grave
[Take a look around ya boy, it’s bound to scare ya boy]

And you tell me
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Over and over and over again, my friend
   Ah, you don’t believe
   We’re on the eve
   of destruction.

Yeah, my blood’s so mad feels like coagulatin’
   I’m sitting here just contemplatin’
I can’t twist the truth, it knows no regulation.
   Handful of senators don’t pass legislation
And marches alone can’t bring integration
   When human respect is disintegratin’
This whole crazy world is just too frustratin’

And you tell me
Over and over and over again, my friend
   Ah, you don’t believe
   We’re on the eve
   of destruction.

Think of all the hate there is in Red China
Then take a look around to Selma, Alabama
   You may leave here for 4 days in space
But when you return, it’s the same old place
The poundin’ of the drums, the pride and disgrace
   You can bury your dead, but don’t leave a trace
Hate your next-door neighbor, but don’t forget to say grace
And, tell me over and over and over again, my friend
   You don’t believe
   We’re on the eve
   Of destruction
   Mm, no no, you don’t believe
   We’re on the eve
   of destruction.659

During the fall of 1965 it was clear that the anti-war movement was experiencing
the same phenomenon that was occurring in the civil rights movement, the ever continuing
and widening split between liberal and radical groups having the same goals but
advocating different methods. An example of division occurred in Berkeley, involving over
two dozen prominent faculty members writing an open letter in opposition to what they
saw as Vietnam Day Committee’s “indiscriminate resort to extravagant tactics and the use
of simplistic and violent slogans.”660 While the liberal professors stated their beliefs that
the attempt by the VDC to end the war by stopping troop trains hurt the reputation of the
university, many new radicals counterattacked with ridicule. Max Scherr, editor and

publisher of the new underground newspaper the *Berkeley Barb*, tauntingly printed an old quote from New York reporter Lincoln Steffens: “A liberal is a person whose mind is so wide open all his brains have fallen out.”

Moreover, many radicals throughout the Bay Area began to voice the opinion that one could not trust these “liberal compromisers.”

Moreover, the conflict within the anti-war movement seemed to “boost radical bravado.”

Jerry Rubin of the VDC later bragged, “We were fucking obnoxious, and dug every moment of it.” This mindset was a far cry from what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. taught in 1958 when he said, “Hate begets hate; violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness.”

On October 15 and 16, 1965, approximately 100,000 activists in 60 cities participated in the Vietnam Day Committee’s call for an “International Days of Protest” against the war. The newly formed umbrella group called the “National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam” (located in Madison, Wisconsin) coordinated the worldwide demonstrations held in cities such as Ann Arbor, Atlanta, Berkeley, Boston, Buenos Aires, Chicago, Detroit, London, Los Angeles, Madison, Mexico City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Montevideo, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, St. Paul, Tokyo, and Vancouver. In New York City, 20,000 people marched down Fifth Avenue in a “Peace Parade to the U.N. Plaza,” while in Berkeley the VDC held a teach-in of over 10,000 people, who afterwards left the campus and marched towards the Oakland Army Terminal in hopes of handing out leaflets to the soldiers, but were blocked by 400 riot police (as the Hells Angels attacked the demonstrators). In the meantime, the National Coordinating Committee (who emerged from the May 21-22 VDC organized teach-in) immediately proceeded to determine the “priorities for the peace movement,” which were comprised of militant direct action, including the use of civil disobedience.

Nonetheless, not everyone agreed even at the rally, as emerging counter-culture spokesman
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Ken Kesey irritated many Berkeley activists by telling the anti-war movement to “just look at it, look at the war, and turn your backs and say . . . fuck it.”  At odds with these early hippie types, Jerry Rubin said, “It’s gotta be more fun to be in the revolution than out of it.” In 1965 Berkeley activists wanted to “organize, to demonstrate, to fight and change America,” to the horror of the masses and disgust of the just emerging bohemian subculture. However, the question of whether larger protests themselves were effective at all continued to emerge, pushed by liberal organizations.

An example in the ongoing battle between liberals and radicals, Richard Fernandez (director of the Northwest Interfaith Movement) argued that large rallies favored by radicals rarely brought in new people; they were “kind of an ecumenical service where the already committed came.” He claimed that “local protests” were more important than national mobilizations, and that the Movement’s main focus should actually be lobbying Congress in order to convince enough lawmakers to “withdraw authorization for the war budget.” On the other radical side, Carl Oglesy (the new president of the SDS), who also spoke at the October 15-16 protests in Washington D.C., named the system (which former SDS president first suggested) that “creates and sustains the war in Vietnam.” For Oglesy, American liberalism itself was proclaimed the culprit since it was liberal presidents who made the original commitment in Vietnam (Truman), seconded it (Eisenhower), and intensified it (Kennedy). Furthermore, he said, “Think of the men who now engineer that war – those who study the maps, give the commands, push the buttons, and tally the dead: Bundy, McNamara, Rusk, Lodge, Goldberg, the President himself (Johnson). . . . They are all liberals.” Finally, Oglesby exposed American foreign policy as a “systematic foreign intervention run by liberals whose interests were corporate profits.” In other words, although there were many liberals who opposed the war, according to radicals, liberalism itself was the problem, in fact the enemy. Instead of petitioning the government, radicals began to focus instead on organizing a string of
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protests against military recruiters and the draft, while encouraging students to opt for conscientious objector draft status.

Nevertheless, no matter how fast the anti-war movement was growing (120 colleges and universities had held teach-ins by the last part of the year), contrary to the myth of generational solidarity, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the population had participated in anti-war demonstrations by the autumn of 1965. Instead, university students overwhelmingly supported American policy in Vietnam, at this stage, with dozens of pro-war marches held in institutions like Purdue, Cornell, Pittsburgh, and Brigham Young. In October, large crowds in Cleveland, Ohio attacked anti-war marchers, with fighting erupting as “peace banners were burned.” Meanwhile, in Austin, Texas students threw water balloons at anti-war protesters, as 200 counter-demonstrators ripped apart an anti-war float in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Later in the month, in Washington, D.C. war supporters held signs such as “Burn the Teach-in Professors” and “More Police Brutality.” In addition, in New York City hundreds of war supporters chanted, “Give us joy; bomb Hanoi,” while waving signs, “Burn Yourselves, Not Your Cards!” Throughout the country, during the first year of the war, the anti-war protesters were often “outnumbered and outdoors by supporters of their nation’s foreign policy.”

On November 27, 1965, SANE (with the help of the SDS, the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and Women Strike for Peace) led another “March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam,” attended by 20,000 to 35,000 people. Oglesby, in another noteworthy speech, seemingly justified the recent destructive Watts uprising, saying that it was an incident engendered by “social desperation done as a last attempt and with little hope of success which makes good men violent both here and abroad.” He added that if “Americans who can understand why the Negroes of Watts can rebel should understand too why Vietnamese can rebel.” Oglesby said he understood the need to discharge violence: “Letting loose of outrages pent up sometimes over centuries. But the more brutal and longer-lasting the suppression of this energy all the
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more ferocious will be its explosive release.”685 As the war went on, student protesters also increasingly insisted that to make their anti-war message heard (amid general student apathy) they had to “shout” and they had to “disrupt.”686 The SNCC added that the U.S. talk of preserving freedom in the world was but a “hypocritical mask behind which it squashes liberation movements,” such as that in Vietnam, and that they too belonged to this larger picture.687 Thus, all these rationalizations for the need to agitate increasingly led towards an escalation of violent confrontation throughout the remainder of the 1960s decade.688 At the same time, however, solidarity was sorely lacking. According to former SDS president Gitlin, “SDS’s last serious effort to clarify what it stood for” in December of 1965 “failed badly.”689 Instead of “education and articulateness.” he said, the student anti-war movement took the path into the future that continued to splinter because of its unwillingness to pin itself to any particular “policies” or “formal authority.”690

The trends of division, fluctuations of hope, and increased violence in the anti-war movement continued throughout 1966. Similarly to the civil rights movement, it too found itself in a state of disorganization. While the civil rights struggle argued about “tactics and location” (whether to continue to concentrate on the rural South or shift to the ghettos of the North), the anti-war movement also was in a state of disarray with “hundreds of ad hoc groups springing up in response to specific issues, with endless formation and disbanding of coalitions, and with perpetual doubts as to where things are headed and whether the effort is worthwhile at all.”691 692 Another diverging factor developing in 1966 was the emergence of the hippie counter-culture in low-rent bohemian sections of big American cities. Young “refugees” from white suburbia called “flower children” were gathering to live in “tribes” to “make love, not war” and take “mind-altering drugs.”693 While taking part in anti-war protest marches, “hippies” had “not necessarily become political yet,” declared Jerry Rubin (during the formation of his hippie “political wing,” called the
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Yippies, in late 1967). Rubin added, “They mostly prefer to be stoned, but most of them want peace, and they want an end to this stuff.” At the hippie counter-cultural “Trips Festival,” held on January 21-23 in San Francisco, 400 people drank LSD-spiked punch, attempting to demonstrate a “world without rules” in which the old “control systems of science and reason” would square off against the “direct spinal language of magic and mysticism.” Incredulous, the organized left considered hippies “unserious” for the most part and had even hesitated to join them during the fight for “People’s Park” in May of 1969 (when hippies in Berkeley rose up to defend against the university reasserting its control over an empty piece of land that had been claimed by the counter-culture and developed into an unofficial park).

Notwithstanding, most politicos including Marxist radicals, other leftists groups, and liberals disdained the hippie counter-culture, viewing them as representing “middle-class escapism that both estranged the working class from any potential worker-student alliance and siphoned energy away from pressing political tasks.”

The increasing disillusionment and frustration that persisted throughout 1965 continued into 1966. News of further escalations of the war blunted the optimism engendered by the fact that more people were now participating in the more publicized anti-war marches. In general, however, the anti-war campus and street demonstrations “slumped” in 1966. For example, the VDC-led “Second National Days of Protests,” held on March 26, attracted only 20,000 people versus 100,000 in October of 1965. It led Newsweek magazine to write that “student activism maybe on the wane particularly in regard to national issues such as civil rights and Vietnam.” Time magazine noted that protesters had “begun to lose heart.” In Berkeley, an anti-war organizer griped, “More and more students would rather smoke pot than march in a Vietnam parade. We’re going back to the 1950s,” while another “disgruntled” protester wrote that the “peace movement in the United States hardly amounts to a hill of beans.” Further reason for
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pessimism (and a heightened urgency on the part of a minority) was the awareness that the rising costs of the war had “hampered domestic reform programs” such as the “war on poverty.”705 Moreover, despondency increasingly turned into radical anger as American war policies escalated the attacks on Vietnamese civilian centers, bombing peasant villages and destroying the environment with the use of herbicides to defoliate the jungles, which forced resettlements resulting in the depopulation of whole areas.706 Thomas O. Perry of Harvard University Forest referred to the “scorched-earth” operations “going beyond mere genocide to biocide.”707 Perhaps most discouraging was that throughout 1966, most Americans were still unwaveringly supportive of President Johnson’s war policies, which was perhaps most exemplified by the famous quote (by an unidentified U.S. military official) stating that “we had to destroy the city in order to save it.”708 Moreover, in their zealousness to show their patriotism, supporters of the war continued to exhibit extreme hostility toward both anti-war demonstrators and anti-war organizations. Several violent examples from 1966 include the Newark SDS office being ransacked, the office of the Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley being bombed, the shooting of an activist ten times “in the back” in Richmond, California, the shooting of three people (one killed) in Detroit at the Socialist Workers Party office, and in Rochester, New York, the beating to death of an anti-war demonstrator for expressing his views about being against the war in Vietnam.709

Consequently, in 1966, confrontational incidents intensified in both the streets and on nearly every campus in America.710 On March 15, there was another riot in Watts, this one leaving two dead and twenty-five injured.711 Soon afterwards, in later spring, it was announced that the student military draft deferments would be cancelled “for those whose class standings were poor.”712 This caused great anxiety and sharp immediate reactions throughout the nation’s universities. As a result, at several schools, SDS chapters undertook direct actions that demanded that the schools stop submitting grades for “Selective Service purposes.”713 At the University of Chicago, five hundred students staged
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a sit-in and later seized control of the administration building for three and one-half days. Similar takeovers and sit-ins occurred in Madison, Wisconsin, City College of New York, and Oberlin College, to name of few.\textsuperscript{714} In other happenings, students at Columbia University provoked violence after forming “a human chain” to stop the “Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps” from having their “final review” (Reserve Officer Training was still compulsory at many colleges at the time).\textsuperscript{715}

Then in early June, the still relatively lethargic anti-war and civil rights struggles suddenly gained new momentum during a James Meredith-initiated protest walk against racism.\textsuperscript{716} On June 6, Meredith (the first black student to attend the University of Mississippi in 1962, after federal courts ruled that he could not be denied admission) started a one man “March Against Fear,” but was shot and injured by a gunman soon after starting.\textsuperscript{717} Upon hearing the news, several civil rights leaders (including the SCLC’s Martin Luther King and the SNCC’s Stokely Carmichael) came down to continue the march, inviting “freedom-loving people from all over the country to join them.”\textsuperscript{718} For almost three weeks, anywhere from two-hundred to two-thousand people walked the 220 miles from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi.\textsuperscript{719} On June 26, an estimated 15,000 people victoriously walked the last stretch. Nonetheless, what is most remembered about the action was how Carmichael (not yet 25 years old) delivered his “Black Power” speech midway through the march, revealing, once and for all, that the civil rights movement (like the anti-war movement) was also divided between old and new guards (“SNCC’s ‘Black Power’ was now competing with SCLC’s ‘Freedom Now’ slogan”).\textsuperscript{720} Carmichael (who was arrested briefly during the march) voiced his anger, saying, “This is the twenty-seventh time I have been arrested and I ain’t going to jail no more! The only way we gonna stop them white men from whuppin’ us is to take over. What we gonna start sayin’ now is Black Power!”\textsuperscript{721} Speaking for many in the Movement, he voiced his frustration by saying, “We been saying freedom for six years and we ain’t got nothing.”\textsuperscript{722}
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Thus the civil rights optimism emerging from the 1950s from a decade of successes also “began to wane in the middle 1960s.”\textsuperscript{723} Dissatisfaction started to grow initially out of the failure of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to win its challenge at the 1964 Democratic National Convention, and continued as the national focus turned away from civil rights issues to the Vietnam War (especially by mid-1965). With most African Americans finding little improvement in their own situation, many increasingly turned to the idea of “black power,” and Malcolm X’s message of “black nationalism” and how “self-defense should replace non-violent resistance.”\textsuperscript{724} Indeed, “black power” (as previously mentioned) was much more in the vein of the late Malcolm X, and the opposite of Martin Luther King’s “turn the other cheek” philosophy.\textsuperscript{725} Malcolm, who had in fact ridiculed King’s non-violent activism, once asked rhetorically if he would “bleed non-violently.”\textsuperscript{726} He had declared, “We’re non-violent with people who are non-violent with us. But we are not non-violent with anyone who is violent with us.”\textsuperscript{727} However, not everyone agreed, and moderate blacks were alarmed. Roy Wilkins the executive secretary of the NAACP, said that “black power means anti-white power” and it is the “father of hatred and the mother of violence.”\textsuperscript{728} Martin Luther King also was aroused, responding in a speech in front of an audience, “Some people are telling us to be like our oppressor, who has a history of using Molotov cocktails, who has a history of dropping the atomic bomb, who has a history of lynching Negroes. Now people are telling me to stoop down to that level. I’m sick and tired of violence!”\textsuperscript{729} Notwithstanding, Stokely Carmichael, a voice of the new generation, countered, “The only time I hear people talk about non-violence is when black people move to defend themselves against white people. Black people cut themselves every night in the ghetto – Don’t anybody talk about non-violence. Lyndon Baines Johnson is busy bombing the hell of out Vietnam – Don’t nobody talk about non-violence. White people beat up black people every day – Don’t nobody talk about non-violence. But as soon as black people start to move, the double standard comes into
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being.”

Basically, at what was still only the midpoint of the 1960s decade, the trend of the previous two years clearly showed that many activists increasingly questioned the tactics of peaceful civil disobedience – there was no turning back.

What was true of the civil rights movement was always true of the anti-war movement; disgruntled white students to a greater extent now began to question the function of peace marches. The marches appeared, as one protester challenged, to “maintain America’s image as a democratic society permitting dissent so that the war effort could continue.”

The turn to combativeness stemmed from desperation, a growing sense of frustration, anguish, and alienation as people began realizing that one could not expect to stop the war and change society through normal political channels. Once again, this direction did not suddenly emerge in late 1969; it was already the reality. In 1966 SDS leader Carl Davidson said, “Something is afoot on the nation’s campuses,” as students increasingly believed that if they truly wanted to transform society and liberate humanity, they had to “make a revolution.”

There was a feeling on the part of students that they had to “scream and cry out and make a lot of noise” in order for their ideas to gain attention. As the youth movement grew, so did the idea of “fighting back against the state” in perhaps an apocalyptic “confrontation between the forces of light and the forces of darkness.”

As always, the black struggle took the lead, as some forty-three urban ghettos (including Chicago, Cleveland, Ohio, Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco) experienced riots in the summer of 1966. The violence during the summer totaled 11 deaths, more than 400 injured and 3,000 arrests. Despite the destruction, some black leaders saw the riots “as necessary and even useful,” and “enjoyed” the feeling of the “strong sense of brotherhood and sisterhood and a sense of camaraderie in the community” that had emerged.

The SNCC happily saw the riots as a “sign that the days of peaceful protests in
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hopes of racial integration were dead.” They and others saw this turn to fighting back as being positive, representing a “new spirit of resistance in the black community” which they did their best to encourage to “fan the flames of violent anger.” As more African-Americans turned militant, they also increasingly connected with international struggles, enabling many to identify with the Vietnamese people whose homes and lives the Americans armies were destroying. Young black militants began to pay more attention to the Vietnam War, demanding to know, for example, why the Selective Service drafted poor blacks from the ghettos while giving hardship deferments to rich white kids. While in the beginning of the war, many civil rights leaders did not want to join the anti-war movement out of loyalty to President Johnson for pushing civil rights legislation, the perceived social injustice of the draft changed things. In time, organizations such as the “Black Anti-Draft Union” and “Afro-Americans Against the War in Vietnam” started up as many Africa-Americans believed that black soldiers accounted for a disproportionate number of those drafted and killed. At the same time, millions of white people turned away from the fragmenting civil rights movement as a result of the ongoing riots, the advocacy of violence on the part of black radical leaders, and the Movement’s overall failure to condemn the rioters.

At the same time, in June, the SDS held its annual national convention, now run largely by people without ties to its original founders. The leaders of the new “prairie” generation adopted a more confrontational plan of action involving “student power.” They believed that large sit-ins and reaching as many uncommitted students as possible to build “class-consciousness” was the key to success. For this reason pushing issues that would concern the average student was promoted, for example, the “liberalization of dormitory rules and grading system and free speech.” But all was not harmonious at the SDS conference; for example, when female activists demanded a policy position concerning women’s liberation, “men pelted them with tomatoes, provoking the females to wonder whether they were included in ‘participatory democracy.’”
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In October, the emotional issue of the use of napalm by the U.S. military in Vietnam erupted on college campuses. Dow Chemical, which was responsible for the manufacture of the horrible chemical agent, experienced (during the fall semester) 64 demonstrations directed at it, beginning with the first one at Berkeley on Oct. 10. Nevertheless, Dow stubbornly continued their program of recruiting at universities even in the face of much harassment. To the anti-war movement, napalm (and Agent Orange) represented all that was horrible about the war in Vietnam. As C. B. Cowan, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of All People Against War, pointed out, “The U.S. is using napalm as a tactical weapon against personnel including non-participants in the war such as Vietnamese women and children.” Indeed, images of napalm igniting in jungles, in villages, and on the people of Vietnam were on the nightly news. Napalm and Agent Orange were the weapons that most exemplified America’s cruelty and immorality of action, forever captured in the famous photo of “a young girl running with a group of other victims, skin peeling off in layers, after her village was doused with napalm.” As nearly 400,000 tons of napalm were dropped on targets in Vietnam, the indignation on the part of activists continued to escalate from “protest to resistance.” Many felt exhausted from endless “normal channels of dialogue and petition” and felt that they must take a personal stance of noncompliance by refusing to pay taxes, burning draft cards, and aiding draft resisters.

On October 15 a black militant revolutionary group formed in Oakland, California, calling itself the Black Panther Party for Self Defense. Started by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale, it believed in taking “black control of the black community of every aspect of its politics and economy.” Taking inspiration from Malcolm X’s doctrine of community self-defense, the Black Panthers “utilized armed self-defense in a bid to stop racist police brutality and assaults on African Americans by white people.” They began to appear in the streets wearing their “intimidating uniform” consisting of black berets, black leather
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jackets, and to the dismay of the police, “often openly displayed weapons.” Their tactic was to follow and taunt the police, in some cases carrying rifles and chanting “The Revolution has come, it’s time to pick up the gun.” (The Black Panther “Police Patrols” rushed to the scene of an arrest, not only with “loaded weapons,” but with “law books” to “inform the person being arrested of their constitutional rights.”) Attracted by the talk of “offing the pigs,” the Panthers gained widespread support from not only the young urban blacks, but also white students, as both groups progressively radicalized.

As the 1960s decade continued there was somewhat of a convergence between the anti-war movement and the black liberation movement, as black groups such as the Panthers opened up to white participation (“however minimal”). Increasingly, white radicals assisted in “setting up speeches and demonstrations, helped to pay for the distribution of their paper and other publications.” Nevertheless, when Newton was asked in 1967 what white people could do to support the Black Panthers, he still expressed his earlier black nationalistic position, and said that they could form a separate “White Panther Party” (which John Sinclair and others did in Detroit by 1968).

Supporting this policy of segregation, the SDS leadership voiced in unison that “we owe SNCC,” first of all, “a deep debt of gratitude for having slapped us brutally in the face with the slogan of ‘Black Power,’ a slogan which said to white radicals: ‘Go home and organize in white America which is your reality and which only you are equipped to engage.’”

In December, a massive sit-in and student strike erupted after Berkeley protesters “tried to set up an anti-draft literature table next to a Navy recruiting table in the Student Union,” and police with the school administration intervened. Later at a large gathering to discuss the strike, a well-publicized hullabaloo was made of the brief joining together of “freaks and politicos” when they all sang the Beatles’ “Yellow Submarine,” after few

---

761 Ibid.
762 Ibid.
763 Ibid.
766 Skolnick, The Politics of Protest, 98.
remembered the lyrics to the old union song “Solidarity Forever.” There were those like Free Speech Movement veteran Michael Rossman who immediately took it as a possible sign that new beat/hippies and activists could unite into a “single-hearted community.” Still, other politicos were “edgy” that the counterculture “would short-circuit American youth’s still tenuous sense of moral obligation to the world’s oppressed.” Moreover, many activists thought the “drug thing” and the hippie credo of “love” was perhaps something of which one “should feel ashamed . . . when founded on privilege,” as most were from middle-class families. Yet, the “Hippie Curfew Riot” on November 12, 1966 (better known as the first of the “Sunset Strip riots” in Los Angeles) showed that the hippie counter-culture itself could get involved in violent confrontation if something infringed on their immediate lifestyle. The uprising (consisting of 1,000 hippie-type youths) occurred after strict (10:00 p.m.) curfew and loitering laws were passed in order to reduce the crowds in front of various psychedelic night clubs, such as the legendary “Whisky a Go Go.” Though often mistaken for an anti-war song, The Buffalo Springfield hit entitled “For What It’s Worth” was inspired by the event. Released on January 9, 1967, it reached number seven on the Billboard Hot 100 charts. The following were the lyrics:

There’s something happening here
But what it is ain’t exactly clear
There’s a man with a gun over there
Telling me I got to beware

I think it’s time we stop
Children, what’s that sound?
Everybody look - what’s going down?

There’s battle lines being drawn
Nobody’s right if everybody’s wrong
Young people speaking’ their minds
Getting so much resistance from behind

It’s time we stop
Hey, what’s that sound?
Everybody look - what’s going down?

What a field day for the heat
A thousand people in the street
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Singing songs and carrying signs
Mostly saying, "hooray for our side"

It’s time we stop
Hey, what’s that sound?
Everybody look - what’s going down?

Paranoia strikes deep
Into your life it will creep
It starts when you’re always afraid
Step out of line, the men come and take you away

We better stop
Hey, what’s that sound?
Everybody look - what’s going down?

As 1967 began, and the counterculture exploded into mainstream news, tensions deepened between the radical activists’ belief in political strategy “with discipline, organization, commitment to results out there at a distance” and the hippie idea of “living life to the fullest right here for oneself or for the part of the universe embodied in oneself, or for the community of the enlightened who were capable of loving one another and the rest of the world be damned (which it was already).”

Thus, radicalism’s tradition was “change the world” while for the hippie counterculture it was “change consciousness, change life.” Despite these disagreements, those looking for unity imagined the two movements to be the “yin and yang of the same epochal transformation.” However there were many differences that masked, not only the new left and the hippie counterculture, but also the liberal reformers from the more general youth culture. As Gitlin wrote, “In all the excitement, the rush of millenarian hopes, profound tensions were obscured.” For example, on the subject of who the “enemy” was for the Movement, there was a lot of divergence. The new left said it was the “political and social system, and or the dominant institutions”; for the hippie counterculture the enemy was the “established culture or civilization itself”; for liberal reformers it was “particular policies”; and finally to the general youth culture the enemy was “adults, their institutions, and culture.”

Perhaps from a distance, one could see the upheaval of “young whites smoking grass and students burning draft cards and blacks burning storefronts” as different parts in a common battle,
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but in 1967 the Diggers (a branch of the hippie movement) still viewed the new left as “square, hypocritical and middle-class kids,” and vice-versa.\textsuperscript{774}

On January 14, “The First Human Be-In” (or the “Gathering of the Tribes”) was held in Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. It was designed to bring together “political radicals” and “acid devotees” to celebrate what the underground San Francisco \textit{Oracle} newspaper called “a union of love and activism previously separated by categorical dogma and label mongering.”\textsuperscript{775} However, this union was not easy to accomplish, because behind the rose-colored “new age” talk, “a fierce competition was shaping up between the radicals and the hippie-gurus, jealous-eyed world-savers, each eyeing the young unplugging from school and job and flag, jamming into the Haight-Ashbury, as up for grabs.”\textsuperscript{776} Moreover, the belief that all hippies or politicos were alike was not true either; there were many divisions and many types. First of all, the old beat-turned-hippie veterans like Allen Ginsberg and Gary Snyder did believe in some sort of “confluence of politics . . . and . . . psychedelia.”\textsuperscript{777} On the other hand, the hippie Haight-Ashbury merchants, dope dealers, and “rock impresarios” were “anti-political purists.”\textsuperscript{778} For LSD gurus Timothy Leary and Richard Alpert, “all political systems were equal oppressors and power-trippers.”\textsuperscript{779} On the contrary, there were “political purists” who called drugs “bourgeois self-indulgences” and “distraction from discipline.” Other political radicals (especially in Berkeley) thought that while there was a danger that drugs “divorced the will from political action” they were “stunned by the wonders of marijuana and LSD.”\textsuperscript{780} In the end, as the more drug experimenting East Bay activist types joined the “grooving” crowds at “the concerts at the Fillmore and Avalon ballrooms” in San Francisco, they too began to resemble beatnik/hippies, at least in appearance.\textsuperscript{781} Thus, as the saying went since the days of the Free Speech Movement, “as Berkeley went today, so would the rest of America go tomorrow.”\textsuperscript{782} In fact, by 1969 (especially as more hippies talked of the need for a revolution), it was hard sometimes to distinguish between who was a cultural rebel and who was a political activist.
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Nevertheless, differences and complications of all sorts persisted in 1967, not the least between liberals and radicals. In February, at a rally at Princeton, Greg Calvert (the National Secretary of SDS from 1966-67) described the philosophical differences between the two political world views. He said, “Liberal consciousness is conscience translated into action for others,” while “radical or revolutionary consciousness . . . is the perception of oneself as un-free, as oppressed – and . . . leads to the struggle for one’s own freedom in unity with others who share the burden of oppression.” Of the liberal reformist, Calvert said, “His struggle is involved in relieving the tension produced by the contradictions between his own existence and life-style, his self-image, and the conditions of existence and life-style of those who do not share his privileged, unearned status.” On the possibility of developing radical or revolutionary consciousness, Calvert stated that the immediate undertaking “at this stage” was for people to break out of the “myth of the great American middle class” and to see that they were in fact the “new working class,” that only the “new level of technological development” has occurred but it was the same “exploitive system.” Yet, the radical student leaders were for the most part “coming from the ranks of sociologists and English majors, not engineers” which made them the next “managers or well-paid professionals” in a few years. The problem of building “a revolutionary consciousness” thus developed into the dilemma of who was going to make the revolution, as “students did not suffice.” They were either “born into privilege or schooled to believe they were entitled to it . . . other forces were needed.” Calvert added, “I am not overflowing with optimism regarding the possibility of building such a movement.” In the midst of much confusion, in a little over two years, the SDS would fracture, with all the factions claiming to be the “self-appointed vanguards” of the revolution.

During the early spring of 1967, many demonstrations occurred “protesting the presence of military, CIA, and Dow recruiters on campus.” Similarly to Brown
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University’s protest in January (against Dow Chemical Company recruiters), Columbia University SDS engaged in “physical battle with other students” as a result of their sit-ins against Marine recruiters. 793 A divided student population raised a core question for radical leaders: what if “the student movement was too small to remake America roots and branch?” 794 Many “full time activists” were already beginning to feel tired of the “often compulsive concern with ideology, the desperate attachment to militant tactics.” 795 Much frustration, pessimism and despair was in the air.

On April 15, anti-war rallies in San Francisco and New York City attracted a combined quarter of a million people. Organized by the “Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam,” the goal was to “emulate” the successful 1963 civil rights “March on Washington.” 796 Nonetheless, while the turn-out was favorable, the average “American citizen” was “left stunned” as an American flag burned in New York City, and “an unruly mob waving flags of the Vietcong” raised “large portraits of Ho Chi Minh.” 797 A large segment of the U.S. population was turned off; they saw the massive protest as a rally in “support for a Communist victory in Vietnam.” 798 The anti-war demonstrators seemed traitorous as they burned their draft cards and screamed hysterically from loudspeakers in support of the “Communist aggressors.” 799 Moreover, a planned “nationwide student strike” was aborted as factionalism, involving continuous “individual power plays for the claim of leadership,” proved too much to overcome. 800 The competing organizations included “several Communist splinter new left and “peace” groups.” 801

On May 2, twenty-six Black Panther members walked into the California State Legislature in Sacramento “carrying loaded guns” to protest the proposed “Mulford Bill” and to read a political statement. 802 The bill repealed the law that “permitted citizens to carry loaded weapons in public places so long as the weapons were openly displayed.” 803 Indeed, the Mulford law, “tagged the ‘Panther Bill,’” was passed in order to eliminate the
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Black Panther Police Patrols.\textsuperscript{804} This occurrence put the Panthers into the spotlight, attracting many recruits but also the attention of the FBI (who on September 8, 1968 called the Black Panthers “the greatest threat to the internal security of the country.”).\textsuperscript{805}

One of the defining myths of the Sixties has been to call the summer of 1967 the “Summer of Love,” because for most of the country it was more like the “Summer of Discontent.”\textsuperscript{806} The expression itself pertained to how around 75,000 young people came to the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco to experience/join the fast-emerging hippie counter-culture community that (especially since the “First Human Be-In” gathering in January) was now very much in the public awareness.\textsuperscript{807} In fact, the fourth most popular song at the time in the U.S. (and number one in the United Kingdom and most of Europe) was “San Francisco (Be Sure to Wear Flowers in Your Hair),” a Scott McKenzie song that meant to profit from the sensationalized “Summer of Love” hippie phenomenon.\textsuperscript{808} While the “Summer of Love” did prove successful in popularizing the alternative lifestyle to the nation’s youth (characterized by long hair, brightly colored clothes, communal living, free sex, psychedelic drug use, and the anti-war belief in peace and love), by the fall of 1967, increased incidents of crime, hard drugs, health/hygiene issues, police hassles, and lost runaway minors begging for money signaled a change for the worse for even the hippie movement.\textsuperscript{809} Overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of young people searching for a utopian community, “vibes” quickly turned negative as “chaos, poverty, and violence” began to dominate “much of the scene” (not only in San Francisco, but in other hippie enclaves as well.)\textsuperscript{810} Symbolic of the shift away from its original vision of psychic-spiritual exploration/transformation and creativity, some hippies in San Francisco (lead by the Diggers) proclaimed their own death on October 6, 1967, with the “Death of Hip” ceremony.\textsuperscript{811} Hundreds of “flower folk” celebrated by burning a coffin labeled the “Summer of Love,” acknowledging that the overexposure by the mass media had
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transformed their counter-culture “into something more sinister than ‘flower power.’” 812

In reality, however, the change away from peaceful protest had been underway for many participants even before the “Summer of Love.” At the same time, the Diggers, who believed that people should have complete freedom to “act according to their consciences,” were distraught at how new members of the counter-culture were boxing themselves into ready-made stereotypic behavior. 814 For them, “personal authenticity and fidelity to inner directives and impulses” were of paramount importance; in other words, what was important was to be a “free man,” in whichever form it took. 815 The Diggers wrote on the day of the death march, “Do not be created. This is your land, your city. No one can portion it out to you. The H/Ashbury was portioned to us by Media-Police and the tourists came to the Zoo to see the captive animals and we growled fiercely behind the bars we accepted and now we are no longer hippies and never were and the City is ours to create from, to be in. It is our tool, part of the first creation which the FREE MAN creates his new world from.” 816 Meanwhile, Time Magazine ran a cover story entitled, “The Hippies: The Philosophy of a Subculture,” in which it described the guidelines for being a hippie: “Do your own thing, wherever you have to do and whenever you want.” 817 Unbeknownst to most was how this attitude could and would lead some to justify violence. Two extreme examples that illustrate this point, were the brutal murders (by “a 26-year-old Black Nationalist”) in October of 1967 of two young hippies (Linda and Groovy) in New York City after a “wild acid party,” and the murder spree committed by the Manson family in August of 1969. 818 In the October 30, 1967 issue of Newsweek magazine, an article entitled “Trouble in Hippieland” declared that most flower children were “seriously disturbed youngsters.” 819 As Professor of Sociology Lewis Yablonsky wrote in late 1967, “The popular image of the loving ‘flower children’ projected and ‘sold’ by America’s mass
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media was a gross misconception and distortion of the truth.”

Continued Yablonsky, the focus of the mass media from “love-ins and gay happy flower-children” to “violence and death” belied the fact that both “have always been part of the scene since the inception of the Movement.”

Even during the “Summer of Love,” some of the flower children were already “toughening up.” Perhaps this was because the Diggers were influenced by the Black Panthers when they helped with the printing of the first two issues of the Black Panther Party newspaper. Either way, the reality was that the Haight-Ashbury district bordered the Fillmore (the black ghetto of San Francisco), and the word was out “that some Diggers in New York and San Francisco carry guns – and intend to use them.”

In June, in an incident that showed how large the chasm was between political and cultural radicals, a group of Diggers drove from California to Michigan to disrupt an SDS conference called “Back to the Drawing Boards.” The assemblage consisted of mostly a couple of hundred SDS alumni, the “old guard,” exactly five years since Port Huron. They were there to try to figure out what they wanted to do, since most were no longer in school, to get into “electoral politics” or create some sort of “post-student organization.”

While Tom Hayden was giving the opening speech, a mixture of “militant rhetoric and reform goals,” the Diggers interrupted and began their madness. First, Emmett Grogan ripped a “fat guy from his seat and forcibly led him outside.” Another Digger, called Hun, jumped onto the speaker’s platform and “pushed Hayden out of his way” and began a “ramble-rap” that included how SDS should not organize the schools but “burn them down” and urging people to “drop out of the system.” Afterwards, a third Digger called Billy Landout walked over and sat onto the speakers’ table and began to play his flute while in a lotus position. After a long debate ensued between the two groups, on the topic of what was the best way to change things, Grogan went crazy, “knocking down girls, punching cats in the face, slapping the older SDSers left and right and all over the fucking place, screaming
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that they were all ‘Cowardly ugly.’” Continuing, he screamed, “Faggots! Fags! Take off your ties; they are chains around your necks. You haven’t got the balls to go mad. You’re gonna make a revolution? You’ll piss in your pants when the violence erupts. You, spade – you’re a nigger, what are you doing here? Your people need you. There’s a war on. They got fuckin’ concentration camps ready; the world’s going to end any day.” Grogan proudly wrote sometime afterwards, “The Diggers are an avant-garde gang of a new kind of status-free people! Basically young, hip, ageless, street-wise-savvy, ballsy, macho, righteous, with chutzpah, flexible in that we can do almost everything to the degree that we are capable of doing anything, resourceful, beautiful, courageous heroes of history.”

However, Bob Ross, an ex-SDSer, disagreed, and yelled at Grogan during the encounter, “If the CIA wanted to disrupt this meeting, they couldn’t have done it any better than by sending you.” Although the Diggers left the next day, the conference “never gathered momentum, never broke out of the Diggers’ gravitational field.” Nonetheless, the whole episode showed how the new left had drifted too far away from “conventional ideas of legitimate authority” and was now in danger of being “out of control.” The Diggers, it was said, “reflected the anti-leader countercultural mood that had taken over SDS,” and with no clear authority principle to mobilize against the Diggers’ takeover, it left the Diggers to do what they wanted. As more members of the new left thought the concept of leadership to be illegitimate, and the leaders themselves denied being leaders, the SDS and other student organizations began the process of dissolution (well before 1969/1970).

As the “Summer of Love” wore on, hippie enclaves began even more to express the volatile energies surrounding them from the outside world. With black militants shouting “black power” and the new left screaming “out now.” Newsweek magazine began referring to the summer as the “Summer of Discontent.” “Desperation and bravado . . . rippled through radical circles across the country” as various activists threatened to “firebomb” and use tactics like “cutting power lines.” After white racists shot at several black homes in Alabama, SNCC chairman H. Rap Brown said “We will no longer sit back and let black people be killed. . . . We are calling on full retaliation.” SDS President Carl Oglesby said
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more had to be done as the anti-war movement was becoming a “wilderness of warmed-over speeches and increasingly irrelevant demonstrations.” As if in response, the “National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (Mobe)” announced “Stop the Draft Week” for October with the aim to “confront the war makers” to disrupt the war machine.

Then SDS old guard Tom Hayden called for “a legion of ‘urban guerrillas’ to change America,” so to create a “strategy of confrontation and disruption” that would “raise the internal cost” to such a high level that those decision-makers will have to get out of Vietnam. Gitlin of the SDS wrote of this period that it was the “end of the Movement and the beginning of revolution,” and now it was time to “wear a flower in your gun belt.”

As the “season of rage” arrived, and especially after the summer of riots ended, black militancy would hold “the new left in thrall.” During the month of June, and just as the “Summer of Love” was beginning in San Francisco, race riots erupted in Atlanta, Boston, Buffalo, Cincinnati, and in Tampa, Florida. In July, in what was referred to by now as the “long hot summer,” there were riots in Birmingham, Chicago, Detroit, Michigan, New York, Newark, New Jersey, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Britain, Conn., Rochester, N.Y., and in Plainfield, New Jersey. Of the 159 race riots that took place in 1967, the two most serious were in Newark, New Jersey, and Detroit, Michigan. The black rebellion in Newark occurred between July 12 and July 17, leaving 26 dead, 725 people injured, nearly 1,500 arrested, and property damage exceeding $10 million. Detroit, on the other hand, experienced rioting from July 23 to July 29 resulting in 43 dead, 467 injured, over 7,200 arrests, and more than 2,000 buildings destroyed with Army troops needed to end the violence. With black power leading the Movement ever deeper into violence, white radicals talked of meeting the challenge of doing “whatever it takes.” However, many activists were not so optimistic about their ability to meet the problem of increased violent escalation, as their numbers were too few, and many would not partake in.
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this type of “risk-taking.”\textsuperscript{849} As a result, gloomy articles already appeared in 1967 reflecting this concern of a dead end. The \textit{New York Review of Books} stated, “To be white and a radical in America this summer is to see horror and feel impotence.”\textsuperscript{850} In another publication, Berkeley radical Frank Bardacke agreed, writing, “Despair became a cliché among young white radicals,” many of which increasingly talked of “political impotence.”\textsuperscript{851} Finally, Herbert Marcuse in his “One-Dimensional Man” (though published three years earlier) discouragingly wrote about the idea of revolution, stating that the “working class was neutered by material goods and technology,” and that a great radical change, though “deeply necessary,” might be “impossible.”\textsuperscript{852} If there was any doubt of there being a relationship between black power radicals and ghetto uprisings, it ended with the Cambridge, Maryland riots in August. Right before the rebellion broke out, new SNCC chair H. Rap Brown told a crowd to “Burn this town down,” and when talking about whites, to “Don’t love him to death, shoot him to death.”\textsuperscript{853} At the same time, a black nationalist writer and activist named Amiri Baraka (formerly known as LeRoi Jones) urged blacks to “smash the windows . . . take the shit you want. Take their lives if need be.”\textsuperscript{854}

By September, the new left withdrew into a mode of “self-rectification,” as political alliances between black and white radicals continued to be tentative.\textsuperscript{855} At the same time, black nationalists, ever more strongly, argued that since blacks had been “oppressed as a caste,” they now needed to articulate their oppression in terms of their own racial experiences.\textsuperscript{856} Thus, identity politics became a major concern for black radicals, who forcefully pushed their own agendas to the fore. During the Labor Day weekend, things turned chaotic at the “National Conference for New Politics” in Chicago, as three hundred blacks (out of approximately three thousand activists) won every demand for all the convention resolutions passed because of “white guilt.”\textsuperscript{857} A former SDS president wrote that after the summer riots, “there was no chance for a genuine alliance of equals” between black and white radicals.\textsuperscript{858} On one hand, white radicals needed acceptance and forgiveness as a result of collective guilt for the past and present treatment of people of
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color by whites, and on the other hand, third world guerrilla units from all around the world were now viewed as the vanguard of the revolution, and in America that meant following black power groups (and soon Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American, and other groups). White revolutionaries, like those in the ghetto riots, were inspired in part by the Black Panthers, who refused to be scared and “carried guns, following the police” and like SNCC had abandoned non-violence. Thus, for white revolutionaries to be taken serious by blacks, they too had to follow this same path of insisting of their own “right to defend themselves.” With “conventional channels” seemingly blocked, many turned their faith to “powers of the will,” believing that perhaps with the right amount of “sheer audacity,” the Movement could “bull” its way “past the apparent obstacles.” During this time of desperate futility, the new left began to toy with the idea of forming “small bands of revolutionaries” that would act as “the ‘small motor’ that sets the ‘big motor’ of the masses in motion.” The focus increasingly fixated on (“at least symbolically”) on the importance on acquiring “the right guerrilla boots than to debate the right book.” Meaning, as Fidel Castro had said, “The duty of the revolutionary is to make the revolution.” While the Movement against the war had grown tremendously over the past two years, it seemed “ineffectual,” and even hippies looked “scared, lonely, and frantic,” with many “playing with guns as a way to forget their own hopelessness.” Not surprisingly, imitating Black Power groups as usual, the SDS for the first time, in September, started calling the authorities “pigs” in their New Left Notes newspaper. With white revolutionaries talking increasingly of sabotage and “running guns to the ghetto,” some members of SDS’s old guard called it a “complete fantasy” of those who “could not admit that we actually had nothing to offer the people in Detroit.” Moreover, the whole “nonsense” made it clear that the serious, constructive SDS-style community organizing of the past was at a “dead end.”
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Meanwhile, at the “Death of the Hippie” mock funeral on October 6, a sign was put up that said, “Stay where you are! Bring the revolution to where you live.” The message alluded to the overexposure of Haight-Ashbury and other bohemian places that reached their “creative peak before people anywhere else were able to learn what was going on,” before the summer of 1967. Following a trend that began during the over-attended “Summer of Love,” Haight-Ashbury within a year was referred to as a “violent, animalized slum, awash with hard-drug pushers, old junkies and . . . disillusioned young runaways who hadn’t gotten the word before they left home that this was no longer the ‘love capital of the world,’ and who still felt obliged, therefore, to wander the streets trying sadly to generate something colorful, or at least suitably eccentric.” During the fall of 1967 the New York Times proclaimed in their headline story that “Love Is Dead,” and that “the hippie movement is over,” as hippie stories faded first into “the back pages,” and then “out of the public eye altogether.” Incredibly, while the established media proclaimed the hippie movement dead (a huge aspect of the Sixties era), “hip communes of every genre imaginable were silently cropping out the earth by the hundreds” during the late 1960s.

Nonetheless, the “back to the land” exodus from places like the Haight-Ashbury symbolized for some that “many of the grander utopian visions of the counterculture had given way to smaller dreams,” implying that this exodus reflected a sort of a downgrading from the hope to change/turn on the world. Perhaps another indicator was that the hippie movement increasingly turned towards a philosophy of “doom-ridden, claustrophobic, paranoiac, occult” beliefs of avoiding the “apocalypse,” and being one of God’s chosen few who would start the world again. Unfortunately, most communes did not survive for more than one year; instead, most people wandered from one to another “searching for just the right one.”

By October of 1967 it wasn’t only the hippies who spoke in the language of the apocalypse, but a large part of the overall movement. It was at this time that “resistance became the official watchword of the anti-war movement,” as the urge for confrontation
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arose from the steadily growing “militant sector” with the “desperate feeling of having exhausted the procedures of conventional politics.” 877 The “rhetoric of showdown,” in which the state would smash the Movement, or vice-versa, was heard everywhere. 878 There was talk of “impending doom” or “salvation,” and a “shootout,” a “faceoff,” with “heroism, tragedy, and cataclysm.” 879 Moreover, with the student politicos and the counter-culture beginning to intersect, convictions became more dramatized and thus more prone to mood swings. Borrowing from the hippies, judging the success of individual political actions was now based on whether or not they made one “feel good” (“highs”), and conversely, “not so good” (“bummers”). 880 However, this type of appraisal of anti-wars achievements, based on subjective perceptions, often led to irrational over-emotionalism that included both an extreme fury against the war when the protest was deemed a failure, and a “frantic joy” in being part of something that was based on “the mirage of ‘the revolution,’” if successful. 881 Overall, there was already a fear that the prophesied world changes would not be delivered, and that the promised beginning of world harmony, or at least radical changes within society, would go unfulfilled. 882 There was a sense that “everything could be lost,” or “everything could be gained,” and as Jim Morison of the Doors sang; during the moment of truth, the end was always near. 883

In October, on the Lower East Side of New York City, a new group emerged called the “Up Against the Wall, Motherfucker,” taken from a line in a poem by black nationalist LeRoi Jones. 884 The group’s theoretical inspiration was part “European anarchism” and part “Marxism of the Frankfurt School,” the most famous representative of which was Herbert Marcuse. 885 For them, the core idea was to form affinity groups, a “street gang with an analysis,” whose purpose was to function as “fighting units in the midst of riots” and hopefully as the actual “armed cadres” when the revolution broke out. 886 They were more aggressive and hostile than the Diggers, who learned martial arts and “urged hippies to interfere with police (already “pigs”) trying to make busts.” 887 The Motherfuckers, like the Diggers, “held milky student politics in contempt,” but went further in disrupting them;
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they joined them and became the Lower East Side chapter of the SDS (as “no applicants for an SDS charter were ever refused”). In other instances of making chaos, they “ barged into the office of underground papers” and give orders on how things should be, and what they needed. Contrary to the myth of everyone working together harmoniously within the Movement, they successfully intimidated the underground newspaper *The Rat*, which allowed the Motherfuckers to lay out several of their own full-page advertisements calling for “Armed Love,” their slogan.

Columbia University, in October, started a new phase in movement tactics, changing from “overnight occupation of buildings to permanent occupation, from mill-ins to the creation of revolutionary committees, from symbolic civil disobedience, to barricaded resistance.” Other campuses not only soon followed, but surpassed them with even more militant strategies. Tom Hayden predicted that soon students will “threaten the destruction of buildings” and make “raids on the offices of professors doing weapons research.” Indeed, during the fall, the anti-Dow demonstrations at Columbia, and elsewhere, turned increasingly militant against their universities’ involvement with military agencies such as the “Institute for Defense Analyses.” University affiliations with the U.S. Department of Defense were not know to the public until Columbia SDS member Bob Feldman discovered documents in the International Law Library in March of 1967. This connection between the schools and the military became the central focus for SDS, during the academic school year of 1967-1968, opposing imperialism and the “military-industrial complex” that ran their schools. The slogan, “Bringing the war home,” became a dominant idea (a full two years before it is normally recognized as having come to the fore) as 300 students imprisoned a recruiter from Dow Chemical (a manufacturer of napalm for use in Vietnam) for several hours at the University of Wisconsin. It was this encounter that started large demonstrations against the military and Dow recruiters at forty
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campuses. Nearly everywhere, students fought back. In Wisconsin, thousands of students surrounded the police and “freed the demonstrators from their grip.” They “let the air out of paddy-wagon tires” and threw bricks and rocks, “sending seven policemen to the hospital along with sixty-five students.”

In Oakland, California from October 16-20, 1967 the “Stop the Draft Week” resulted in major clashes at the military induction center after organizers could not agree on which tactics to use in order to shut it down. On the first day, there were peaceful pickets, the returning of draft cards by registrants to the Justice Department (throughout the country), and pacifist types who sat in the doorway and “allowed themselves to be peaceably arrested.” When these non-violent “conventional civil rights tactics” seemed to have not succeeded in doing anything, the strategy led by militants turned to hit-and-run skirmishes with the police after they blocked the arrival of busloads of inductees. Then a back-and-forth battle commenced with cops attacking demonstrators with “clubs, tear gas, boots,” and protesters retaliating by throwing “cans, bottles, and smoke bombs.” When the police periodically “pulled back to redeploy,” the crowds would retake the intersections and stop traffic. Before long, the protesters began to push parked cars into the streets, disabling them by “disconnecting their distributors” and letting the air out of their tires by puncturing them. Moreover, anything else that could be moved was hauled into the streets, for example, “benches, newspaper racks, parking meters, garbage cans, trees in concrete pots.” Nonetheless, not everyone was impressed, as some demonstrators were put off by all the violence. For instance, according to the San Francisco Chronicle, a “bearded youth” yelled out at the people dragging a car into the street, saying, “Don’t you understand you’re defeating the whole movement? You’re going to kill us with the public!” Blacks from the Oakland ghettos also scorned the actions, as they were leery of the “‘white’ confrontation tactics” that would lead them into a bloody showdown with the local police “with whom they were already well acquainted.”
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movement failed to “enlist blacks on a mass basis” (as they had hoped and planned for), as African-Americans ended up having their own separate protest rally that avoided confrontation.\footnote{Ibid.}

By 1967, a declaration on the part of many in the anti-war movement had stated openly their aim to confront the Selective Service System, announcing that they had gone beyond the “We Won’t Go” pronouncements to “forcing an immediate confrontation by practicing total noncooperation with the military establishment.”\footnote{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 196.} However, even radicals were still naïve about how their actions could bring on such brutal repercussions from the authorities when they tried to shut down the “smooth running of the draft machine.”\footnote{Gitlin, The Sixties, 253.} Indeed, it was during the “Stop the Draft Week” that radical organizers, in reaction, began to call their actions “militant self-defense” and to call themselves “political outlaws” who now believed in “insurrection.”\footnote{Ibid., 252.} As protest shifted to resistance, it quickly became clear that the ramifications of this change in tactic would one day include somebody getting killed.\footnote{Ibid., 256.} Often beginning as cohesive units, though, these opponents of the draft soon degenerated in a chaotic fashion as “ordinary students without a signal from leaders” would begin to barricade intersections and liberate territory during protests.\footnote{Ibid., 252.} Moreover, the “surge in militancy” received added stimulus, according to former SDS old guard Todd Gitlin, from LSD and other drugs, as they began to emerge and “percolate throughout the New Left” at the same time, perhaps helping some to ward off fear during confrontations, and increase a sense of unreality.\footnote{Ibid., 253.} Then the “willful suspension of disbelief” became the “spiritual heart of the new militancy,” as “grandiose hopes” to “make a difference” from the beginning of the decade already at times “felt extreme” because of the pressure to succeed, and the “cost of failing.”\footnote{Ibid.} The suspending of disbelief was also a way to try to ward off the sense that the young anti-war generation was not “stretching to the outer rim” of what was possible to accomplish by itself in the U.S. without the help of older generations.\footnote{Ibid., 254.}
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“vision.”\footnote{Gitlin stated, “That is why perceptions could shift so radically from one moment to the next.”} But the Movement was still far from a unified community, as draft resister Michael Ferber pointed out in his speech in Boston: “To be honest we have to admit that we in the Resistance still disagree about a great many things, whether we speak out about them or not.”\footnote{Moreover, not being too optimistic either, he continued by saying the Movement must keep a level head in expectations and must not “dwell too much on the possibilities of an Apocalypse happening or a Utopian Society,” as the reality was that they consisted of “only a few hundred people with very little power.”} Towards the end of his address, Ferber despairingly told his audience, “But let us not be deceived. The sun will rise tomorrow as it does every day, and when we get out of bed the world will be in pretty much the same mess it is in today.”\footnote{Indeed, in October of 1967 two hopeful symbols of the 1960s rebellion were eliminated (one permanently). First, on October 10, guerrilla leader Che Guevara was first reported captured and killed, making the idea of revolution “more vulnerable than the Left wanted to think.”} Secondly, on October 28, Black Panther leader Huey Newton was wounded in a shootout with police and eventually went to prison for killing a police officer (his sentence was overturned and eventually released on August 5, 1970).\footnote{At the same time, on October 20, on the other end of the anti-war spectrum, Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarty announced his presidential candidacy to fight the “sense of political hopelessness” of many young people who were frustrated and discontent over the Vietnam War, and aspired to turn the anti-war students away from “extralegal if not illegal actions” and restore their faith in the political process.} Just a day after the “Stop the Draft Week” ended, on October 21, Mobe (the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam) organized the large “March on the Pentagon” demonstration in Washington D.C. as a culmination to these anti-draft protests.\footnote{While about 100,000 people rallied peacefully near the Lincoln Memorial, 35,000 marched afterwards to the steps of the Pentagon to do civil disobedience and as a}
“few dozen radicals attacked.”  

Here more than 2,500 Army troops protected the Pentagon as 650 people were arrested, including novelist Norman Mailer who wrote about his experiences in the book *The Armies of the Night.*  

Although the most famous image of the whole encounter was that of a hippie placing a flower in the rifle barrel of a soldier, it was called “the bloodiest clash in the nation’s capital since General MacArthur’s troops routed the Bonus Army at Anacostia Flats in 1932.” While radicals came to “fight,” the hippie counterculture attempted to “exorcise demons” by “chanting ‘Om’ and levitating the Pentagon.” The differing of intentions (and possibly the dilution in effectiveness) derived from the fact that, for the first time, a significant number of hippies “with long hair and fanciful garb” took part in an anti-war demonstration. Abbie Hoffman “donned beads and an Uncle Sam hat” as many showed off their humor by holding up signs such as “LBJ, Pull Out Now, Like Your Father Should Have Done.” At times the protest had a “festival atmosphere” where hippies yelled out to the troops chanting “Join us,” and “We love you,” or “We’d love to turn you on,” but around midnight “paratroopers of the 82nd Division replaced the MPs on the line” and attacked, clubbing “non-resisting girls” who were young enough to be their daughters. Many demonstrators afterwards felt that the “tactic of sitting down and taking the beating was getting old.” Adding that “Saturday night’s confrontation at the Pentagon was a last sit-down for us,” the question many asked during the coming days was “Why the passivity?” Even long-time pacifist David Dellinger announced that the “March on the Pentagon” was the end of peaceful protest: “This is the beginning of a new stage in the American peace movement in which the cutting edge becomes active resistance.” Jerry Rubin said that this Pentagon protests created a new type of protester who (like him) “didn’t feel at home in SDS” and “wasn’t a flower-power hippie, or a campus intellectual,” but instead was a “stoned politico . . . A street-fighting freak, a dropout, who carries a gun
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at his hip.” 936 Rubin had boasted during the “March on the Pentagon” that “crazy revolutionaries . . . are ready to burn the whole motherfucker down.” 937 When a newspaper reporter asked SNCC’s Rap Brown if he would bring a gun to the Pentagon protests, he had answered, “I’d be unwise to say I’m going with a gun because you all took my gun last time. I may bring a bomb, sucker.” 938 Hoffman and Rubin would soon emerge as part of the newly formed Yippies, who in some ways emulated the Diggers, but who were criticized by their forerunners as “fraudulent” because of how they handled the media. The Diggers were not happy with the new group because they believed that they should remain anonymous to expose the media as deceitful, while “Abbie and Jerry wanted to go through the channels and use them for good ends and ‘take the theater to the enemy camp.’” 939 Nonetheless, the most effective groups in organizing mass protest in late 1967 remained Mobe and the SDS, both regrettably with “extremely fluid membership” and “virtually no national control over their membership’s behavior.” 940

By late October, the repressive policies of the U.S. government pushed ever more young men into open resistance (and others out of the country) as the Selective Service “recommended that local draft boards issue punitive reclassifications to unruly peace demonstrators,” and in early 1968 cancelled most draft deferments, making “noncooperation inescapable for large numbers of youths who opposed the war.” 941 As a result, a move to “more aggressive and clandestine actions against property” began, not only by young people, but from all walks of life. 942 On October 27, the “Baltimore Four” occupied the Selective Service Board in Baltimore and poured blood on the draft records. The members were religious activists that included two Roman Catholics (Phillip Berrigan, a priest, and artist Tom Lewis) and two Protestants (writer David Eberhardt and the Rev. James L. Mengel). 943 Upping the ante in taking radical steps to bring attention to the anti-war effort, they performed the sacrificial, blood-pouring protest as a statement that the U.S. forces had “killed and maimed not only humans, but animals and vegetation” throughout Indochina. 944 Six months later, while Berrigan was out on bail, he repeated the protest, this
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time with his Jesuit brother Daniel and seven others, later known as the “Catonsville Nine.” This time, using homemade napalm, they walked into a draft board in Maryland and after removing 600 draft records (and the files of Dow Chemical and General Electric), they burnt them in an empty lot outside of the building.\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 292.} Afterwards the following statement was issued: “We confront the Roman Catholic Church, other Christian bodies, and the synagogues of America with their silence and cowardice in the face of our country’s crimes. We are convinced that the religious bureaucracy in this country is racist, is an accomplice in this war, and is hostile to the poor.”\footnote{Nepstad, \textit{Religion and War Resistance in the Plowshares Movement}, 48.}

Protests continued during the latter part of autumn. From November 4-9, 1967, demonstrations again erupted at the University of Wisconsin against Dow Chemical and against the CIA for its alleged war crimes. The Student Life and Interest Committee (SLIC) formally requested that the use of UWM facilities by both Dow and CIA, in their recruitment efforts, be denied.\footnote{“Beginnings, ‘Bitch-Ins,’ and Dow Chemical, 1966-1968,” Vietnam War Protests at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee Libraries: Archives Dept., \url{http://guides.library.uwm.edu/content.php?pid=85020&sid=633106}. Accessed April 8, 2013.} Despite years of angry protests, Dow continued its manufacture of the napalm B compound (even as all other manufactures discontinued their production), frustrating many at the slow pace of change. Regardless of the negative publicity and harassment, Dow stated that “its first obligation was to the government” as the U.S. continued to drop napalm on the North Vietnamese until 1973.\footnote{“Protesting Napalm,” \textit{Time Magazine}, January 5, 1968, \url{http://www2.vcdh.virginia.edu/PVCC/mbase/docs/napalm.html}. Accessed April 8, 2013.} In New York City, on November 14, the SDS disrupted a peaceful demonstration of 5,000 protesters by attacking the limousines of foreign policy elites gathering to hear the Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a banquet. The militant action involved “hootings, throwing bottles, bags of paint and cow’s blood,” and continued as they “dumped trash baskets, [while] dented fancy cars swarmed through intersections” and handed out leaflets saying “the Revolution Begins at 5:30”\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 254.} In early December, again in New York City, in an effort to “seal off the induction center,” two clashing philosophies battled for supremacy. The first one tried to win the soldiers over to the anti-war side by chanting “Cross the lines and join us” and “We love you,” and sang “Yellow Submarine” while sticking flowers in the barrels of their
rifles. The second strategy consisted of “staying loose in the streets,” to taunt and elude the “armed antagonists,” while turning up the heat by fighting back.

By the end of 1967, the “relative optimism and hope” felt during the summer of 1965 had turned to “crisis and gloom,” according to many major newspapers. Anti-war protesters who hounded President Johnson “at his every public appearance” were bitter and frustrated by their inability to impel their government towards ending the war, and thus began to move from protest to resistance. On the other hand, the average person was perturbed by all the disturbances and disorder and the violent, militant direction symbolized by some protesters marching with the “black flag of anarchy, the red flag of revolt of revolution, to the flags of enemies engaged in killing young Americans – the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong.” Discouragingly for the anti-war movement, 60 percent of all the U.S. citizens still “favored increasing military pressure against the enemy,” while 70 percent disliked anti-war demonstrations and felt that they “were acts of disloyalty and three-quarters stating that protests only encouraged the Communists.”

The year 1968 continued the same trend of “periods of optimism followed by periods of despair and disillusion.” At times, movement leaders felt that their anti-war message was “penetrating mainstream America” and that “the political tide was turning.” Nonetheless, these exhilarating moments were too often “followed by tragedy, defeat, and pessimism.” Contrary to the Sixties myth of unity, optimism and non-violence, from the fall of 1967 to the end of 1969 America continually “reeled from its tragedies, its disillusionments, and its internal rifts.” Meanwhile, by 1968, both the new left student movement and the African-American movement for social justice had “lost faith in the American political and judicial system” and now fully embraced a revolutionary political stance, saying “yes to revolt.” Obsessed with passion, desperation often spoke louder than logic as the Movement was in a “combat mood” and learned to swallow its fear. Nevertheless, there was a sharp line between the planners of the confrontations and those “troops” who would have to do the sacrificing when facing the
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police or the National Guard. SDS, the “most visible white radical organization,” had gone over to “the other side” and embraced revolutionary ideology. Young anti-war protesters were now rebelling not only against their government’s policies in Vietnam, but against their society’s established values as the “lines separating the anti-war movement and the hippie counter-culture had blurred.” Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, seeing this tendency, started the Yippies (Youth International Party) on December 31, 1967. It was an organization dedicated to “convincing turned-on youth that only through radical politics would the freedoms inherent in sex and drugs and rock in roll be fully realized.”

However, mainstream media continued to paint the counterculture in ever more sinister tones, with the Reader’s Digest (with 28 million readers) writing in early 1968 of the dark side of the hippie movement, emphasizing “murder, rape, disease, and suicide” and claiming that even the leaders of the hippie movement said that “the Movement has gone sour” (once again, way before Altamont in December 1969).

On January 5, 1968 Time magazine’s cover story was “Protesting Napalm,” which dealt with the continued anti-war grievance on the use of the chemical. In the article, it quoted C. B. Cowan, the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of All People Against War, on why they were protesting against Dow Chemical: “The U.S. is using napalm as a tactical weapon against personnel including non-participants in the war such as Vietnamese women and children, and Dow is the basic manufacturer of napalm. Dow is no more guilty than other manufacturers of goods, but napalm is the best weapon that exemplifies the U.S.’s immoral actions, and napalm is the best subject that lends itself to controversy about the war.” However, after years of protesting Dow and “begging their elected leaders to take mercy on the people of Vietnam,” ever increasing numbers of protesters began to “rethink the question of violence versus non-violence,” with some even being to flirt with the idea of terrorism. The growing desperation on the part of the anti-war movement arose as a result of its failure to influence government to stop the war, and the bitterness led to growing violence throughout the world, with paralyzing student strikes in Brazil.
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Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and West Germany.\textsuperscript{969} The rise of the revolutionary student movement, with its militant hostility towards established authority and institutions, did not proceed without difficulty, however, as it lacked discipline, which it sacrificed “in exchange for spontaneity and political autonomy.”\textsuperscript{970} Particularly in organizations such as the SDS, “party discipline” disappeared with the surge in “participatory style of decision-making,” which undermined its “leadership structure.”\textsuperscript{971} According to the Task Force Report on violence, organizational leadership for many anti-war organizations by 1968 had been reduced to “applying for permits, holding press conferences, announcing the time and place of demonstrations, and mailing appeals for funds”; furthermore, any sort of ideology had been subordinated to a collation of tactics.\textsuperscript{972} On the other hand, groups that did have “long-range purposes” and “articulated leftist ideologies” were usually not very influential and had to merge (at least on paper) with larger organizations and/or coalitions (such as the National Mobilization Committee and the Student Mobilization Committee) in order to “get their names associated with large and dramatic rallies.”\textsuperscript{973} As far as anti-war coordinating coalitions went, they in fact had no real membership at all; they were a “coalition of ‘leaders’ from various smaller groups” who would clash with one another “on a number of fundamental points,” but were willing to come together in the same demonstration or protest march.\textsuperscript{974} The lack of agreement within the overall movement forfeited the control over those who were bent on provoking the greatest amount of violence.\textsuperscript{975}

By February 1968, with the rise of street battles, “the rank-and file devotees to non-violence were defecting in droves.”\textsuperscript{976} On February 8, violence on the part of students resulted in death at the South Carolina State University in Orangeburg. After trying to desegregate a downtown Orangeburg bowling alley, the youth lit a large bonfire at the edge of campus.\textsuperscript{977} When firemen moved in to put out the fire, students threw a banister, wounding a highway trooper.\textsuperscript{978} Soon afterwards the police fired upon the students, killing
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three and wounding thirty-three others.\textsuperscript{979} Elsewhere, the police in Haight-Ashbury were now “routinely macing and clubbing” hippies, whose use of drugs perhaps “inflated the spirit of Armageddon,” and the “Summer of Love” of five months earlier was but a distant dream of a long ago paradise.\textsuperscript{980} However, it was the Viet Cong and North Vietnam launching of the “Tet Offensive,” on January 30 (and lasting throughout February), that most affected both the general public and the anti-war activists. The well-coordinated attack by Communist troops struck more than 100 towns and cities, by far the largest military offensive by either side up to that point in the war.\textsuperscript{981} Although the offensive was called a military defeat for the communists, it created a “credibility gap” among the public, who had been led to believe that the war was being won and that the enemy was incapable of launching such a massive effort.\textsuperscript{982} Some in the anti-war movement, such as Dennis Sweeney, became even more radicalized and adopted even more radical tactics to stop the war, including sabotage.\textsuperscript{983} In February, Sweeney and a few others in the Bay Area attacked and burned down an ROTC clubhouse with gasoline.\textsuperscript{984} At the same time, however, more young people suddenly turned to mainstream politics and joined the anti-war presidential campaign of Senator Eugene McCarthy for President (refuting the Sixties myth that working for the anti-war presidential campaign of Senator George McGovern in 1972 somehow symbolized the end of an era and the selling out of the revolution).\textsuperscript{985} McCarthy, who had criticized LBJ’s war throughout 1967, in November of that year announced his bid for the nomination. He also pessimistically spoke on the state of affairs, saying, “In 1960 we started to get America moving again. Today, eight years later, the fabric of the great achievement is unraveling.”\textsuperscript{986}

McCarthy’s supporters were not from the radical new left, but instead consisted of the more moderate liberal wing of the Movement.\textsuperscript{987} His idealistic “army of volunteers” was made up of students who might perhaps “romanticize popular revolutionaries such as Malcolm X or Che Guevara, but still remained optimistic about the nation.”\textsuperscript{988} While against the war and the draft, they were also against the anti-Americanism of the new left
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and “believed that America could be beautiful – if it would live up to its own principles.” Unlike the radicals of 1968, they still flashed the anti-war V sign while revolutionaries had moved on to clenching their fists. Moreover, to support a fashion that was called “Clean for Gene,” men with long hair or beards were “asked to see the free barber,” and females wearing miniskirts switched to “more traditional outfits” in order to present a more moderate image while campaigning door-to-door for McCarthy. Unlike radicals, they were willing to be “polite and patient” in order to work for change, with the “hairier ones” staying back at the campaign headquarters stuffing envelopes (again similar to the 1972 McGovern campaign).

On March 12, 1968 McCarthy came in a close second to President Johnson in the first presidential primary, in New Hampshire, signaling the possibility of defeating the president. As a result, four days later Senator Robert Kennedy entered the race, further dividing the anti-war movement; many saw him as a “stronger candidate than McCarthy,” causing many to switch allegiances. While McCarthy was much more radical then Kennedy in his “bold statements” about how he would “fire Secretary of State Rusk, Selective Service Director Hershey, and FBI Director Hoover,” Kennedy “seemed more radical” on his campaign trail as he went into ghettos and barrios and gave colorful speeches filled with “rhetorical flourishes.” As a result, RFK also attracted many movement people (including some from the new left) such as Cesar Chavez, Tom Hayden, Abbie Hoffman, John Lewis, Carl Oglesby, and Robert Scheer. Both candidates brought many alienated students “back into the traditional framework of American politics. That is, off the streets and into the electoral process.” Moreover, with the March 31 surprise announcement by President Johnson that he would not seek reelection, and furthermore, of his plan for halting “of bombing above the 20th parallel” in Vietnam (and the turning down of the military’s request for 206,000 more American troops), many anti-war leaders began to feel that they were finally having some effect. On the other hand, the optimism was cautious as many in the Movement began to worry about “how the news would affect the prospects for future demonstrations.” They wondered if the bombing pause signaled the beginning of the end of the war, or if it was “a trick to build the case for a subsequent
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Already a feeling that the “movement would collapse without the presence of a worsening military situation” immediately gained credence, as protests slackened after President Johnson’s March 31 speech, and as many young people continued their absorption with “straight” politics during the McCarthy and Kennedy campaigns. Even at such an early date, many felt despondent about the future, fearing that all could fall apart if the issues become less immediate and dramatic. Furthermore, many radicals scorned the enthusiasm and energy of those college protesters who joined the “Children’s Crusade” of the McCarthy campaign, which renewed at least temporarily “the traditional tendency of dissent to express itself through established channels,” versus their increasingly confrontational tactics (which once again showed that the Movement turning to McGovern in 1972 was not a mellowing of the anti-war movement or ending of the Sixties, as is so often portrayed).

Elsewhere in late March, combative impulses and disorganization reigned within the Movement. In Chicago, 6000 people showed up for a Yippie celebration of the spring equinox. Although the idea was for the attendees to “play with balloons” and yell “Yippie!” in unison, not everyone felt inclined to celebrate the “natural cycle of the seasons.” Some young people climbed onto the roof of the information booth to lead provocative chants such as “Long Hot Summer,” “Burn Baby Burn,” and “Up Against the Wall Mother Fucker.” Others “tore off the hands” from a clock, as two “cherry bombs” were thrown, inciting the police to charge into the crowd, “smashing people with nightsticks.” In Lexington, Kentucky, members of the Motherfuckers, at an SDS National Council meeting, showed off how aggressive and tough they were as “two of them held up a brick wrapped in gold foil,” while a third person “smashed it in half with a karate chop,” making it clear how they were “going to smash capitalism, smash the state, just like that.”

At a movement conference near Chicago, Tom Hayden and Rennie Davis presented their ideas on creating an “Election Year Offensive,” but couldn’t agree on what to do. An idea of not having “a national spectacle” such as the “Festival of Life” in Chicago was voted on in favor of a strategy of “creating local groups.” Nonetheless,
towards near the end of the gathering, to the dismay of the “straight left,” a bunch of Yippies (which included Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin) arrived to present their “Yippie platform” of “abolition of pay toilets” and other nonsense, putting the meeting into confusion and leaving it without a plan for the summer.\footnote{1006}{Ibid.} Then in Memphis, Martin Luther King’s last march, on March 28, ended in a violent riot as protesters threw Molotov cocktails at police, who opened fire on them. By the spring of 1968 it was difficult for even the leader of non-violence to prevent his demonstrators from smashing shop windows and fighting back (his attempt to lead a second march in Memphis, on April 3, ended with his murder at the Lorraine Motel, where he was staying).\footnote{1007}{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 362.} In spite of all the above, at the end of March, activists were ecstatic with President Johnson’s announcement that after bombing North Vietnam for over three years, there would be a “limited halt.”\footnote{1008}{Anderson, The Movement and the Sixties, 190.} Most people in the Movement felt that this was a positive step, and were optimistic that “peace would break out, perhaps later in 1968.”\footnote{1009}{Ibid.} McCarthy workers cheered on March 31, shouting, “We did it.”\footnote{1010}{Ibid.} Students left dorms and apartments at many college campuses, marching and chanting, “The hawk is dead” and singing “We have overcome.”\footnote{1011}{Ibid.} While it appeared that the Movement again was having an impact in changing America, and that the “spirit of the sixties seemed to be relit by the New Hampshire primary and LBJ’s dramatic announcement,” the “flickering” optimism faded quickly again with the assassination of Martin Luther King four days later.\footnote{1012}{Ibid., 190-191.}

The assassination of King on April 4, 1968, set off days of urban rebellion in over a hundred cities.\footnote{1013}{Ibid.}\footnote{1014}{Unger and Unger, The Times Were a Changin’, 9.} Riots exploded across America, with fires set, windows broken, Molotov cocktails and dynamite thrown, and a total of thirty-seven people killed\footnote{1015}{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 332.} His death led to a venting of frustration that turned into “an orgy of destruction.”\footnote{1016}{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 363.} Major riots occurred in Baltimore, Chicago, Kansas City, Missouri, Washington, D.C., and other cities, which contributed to the month of April of 1968 experiencing more disorders than the “entire year of 1967.”\footnote{1017}{Farber, The Age of Great Dreams, 209.} Black activist Julius Lester wrote afterwards, “We had a
dream and we are losing it. . . . In the beginning it was easy to maintain the dream . . . without the dream, there is no revolution.”

Stokely Carmichael added, “When white America killed Dr. King, she declared war on us.” As rioting swept the nation, activist Alex Rodriguez threatened, “White America killed Martin, and goddamit, you’re gonna pay for this.”

King’s death shocked the nation and marked another turning point in the Movement. Todd Gitlin proclaimed, “When he was murdered, it seemed that non-violence went to the grave with him, and the Movement was ‘free at last’ from restraint” (again, well before December of 1969). A few radicals felt that with King dead, “the Panthers and the other militants would have a clear field to lead the revolution.”

However, movement leaders such as Mexican American organizer Cesar Chavez still believed in non-violence and wrote a message to Mrs. King shortly after his death, saying, “It is my belief that much of the courage which we have found in our struggle for justice in the fields has had its roots in the example set by your husband and by those multitudes who followed his non-violent leadership.” Nonetheless, the SDS started “ripping signs and getting really out of hand,” trashing a jewelry store in New York; as one of its leaders, Bernardine Dohrn, said, they “really dug it.”

Dohrn further explained that after SDS members came back from a really “pissed off” demonstration of “black kids and white radicals,” they had “a long talk about urban guerrilla warfare and what had to be done now – by any means necessary.”

Despite victories in the political arena (Johnson quitting the presidential race and the campaigns of McCarthy and Kennedy), college students overall continued to grow increasingly more militant on campuses across the country in the spring of 1968, as one college after another erupted over mainly anti-war and racial issues. At Columbia University, on April 23, students began an occupation of buildings over the two issues of the university’s sponsorship of war-related research and its plans to build a gymnasium with a separate entrance for the ghetto.
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Students Afro-American Society activists charged toward Low Library after holding a rally. When they were “repulsed” by the “more conservative Students for a Free Campus,” the radicals marched to the proposed gym site, “tore down a fence and fought with police.” Next they seized Hamilton Hall, took a dean hostage, and proceeded to proclaim their demands. All was not unified, however, as black and white students argued, with black militants telling the white radicals in the middle of the night to “find their own building.” Forced out of Hamilton Hall, whites broke into Low Library, where they occupied school President Grayson Kirk’s office, at which point they sat at his desk, smoked his cigars, drank his sherry, searched through his files, and “urinated in a wastebasket.” During the next two days a thousand more students joined the protest, occupying three more buildings, barricading themselves inside, desecrating the symbols of authority, and smuggling “liberated” documents to the underground newspaper called The Rat. After a week of futile negotiations between the occupiers and the administration (mediated by an “Ad hoc faculty group”), police were ordered in on April 30. In some occupied buildings the students gave up peacefully, but in others they yelled “Up Against the Wall Mother-Fucker” and fought back as police entered and began to pound their heads, and drag or walk them outside into paddy wagons or ambulances with faces bleeding. In total, a hundred activists were injured and over 700 arrested, “a tenth of the student body.” Fortune magazine wrote that “the students were ‘acting out a revolution – not a protest, and not a rebellion, but an honest-to-God revolution.'” Barron business journal wrote about the students’ tactics, saying that they “represented the latest assault by a revolutionary movement which aims to seize first the universities and then the industries of America.” Many students agreeing with the above assessment realized during the Columbia rebellion that barricades were only the beginning of what they increasingly referred to as “bringing the war home.” Tom Hayden wrote that Columbia represented new tactics for the Movement, “from the overnight occupation of buildings to permanent occupations.” The goal turned to creating a large crisis that would be “too massive for
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police to handle.”1040 The purpose of protests for many radicals had by now turned to bringing about a “confrontation with authority.”1041 Hayden spoke of the Movement: “We are moving toward power – the power to stop the machine if it cannot be made to serve humane ends.”1042 That is why his stated his goal was to “create two, three, many Columbia’s.”1043 The radical vision involved expanded strikes nationwide, so that the “U.S. must either change or send its troops to occupy American campuses.”1044 The hope was that the student rebellion would spread to the cities and spark a broad revolution to bring down the system. On the other hand, according to a poll taken by Spectator magazine, while there was broad support for the aims of the occupation at Columbia, most were against the “tactics of the radicals.”1045 While three out of every four students wanted to end construction of the gym and all ties with the Institute for Defense Analysis, by the same margin, they denounced the “infringing the rights of other students by shutting down the university.”1046

Other incident around the country in April included thirteen Black Panthers (led by Eldridge Cleaver) ambushing an Oakland police car, resulting in the serious wounding of two police officers.1047 The impetus for the attack on the police was the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., two days before. The assault consisted of the Panthers firing off 157 shots; this was responsible for a shoot-out 90 minutes later that led to the death of Bobby Hutton (treasurer and first recruit to join the Black Panther Party in 1966). Cleaver finally admitted in 1980 that the Panther story of how they had reacted in self-defense was not true, and that their goal was to clear the streets of the Oakland police.1048 A few days afterwards, students at Trinity College held the board of trustees captive until their demands were met.1049 Then on April 26, a national student strike sponsored by the Student Mobilization Committee took place with up to a million college and high school students taking part.1050 Nonetheless, instead of seeing the large turn-out positively, those more radical in the Movement viewed the peaceful demonstrations with disdain. The SDS called
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the marchers “peace creeps” who were “losing wagers” on their hope that “normal politics might still matter.”

To them, any efforts at peaceful protest were to be looked upon as something that “had been done” and were now but “wilderness of warmed-over speeches and increasingly irrelevant demonstrations.”

The next day, April 27, nationwide protests continued, but this time with the goal of creating “mass disruptive actions” designed to “benefit the North Vietnamese enemy and the world Communist movement,” according to critics.

In Chicago (as part of these protests), a violent confrontation occurred at the anti-war march that would later be viewed as a “precursor to the police riots later that year at the Democratic Convention.”

There was already much confusion with Johnson dropping out of the presidential race; this in itself had almost killed plans to stage the much anticipated “Festival of Life” demonstrations in Chicago in August. Then, as a consequence of Mayor Daley’s “shoot to kill” orders after King’s death, and the attack on protesters on April 27, most people, including “rock stars and counterculture heroes” chose not to flock to the proposed festival, nearly cancelling it.

Although successful, the late April student strike ended in disagreement as a coalition of Communist Party and pacifist elements initiated a split within the SMC, breaking with the perspective of mass anti-war demonstrations; when they were unable to “capture the SMC,” they left the now badly divided anti-war organization.

Overall, during the spring semester, approximately 40,000 activists conducted over 200 demonstrations at over 100 campuses, some held in sympathy of Columbia.

Still, in May of 1968, the anti-war movement “struggled to maintain its pressure on the Johnson administration” to end the war, as the Movement was filled with strife. On one hand, most “moderate” movement people had continued to adopt a “wait-and-see attitude” ever since Johnson decided not to seek reelection and partially halted the bombing in Vietnam.

Radicals, on the contrary, were furious at the McCarthy and Kennedy campaigns for siphoning off many of their fellow activists, as they yelled, “The war is not
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over!" Tom Hayden confronted a McCarthy activist, asking, “Why are you a whore for McCarthy?” Other radicals declared that pacifists and liberals against the war should be “destroyed.” Yet radicals too began arguing among themselves, drifting increasingly into sectarianism. Anybody holding a contrary idea was denounced as a “revisionist” and called an enemy, in fact, became the “most vicious of enemies.” Antagonistic “name-calling” turned to hatred and then to “degenerate abuse” towards anyone who deviated from the party line. As many radicals became demoralized by the bickering, others turned to more violent methods to get their point across; for example, at Stanford University the new Naval ROTC building on campus was destroyed by an arson fire.

As mentioned earlier, on May 17, nine Catholic anti-war activists, called “The Catonsville Nine,” broke into the Catonsville, Maryland draft board, taking out 378 draft files into the parking lot and poured home-made napalm over them, and set them on fire (Philip Berrigan and Tom Lewis had previously poured blood on draft records as part of “The Baltimore Four”). From May 17 to 22 a much more violent “second round” of protests erupted at Columbia University. After the school suspended the radical leaders of the April protests, a second occupation of Hamilton Hall were the result. Flyers distributed by students asked: “Can an administration, which helps make weapons for Vietnam, steals people’s land and homes discipline anyone?” However, as the more radical among the protesters set fire to parts of the campus and “hurled bricks through windows and glass doors,” the administration wasted no time to crush this new revolt. Again, a thousand police officers, not “in the mood to be pushed around by rowdy college students” throwing bricks, rocks, and bottles at them, brutally confronted them. Two
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hundred students were arrested in “a bloody, wild fight.”\textsuperscript{1071} Afterwards, news reporters from the underground called Columbia University the new “Berkeley East,” and a sign that the revolution was spreading.\textsuperscript{1072} Student activists increasingly dressed in “work shirts and army surplus jackets,” and “read Mao’s mottos in his Little Red Book.”\textsuperscript{1073} Even some members of the SDS’s old guard had changed their opinion about violence, saying that it “could not be ignored as an option” anymore.\textsuperscript{1074} Nevertheless, the Movement could not rise above its confusion. The diversity of opinions created activity, but no clear idea on tactics or how to solve the “nation’s ills.”\textsuperscript{1075} Frustrated, some shouted “Revolution” or talked about violence, but knew that the police were stronger and better armed.\textsuperscript{1076}

On June 5, Robert Kennedy won a narrow victory against Eugene McCarthy in the California Democratic Party primary, but after addressing his supporters he was fatally shot, and died the next day. In his short speech he had called for an end to violence and division, saying, “We can start to work together. We are a great country, and a compassionate country. I intend to make that my basis for running.”\textsuperscript{1077} Before RFK was murdered, a growing part of the Movement was once again beginning to feel optimistic that it was “going to change America.”\textsuperscript{1078} Richard Goodwin, a speech writer for both RFK and JFK, wrote about how “the sixties came to an end in a Los Angeles hospital on June 6, 1968.”\textsuperscript{1079} To many more moderate activists, especially those who had joined the Movement during the early 1960s, RFK was the last hope.\textsuperscript{1080} Others more radical did not want to mourn a liberal.\textsuperscript{1081} Nonetheless, only eight weeks after the death of Martin Luther King, there was “a stunned, morbid silence.”\textsuperscript{1082} Hayden referred to “feelings of loss and despair and grim, grim days ahead.” Former SDS leader Carl Oglesby explained that after the murders of MLK and RFK, even more people turned to the talk of revolution as reform seemed to them “a dead-end street.”\textsuperscript{1083} The system had failed and “was even worse in terms of the opportunities for peaceful change.”\textsuperscript{1084} As far as any hope was presented by

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1071} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1072} Anderson, \textit{The Movement and the Sixties}, 200.
\textsuperscript{1073} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1074} Ibid., 201.
\textsuperscript{1075} Ibid., 202.
\textsuperscript{1076} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1077} Ibid., 206.
\textsuperscript{1078} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1079} Ibid., 207.
\textsuperscript{1080} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1081} Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 310.
\textsuperscript{1082} Anderson, \textit{The Movement and the Sixties}, 207.
\textsuperscript{1083} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1084} Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 311.
\end{flushleft}
McCarthy (the Movement’s last hope after the murder of RFK), while his momentum grew during the summer of 1968, his campaign ultimately faltered as he “was not up to the task.”  

The 1960s were fast becoming the decade of frustration, as Robert Kennedy had been seen by many as the one who was going to “relight the torch” of “magic and vision” that was put out by the murder of his brother in 1963. For activists, the 1960s seemed like a slow defeat of their dream to transforming America, “the assassinations of Kennedy in 1963, and King and Kennedy in 1968 were like stations in one protracted murder of hope.”  

It was said that the 1963 Kennedy assassination felt like the “tragedy of innocence,” in which “everything was possible,” by end of the decade flipping over to “nothing was” (once again showing that the end of the Sixties and hope did not happen magically at the end of the decade but was an ongoing process throughout the years).

As a consequence, the planned Chicago protest regaining some of its rationale and momentum, even though some movement leaders hinted of using “self-defense” and violent confrontation, while other organizers within the Mobe told demonstrators that they “would not be welcome unless they were willing to be non-violent.” The Yippie agenda, however, verged on the absurd with plans of “faking delegates cards, setting off smoke bombs in the convention hall, fucking in the parks and on the beaches, floating nude, a mass of flesh, in Lake Michigan; releasing greased pigs; planting Yippie agents in hotel and restaurant kitchens and drugging the delegates’ food; painting cars to look like taxis and kidnaping delegates to Wisconsin; getting female Yippies to pose as prostitutes and dose the delegates’ drinks with LSD; getting ‘hyper potent’ male Yippies to seduce the delegates’ wives, daughters and girlfriends (the great majority of delegates being male); walking the streets dressed as Vietcong; burning draft cards en masse with the flames spelling out “Beat Army.” The Yippies, however, were not just pointlessly instigating chaos; instead, they (like many in the Movement) were provoking the authorities as a calculation. The belief that the “movement cannot grow without repression” was by now quite popular. Jerry Rubin said, “The Left needs an attack from the Right and the
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Center. Life is theater, and we are the guerrillas attacking the shrines of authority, from the priests and the holy dollar to the two-party system.”

Later in June, the SDS held its annual national convention, which was increasingly fraught with disunity, as various groups of “Trotskyists, Communists, and Maoists – Marxist-Leninists of several kinds” joined the organization and fought for power. A further fragmentation involved black militants and activist women declaring their independence of white male radicals, “cutting sharply into the SDS leadership’s confidence and moral authority.” Meanwhile, those more influenced by the hippie culture “mocked the ‘square’ attitudes of SDS” and political radicals in general. At the convention, the Up Against the Wall Motherfuckers dressed in black, gave “outlandish anti-PL speeches,” and waved their “black flag of anarchism” as “straight SDSers” waved red flags. On the other hand, many SDSers “were thrilled with these new tough hippies” joining SDS. By the summer of 1968 the “hip-radical identity coalesced,” and so did rock throwing, the trashing of windows, and fighting back against the police and “Amerika.”

At the end of June, in support of the Paris insurrection, the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance held a rally in Berkeley in which barricades were put up by protesters for the first time. With signs of “two, three, many Vietnams, and “two, three, many Columbias,” bottles, rock, and bricks were thrown and bonfires lit before the police charged. The following night protests continued as someone threw a Molotov cocktail and thirty-one demonstrators were hospitalized along with a dozen police including a highway patrolman who had caught fire. As summer progressed, the new left had passed into seeing itself as having “outlaws identity,” as violence became ever more the “harsh currency of the twentieth century,” filled with assassinations, riots, and war. Movies such as 1967’s Bonnie and Clyde gave a romantic feel to “doomed killers” and “sudden death,” threatening to submerge the whole movement into violent and even
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terroristic behavior.\footnote{Ibid.} Violence of picking up stones or guns became the “movement’s fantasy life,” which was “endlessly talked about, feared, skirted, flirted with.”\footnote{Ibid.}

On August 23 the long-awaited movement showdown began in Chicago at the Democratic National Convention, lasting a week. The “mobilization” of 100,000 “revolutionary troops” fell incredibly short though.\footnote{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 366.} There were no more than 10,000 activists at one time in Chicago, and 5,000 of those came to see McCarthy arrive on August 25, the day before the official start of the convention.\footnote{Anderson, The Movement and the Sixties, 215.} Moreover, according to the “Walker Report,” the remaining 5000 young people were from the Chicago area, and only 500 came from out of town, resulting in a major failure for the Movement (interestingly, when the same low turnout occurred at the Miami Republican National Convention in 1972, it was portrayed as an example of the Movement fading or as a further example of the end of the Sixties).\footnote{Bloom and Breines, “Takin’ It to the Streets,” 366.} \footnote{Anderson, The Movement and the Sixties, 215.}

The reasons for the disappointing turn of events in Chicago included both the dissension between those organizing the protests (and other groups within the Movement) and people warning that the “Festival of Life” could end up as the “Festival of Blood.”\footnote{Gitlin, The Sixties, 324.} As far as the latter point, Mobe, the main co-organizers, worried throughout the summer that some of the Movement leaders (such as Tom Hayden and Rennie Davis) actually wanted violence, and thus “made little effort to bring thousands to Chicago until a month beforehand, and by then it was too late.”\footnote{Ibid., 323-324.} Moreover, underground magazines such as Chicago’s \textit{Seed} turned against the Yippie “Festival of Life,” telling people not to come because “many people are into confrontation,” including the authorities.\footnote{Ibid., 324.} The \textit{Express Times} wrote, “If you’re going to Chicago, be sure to wear some armor in your hair,” featuring a photo of a hippie wearing a hardhat.\footnote{Ibid.} Then, just a day before the first official Yippie protest, a Sioux teenager was killed by Chicago police near where the Festival of Life was to be held.\footnote{Ibid., 325.} Also, McCarthy himself urged his followers to stay at home, as he sensed the threat of bloodshed, and other liberal moderates began to lose interest in him.
anyway for having little chance of winning. Nonetheless, not to be overlooked was the lack of unity in the Movement, which continued to be divided into factions that bickered with each other. The Chicago chapter of the SDS announced “that it was not interested in demonstrating with liberals and did not want to be aligned with the ‘McCarthy kids.’” Likewise, the McCarty people made an effort to keep away from the radicals and held their own peaceful protests. Many young people who came to Chicago wanted change, but were not dedicated revolutionaries. They still believed that the system could be salvaged, but there was a sense that “the Chicago convention was its last chance.” Others who came thought that violence in the end might be the only way. The Chicago Area Draft Resisters stated that they were “too individual” to partake in any mass mobilizations. As far as blacks went, only a few members of the “Poor People’s Campaign” came to Chicago, but they held their own march; most African-Americans “showed little interest in what they called ‘white man’s politics.’” Additionally, many activists disliked the Yippies, as they were seen as “apolitical, irrational, freaks,” while others viewed them as “provocative radical New Yorkers on an ego trip.” For sure, Yippie slogans such as “We will burn Chicago to the ground,” “We will fuck on the beaches,” “Kill the pigs,” and “Your wife sucks cock” only helped create intense anger in both the average person and the police. Finally, the Progressive Labor Party did not believe in “the gospel of the youth revolution” at all and instead preferred working with blue-collar workers, based on “sacrifice, not fun.” To them, Chicago was not the way towards revolution; they saw it as a debacle that had “alienated the working class.”

The Democratic National Convention became “a theatre of protest and rage” as Vice-President Hubert Humphrey’s nomination reaffirmed Johnson’s Vietnam polices, and many delegates and demonstrators voiced their disappointment and anger at seeing their “party of reform and peaceful social change” unravel. Outside the halls, shattered glass, tear gas, and blood filled the parks and streets, symbolizing the disillusionment with the
Democratic process. However, a part of the new left actually had wanted a riot, or at least the disruption of the convention, as organizers talked about “forcing it to a halt unless it voted to stop the war.” Meanwhile, the city of Chicago, with its law enforcement, surely helped create violence too by denying “all parade permits, and arming themselves with riot-control weapons, armored vehicles, and bringing in 7,500 members of the Illinois National Guard to reinforce its 12,000 police officers. Clearing Lincoln Park, on August 25, of 1,500 to 2,000 demonstrators was an example of police-induced violence as it forced protesters into the streets to find a place to stay (including sleep).

Notwithstanding, the extra tension also stemmed in part from some of the activists making threats to the police, who in turn were concerned about facing protesters armed with unknown weapons and unknown intentions. At around 9 p.m., after police ordered the campers to leave, a part of the crowd began to heckle and taunt the police, which made them charge into the park “swinging their batons,” initially scattering everyone, but starting a running battle throughout the night. Yippie organizer Jerry Rubin, quite pleased with the situation, enthusiastically told a friend, “This is fantastic and it’s only Sunday night. They might declare martial law in this town.” When 7,000 protesters were denied their request to march to the convention hall the next day, the activists blocked Michigan Avenue and began to throw rocks and “bags of shit,” and shouted obscenities at the police, who “went berserk and physically expressed the rage millions of Americans had built up against America’s dissidents.” Before the police exploded into the crowd clubbing people senseless, the marchers had chanted “Fuck You, LBJ,” “Hell no, we won’t go,” “Fuck the pigs.” However, the brutal behavior on the part of the police only “shifted many toward more militancy, toward more violent rhetoric and behavior.” As Yippie Stew Albert said, “Chicago was ‘a revolutionary wet dream come true,’” as repression only further radicalized the youth.
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of some demonstrators was to “expose the inhumanity, injustice, prejudice, hypocrisy, or militaristic repression of the society.”\textsuperscript{1137}

The convention protests even further split the anti-war movement, as some strengthened their belief that “only through violent confrontation and even revolution could the country be directed to a more just and democratic path.”\textsuperscript{1138} For others (who still held on to hope after the assassination of RFK), the violence in Chicago signaled for them the end of the Sixties. The two broad tactical groupings of the anti-war movement had always been built on the following principals: 1. pacifists – for whom “tactics are chiefly a moral question,” and 2. non-pacifists – whose tactics are “means to political ends.” After Chicago, the latter belief gained increasing currency as more protesters were more interested in “impeding the war than in achieving a correct moral posture,” and using tactics that would “hurt the enemy.”\textsuperscript{1139} Even long-time pacifist David Dellinger, who witnessed the growing militancy at the convention, now said that the “movement had to accept more confrontational tactics” and hold a “more openly pro-Vietcong position” in order to stop the war.\textsuperscript{1140} The direction of the peace movement turned towards bitter militancy as the mood of disenchantment “spread into new segments of the American public.”\textsuperscript{1141} Yet Dellinger wrote, “We will come closer to achieving our goals . . . when we conduct teach-ins for the police and soldiers, and fraternize with them rather than insulting them by calling them ‘pigs,’ or raising their wrath by stoning them.”\textsuperscript{1142} Alone those lines, both Mobe and even the Yippies tried at times to calm things down a little during the convention riots, but found that they had lost control. Protesters, many of whom were very young (some only in their early teens) and new to the Movement, did not listen to anyone and instead turned against the organizers, yelling “Fuck the marshals!” and “Marshals are pigs.”\textsuperscript{1143} These youngsters “played out the logic of juvenile delinquency,” and the idea that there was some sort of authoritarian hierarchy governing the Movement, to which they had to listen, seemed “laughable to them.”\textsuperscript{1144} On the other hand, “old-timers” themselves rushed towards embracing this ever-increasing militancy on the part of its newest members, out of fear of being isolated or being seen as passé to the Movement. Thus often the “leaders” at the chaotic Democratic National Convention protests found that they were
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leading no one, but perhaps instead following. Just as the SDS’s “prairie people” (1965-1968) had gone beyond the “old guard” (1960-1965), now the new revolutionary “park people” (1968 onwards into the 1970s) went beyond the prairie people. When the police attacked the protesters, it was mostly the “park people” who led the retaliation, throwing gas canisters back and blocking the streets with trash cans; they “trashed police-car windows with bricks and rocks, rocked police cars and paddy wagons and tried to overturn them,” and punched police officers when they could. Moreover, they let air out of police tires, “threw rocks and slabs of sidewalks at the police hoping to provoke reprisals.” Some even went so far as to pull up “the slats of park benches and hammered nails into their ends,” while shifting chants away from “Hell no, we won’t go and “Peace now,” to “Pigs are whores” and “Pigs eat shit.”

As an indication that the anti-war (anti-establishment) movement was broadening, many of these “park people” were not from the middle-class, but instead, “greasers, motorcycle toughs, no nonsense Chicago working-class teenagers.” These members of the working class were immediately looked upon by many radicals as being “romantic heroes,” and “a sign that the white movement was getting ’serious’” about revolution. After several days of bloody combat (peaking on August 28), most militant of movement leaders left Chicago convinced that “armed revolt was both necessary and possible.” Even though “kids with the McCarthy buttons” still had outnumbered everyone at the Convention, their voices were “muffled.” Moreover, most political commentators agreed later that the brutal confrontations between the protesters and police (with law enforcement losing control in a “police riot”) was the catalyst that “radicalized” youth as a whole in the U.S., which now meant “the abandonment of politics in favor of violence.” While some SDS members were said to be “high from the violence,” author and political activist Arthur Waskow spoke for those still more moderate: “We must invent a political course of action, not street tactics.” Thus, those not agreeing with the “violence-prone radicals” began to work towards the
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mobilization of hundreds of thousands of people, which led to the Moratorium demonstrations of October and November in 1969.\footnote{Anderson, \textit{The Movement and the Sixties}, 224.} Radicals, on the other hand, were fueled further when (on March 20, 1969) eight movement leaders who had been in Chicago (Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, David Dellinger, Tom Hayden, Rennie Davis, John Froines, Lee Weiner, and Bobby Seale) were first indicted and then put on trial for “conspiracy to incite a riot” (known as “the Chicago 8” and later “the Chicago 7” as Seale was later tried separately).\footnote{Ibid.} Meanwhile, the Rolling Stones’ new song “Street Fighting Man” (which called for revolution) was released on August 31, only three days after the bloodiest day at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Its lyrics:

> “Everywhere I hear the sound of marching, charging feet, boy,  
> ‘Cause summer’s here and the time is right for fighting in the street, boy”  
> “Hey! think the time is right for a palace revolution,  
> but where I live the game to play is compromise solution. ”  
> “Hey, said my name is called Disturbance;  
> I’ll shout and scream, I’ll kill the King, I’ll rail at all his servants”  
> “Well now what can a poor boy do, Except to sing for a rock & roll band?  

In September, after Chicago and the start of a new academic year, the SDS boomed with at least 100 new chapters starting up out of only 350 to 400 existing nationwide at the time.\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 336.} However, the discussion occurring within SDS about its future direction was forcibly “warped into simplistic formulas,” not open to debate.\footnote{Ibid.} First of all, any member who “worried about the new turn” within the SDS and did not agree with the talk of rebellion was met with abrasive words, and felt that they “couldn’t see how to get a word in edgewise.”\footnote{Ibid.} On the other hand, those in the SDS who believed in starting a revolution were split into two groups: the Progressive Labor bloc and the anti-PL National Office group (or Revolutionary Youth Movement). Progressive Labor (as mentioned before) thought the protests at the Democratic National Convention “had alienated the working class,” as they continued to push for “base-building,” arguing for “worker-student alliances.”\footnote{Ibid.} The National Office group believed that their strategy of “resistance” had been “vindicated” in Chicago, and that the working class toughs (the “park people”) were “the vanguard of the developing revolutionary forces” (in many ways the same type of
hoodlums that caused the trouble at Altamont). 1164 Meanwhile, many of those not allowed a voice were the old guard “who abhorred the street fighting turn while also thinking PL’s fetishism of the working class romantic nonsense.” 1165 However, groups like the Motherfuckers “growled at” anyone who would dare raise questions, and those who did were put down for “discrediting the righteous tactics of righteous brothers.” 1166 To those readying to fight for the revolution, the old guard was seen as a “watery holdover from the discredited old New Left, dangerously soft on liberals, undermining the toughness” that they were trying to establish “for the coming struggle.” 1167 According to an old guard, what the SDS didn’t have (by the summer of 1968) was enough “clarity” and “political discipline” in order to “know what you want to do, and then you have solid ground to refuse to follow people who take you where you don’t want to go.” 1168 As a result, after Chicago, the Movement’s reply to all contentions was an overly simplified credo to “abandon the institutions,” “decide to possess power,” and “make the revolution.” 1169

In other news for September (and into the autumn), Hubert Humphrey, after winning the Democratic Party nomination in August, toured the country “declaring his liberal agenda” as “young hecklers chanted “Shame, Shame, Shame,” and “Bull Shit, Bull Shit, Bull Shit.” 1170 However, after he “began to distance himself from the Johnson administration” and declared that “if elected” he would work towards “an immediate cease-fire” in Vietnam, “McCarthy’s kids” began to help his campaign against Richard Nixon. 1171 Meanwhile, another chasm arose in the Movement, this time between “white middle-class radicals and the black poor” during a New York City teachers’ strike (lasting from September 9 to November 17). 1172 The confrontation was between the relatively new community-controlled school board in a largely black section of Brooklyn and New York City’s United Federation of Teachers. The rift was a result of mostly white (and some black activists) supporting the teachers’ union, while blacks wanted to maintain their “community control” of their schools. 1173 The strike was seen as a battle between local
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rights of self-determination and “teachers’ universal rights as workers.” The UFT opposed among other things the involuntary assignment of experienced teachers to poor schools, while the community-controlled school board opposed the ability of teachers to have children removed from classrooms and placed in special schools when deemed incorrigible (blacks saw this as “the system’s overall racism”). At one point the black-controlled school board dismissed 83 white and mostly Jewish teachers and administrators, causing the “whole alliance of liberals, blacks and Jews” to break apart on this issue. The conflict was seen as a turning point, and as an example of how “groups, previously allied in the struggle for civil rights and the labor movement” began to clash with one another; race came to eclipse class as the main axis of social conflict. The once-popular “Freedom Now” slogan of the civil rights movement was now seen as unable to settle the conflict of interest questions such as the “righteous demands of black parents and white teachers all at once.” Some in the SDS resolved these types of problems by using the formula of “Black Skin Good, White Skin Bad”; however, many were not so sure and “wondered just which power rightly belonged to just which people.” Concurrently, from September 16 to October 15, out of the 216 incidents of protests reported by the New York Times and Washington Post, 35% involved violence as the anti-war protests continued to grow. On September 24, 1968, fourteen people, including five priests and a minister (called “The Milwaukee Four”) removed approximately 10,000 draft files from Milwaukee’s Selective Service office “and burned them with home-made napalm.” In October, at San Francisco State University, a hundred blacks converged on the administration building during a demonstration and chanted, “Revolution has come. Off the pig. Time to pick up the gun,” as a general strike from classes was announced starting in November. At the same time, the “Yippie Manifesto” was distributed nationwide encouraging everyone to take over the streets and boycott the November 5 elections. The following was but a small excerpt from the long declaration:
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“Don’t vote in a jackass-elephant-cracker circus. Let’s vote for ourselves. Me for President. We are the revolution. We will strike and boycott the election and create our own reality.

“Can you dig it: in every metropolis and hamlet of America boycotts, strikes, sit-ins, pickets, lie-ins, pray-ins, feel-ins, piss-ins at the polling places.

“Nobody goes to work. Nobody goes to school. Nobody votes. Everyone becomes a life actor of the street doing his thing, making the revolution by freeing himself and fucking up the system.”

But as always, not everyone supported or agreed with Yippie tactics and philosophy; as Yippie leader Jerry Rubin said, “The left immediately attacked us as apolitical, irrational, acidhead freeks who were channeling the ‘political rebellion of youth’ into dope, rock music and be-ins. The hippies saw us as Marxists in psychedelic clothes using dope, rock music and be-ins to radicalize youth politically at the end of a policeman’s club.” Added Rubin, “The hippies see us as politicos and the politicos see us as hippies.”

On November 5, 1968 Republican Richard M. Nixon won the presidential election, which for much of the anti-war movement “confirmed the disillusionment” with the political process to change the course of U.S. foreign policy i.e., stopping the war in Vietnam. For large numbers who had agitated for change over the years, “the election signaled the end of the Movement and the Sixties” (one again), as activists knew that Nixon’s policies would continue the war for years, and unleash massive police power to contain it. Many in the Movement also discerned “the end of poverty programs and the struggle for equality.” Nixon, who positioned himself as “the champion of the silent majority” and emphasized “law and order,” was seen as coming to power as a result of a great backlash against the Movement. Depressingly for countless who had demonstrated for years it appeared that “what began in Greensboro in 1960 seemed to die at the polls in 1968.” Journalist and founding member of the SDS Jack Newfield wrote how his age group felt after the election of Nixon, saying that they now believed “that we shall not overcome,” and that “things would get worse,” and that there was no hope (interestingly,
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four years later (1972) during another Nixon presidential election victory, many political radicals went through the same feelings of despair, defeat, and claims of the Sixties just ending).\textsuperscript{1190} \textsuperscript{1191} For a good many, The Doors’ song “Waiting for the Sun” epitomized the frustration felt over the state of the Movement by late 1968, wondering if “the Movement had failed, whether the New Left was dead, whether the sixties were over.”\textsuperscript{1192} Although “Waiting for the Sun” was not released until Feb. 1, 1970, work began on the song in March of 1968). The following were some of the lyrics:

“At the first flash of freedom
we raced down to the sea,
standing there on freedom shore
waiting for the sun…
Waiting for you to hear my song,
waiting for you to come along,
waiting for you to tell me what went wrong.”\textsuperscript{1193}

Another example of both doubt and defeat creeping into the Movement was said to have been the moment when “Captain Billy America,” the main character in the 1969 counter-cultural movie Easy Rider, stated near the end of the film, “We blew it”; this statement was viewed as conceivably an “epitaph for the Movement and the sixties” as a whole.\textsuperscript{1194} Nonetheless, others disagreed with such pessimistic hysteria, and saw things quite differently. To them, while perhaps many older “first-wave activists” (the “old guard” from the early 1960s civil rights era) were now “too angry to carry on,” and the second-wave activists (the “prairie people” who joined the Movement in the middle of the decade as the Vietnam War started in earnest) were “looking forward to graduation – and to the draft” and thus too busy, there was still the newest wave of “younger brothers and sisters” (born in the early-mid 1950s) who were only now joining the Movement and just starting to fight.\textsuperscript{1195} Moreover, the idea that the Movement failed because of a defeat at a national election was considered by others as, at most, a “dangerous half-truth,” or completely absurd, as the Movement consisted of only a small minority of people who could not possibly be expected to pick a president.\textsuperscript{1196} Likewise, the future of the Sixties movement could not be possibly measured by the fate of “the older wave of activists, many
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of whom retired from demonstrating and turned to other pursuits.”^{1197} Finally, it seemed that every year one group of activists would burn out and get disillusioned, only to be replaced by a younger, newer group filled with optimism, only to also fall into despair and in turn be replaced. Peculiarly, each disappointed wave would then proclaim the Movement and the Sixties era over.^{1198}

The reason many historians choose to close the Sixties with the election of Nixon (and not later) was because it “is a convenient break and because the focus to the Movement blurred.”^{1199} Some have theorized that until 1968 there was an awareness that people belonged to a “single movement”; however, starting around 1968, “it should be understood as referring to a set of movements, some overlapping, some mutually exclusive, many hostile to one another.”^{1200} For example, one division within the Movement was between feminist groups and various black and white revolutionaries (including the new left) over the issue of needing first to focus on destroying the state, then later dealing with the issue of equality for women.^{1201} Another point of contention involved whether “ethnic nationalism among oppressed minorities was ultimately reactionary,” as progressive labor claimed starting in 1969 (more on this later).^{1202} Others, on the other hand, pointed out that there had been splits between various movement factions throughout the 1960s. No matter, there is no doubt that the Movement was still growing in numbers during the late 1960s and early 1970s, although as it expanded it became more difficult to define.^{1203} Millions of young “baby boomers” came of age, attending universities, taking to the streets, and “advocating a myriad of causes” (some political commentators would later claim that the media lost interest in the Movement for just this reason: too much diversity and fragmentation).^{1204} Either way, as “the Movement evolved into many different shapes and forms,” some continued to search for ways to explain the Movement’s overall focus, and came up with the following two entwined goals: “To build new things good for our own heads and to work equally hard toward making a more humane and non-oppressive
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society.” Or simply put, the revolution was now both a “personal liberation” (inside) and a “political empowerment” (outside).1205

Although many activists had felt defeated in late 1968, others were transformed into complete militants. After years of ghetto uprisings, the murders of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, the failure of the War on Poverty, and the rise black power ideology, it “all fused to create an apocalyptic mood” among student radicals, ready for “a final conflict.”1206 1207 The SDS by this time considered themselves as “revolutionary communists” whose goals were the “destruction of American liberal capitalism” and its replacement by an “ill-defined Marxist utopia.”1208 Believing that the organizing since the early 1960s had failed to accomplish anything, what was needed now to change the system was perhaps something drastic; some even called for “violence that was going to end all violence.”1209 It was the ever increasing hatred felt towards America’s imperialistic wars in Indochina that accelerated the Movement’s attraction towards the writings of Marx (and other communists) concerning the willingness to participate in a violent struggle. The cynical pessimism and spiteful revenge of radicals against the establishment was so intense that the urge was to “blindly destroy it.”1210 While debates raged about (among other things) the need to build a broad-based communist party first “before the revolution” (versus during and after it) and with what segment of the population, the new left incorporated a Maoist type anti-revisionist form of Marxism-Leninism, assuring that violence at some point would surely be needed to overthrow the ruling class. Marx in many of his writings did seem to justify violence as a “legitimate revolutionary instrument,” and wrote in 1848: “There is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shortened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror.”1211 Not surprising, by the end of 1968 the SDS wrote that a key element of “bringing the war home” would be guerrilla warfare tactics, and said, “We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment” and fight to overthrow existing society.1212
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The path taken by the new left towards insurrection, some would argue, had its beginnings already in the creation of the 1962 Port Huron Manifesto itself (and not the end of the 1960s decade). Already at the Port Huron conference, democratic socialists like Michael Harrington (who was a staff-person of the SDS’s mother organization LID) clashed with the SDS over (amongst other things) how the final draft was “insufficiently anti-Communist,” and for allowing a delegate of the Communist Progressive Youth Organizing Committee to attend the conference as an observer. Notwithstanding, the SDS from its conception rejected the American left’s anti-communism, seeing it as an “obstruction to democracy.”

In 1965, the SDS took another step; it voted to remove from its constitution the “exclusion clause” banning membership of communists, allowing “disciplined cadre” organizations to infiltrate. Soon afterwards, the progressive labor movement (later party), a militant communist (Maoist) group, dissolved its M2M organization and “entered SDS, working vigorously to attract supporters and to form party clubs on campuses.” The PL faction of SDS then began to advocate a “fight directly for communism” rejecting the concept of a gradual “socialist economic transition-stage,” viewing it as an error of the “old movement.”

Originally the new left had advocated for a type of “participatory democracy,” and a tactic of “non-violent civil disobedience,” in order to bring forth social justice and reform the system. During the early 1960s, the SDS still viewed the negative social conditions in capitalist societies as “problems” to be solved in order “to fulfill the promises - liberty, equality, fraternity - of the bourgeois revolution of the eighteenth century.” However, as various communists groups joined the SDS, it gradually evolved from its reformist type democratic socialist world view to a Leninist “vanguard” of “professional revolutionaries” approach, and finally to Mao’s “every Communist must grasp the truth ‘Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun’” position.

1214 Ibid.
It was not long after the new left had disavowed the Soviet Union as the “world center for proletarian revolution” that the Vietnam War began (and the civil rights movement was at its height), finding in Mao Zedong a new compelling brand of Marxism-Leninism. “Maoism,” as it became known, offered an analysis of race and war that in the 1960s decade seemed to apply to much of the world, “linking interventionist war and domestic injustice to the economic imperatives of monopoly capitalism.” As Maoist China presented itself as “the main champion of the Third World national liberation movements,” Mao specifically taught that the struggle for communism would begin “with the peasant and working classes of the lesser developed countries,” thus putting the third world revolutionaries into the vanguard. Not surprisingly, white radicals in the U.S. also elevated the importance of American minority “third world” groups, expecting them to take the lead in the revolution, and though they embraced Maoism, they also mixed together various other radical ideas of the time. It was the Black Panther Party that early on sold “copies of Mao’s little red book,” in order “to raise money to buy their first guns.” Soon other nationalist groups followed including: the Young Lords (a Puerto Rican group), the Brown Berets (a Chicano/Mexican American organization), and the American Indian Movement. The appeal of Maoism had a lot to do with the notion of bringing the war home by imitating the “heroic armed bands of Red army fighters waging a war against imperialism in its very heartland.” By the fall of 1968, both of the two main groups within SDS were now Maoist: the PL and the Revolutionary Youth Movement. The difference between the two stemmed from the fact that the PL was already moving away from “mainstream Maoist positions,” for example, when attacking “the Vietnamese communists for ‘selling out’ and the Black Panther Party for ‘anti-working class nationalism.’” The RYM, on the other hand, believed in the right of self-determination for oppressed nations and ethnic groups. Either way, the underlining justification for the use of violence within the Movement had a lot to do with the adopting of the political philosophy of Marxism-Leninism over the years, especially Maoism. The Bay Area
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Revolutionary Union wrote, in its Red Papers 1: “It is the task of the revolutionary party of
the working class, guided by Marxism-Leninism, to lead the people to victory. The
organized repressive violence of the state must be met with the organized revolutionary
violence of the people. Power to the People.”\textsuperscript{1224} Mao was clear about using revolutionary
violence; he wrote in his Little Red Book, “A revolution is not a dinner party . . . [it] is an
insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another.”\textsuperscript{1225} In another
quote, Mao stated, “Communism is not love. Communism is a hammer which we use to
crush the enemy.”\textsuperscript{1226} Notwithstanding, even with all the revolutionary fervor escalating in
1968 within the U.S., the acts of violence were still most often perpetrated by police
provocateurs that would “mingle among the demonstrators and incite their fellow officers
to violence.”\textsuperscript{1227} However, violence in the name of starting a revolution was just as real,
when for example in early November, the school officials of San Fernando State College
were held at knife point by students.\textsuperscript{1228} Soon the RYM would divide into RYM I (the
Weathermen), who began preparations for “immediate armed struggle in the U.S.,” and
RYM II, who still advocated the need to build a new revolutionary vanguard party
instead.\textsuperscript{1229}

On November 6, the longest student strike in U.S. history erupted at San Francisco
State College, lasting until March 20, 1969.\textsuperscript{1230} The strike was led by the Black Student
Union and the Third World Liberation Front, and it demanded, among other things, an
ethnic studies program and an end to the Vietnam War. The catalyst for the strike was the
suspension of an African-American English instructor (and Black Panther Minister of
Education) George Mason Murray on November 1.\textsuperscript{1231} Murray was stopped from teaching
as a result of his various violent comments. At a Fresno State College rally, for example,
his asserted, “We are slaves, and the only way to become free is to kill all the slave
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masters.” At San Francisco State College, he declared that “black students should bring guns to campus to protect themselves from white racist administrators.” Astonishingly, with the strike beginning in earnest just the day after Richard Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey in the presidential elections, not one speaker at the rally mentioned Nixon’s victory. It was seemingly shrugged off in “despair and fatalism” just as the social reform programs of President Johnson’s Great Society (of eliminating poverty and racial injustice) “expired without a tear from the New Left,” as the goal now was total revolution and not compromised solutions. Stokely Carmichael, who spoke on campus early on during the strike, told the students to struggle for true control: “We want the power to pick, to hire, and to fire.” As far as tactics, Carmichael spoke of confrontation and possibly having to kill and die, concluding his November speech by saying, “Then we prepare for the confrontation so that when the confrontation does come we become victorious. It is easy to die for one’s people. It is much more difficult to live, to work, and to kill for one’s people” (“The audience stood up, applauding,” as killing was now acceptable for many in the Movement). Not surprisingly, the strike quickly turned violent as black radicals began to roam the campus, “disrupting classes, shouting that faculty who continued teaching were racists,” which irritated many of the other students wanting to study. Radicals also “stormed department offices, turning over files, setting small fires, and breaking windows in front of frightened secretaries.”

Tension resulting from some sort of agitation continued daily at SFSC. On December 2, after radical students broke a ban on using microphones while giving speeches, university President S. I. Hayakawa “stunned demonstrators by climbing on their truck and pulling the wires out of their amplifier.” This, however, accomplished little as pushing ensued, and in a little while students began to throw rocks, breaking windows, and police chased them all over campus. The next day, at a still larger rally, students shouted outside of Hayakawa’s office, “Up against the wall . . . this is no longer a school, it’s an armed camp,” at which point the school president began playing the radio using
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loudspeakers to “drown out the strikers.””\textsuperscript{1241} As frustrated radicals began to provoke the police by “hurling stones and bricks” at them, 300 police marched into the crowd arresting and beating many students, knocking them unconscious.\textsuperscript{1242} In January of 1969, the San Francisco State strike continued with 450 students and professors jailed, taking its toll on protest efforts as “posting bail demoralized radicals,” and so did the fact that the school faculty was increasingly interested in “compromising with the administration.”\textsuperscript{1243} On March 20 the school strike finally ended but not before a student was critically injured while attempting to bomb a San Francisco State College classroom.\textsuperscript{1244} An agreement was made that the administration would retain control of hiring and admissions, but that a “School of Ethnic Studies” would be created, and that “admission requirements” would be waived, which would allow more “third world students into the school.”\textsuperscript{1245} In a nearly five-month period, the police had continuously occupied the campus, over 700 people had been arrested, about two dozen faculty members had been fired, and student classroom attendance fell to only 20 percent and “only about a third of scheduled classes met.”\textsuperscript{1246 1247} San Francisco State inspired more minority student militancy throughout 1969 as they began to advocate for a “third world revolution” against the white college establishment.\textsuperscript{1248} Following the lead of African-Americans, Asian Americans, Chicanos, Native Americans, and others began demanding classes on their own history and culture. During the spring of 1969, protests exploded (sometimes violently) at 230 colleges across the country with major riots at Wisconsin and Berkeley “forcing governors to call the National Guard to occupy the campuses.”\textsuperscript{1249}

For some members of the Movement, by early 1969, the optimism of the early sixties, which “had erupted periodically in 1968,” had faded.\textsuperscript{1250} Others, on the other hand, especially after Chicago, saw it otherwise; they were now enthusiastically focused on confronting those in power to “unmask illegitimate authority,” and to take the Movement to its “final showdown of good and evil, order and chaos.”\textsuperscript{1251} Not only had massive
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student demonstrations become a familiar sight, but an escalation of violent student tactics was matched by authorities sending “bayonet-wielding” troops.\textsuperscript{1252} By the beginning of 1969, even those who had usually denounced violence began to seize and vandalize buildings while the more radical had already moved on, bombing of draft boards, ROTC buildings, and other things. Protests that had been limited to certain colleges up until then expanded rapidly to include a “wider range of campuses,” involving a widely differing types of students, including the previously mentioned “third world students.”\textsuperscript{1253} A growing number of activists were moreover in “open revolt” against what they considered “the American way of life.”\textsuperscript{1254} They had become “long hair freaks and hippies who experimented with illegal drugs and counterculture lifestyles,” and who wanted to “kill the white man, the American,” inside them.\textsuperscript{1255} On the other hand, those activists now still organizing large anti-war demonstrations (with the goal of attracting the maximum amount of people) were seen by radicals as being uninterested in broader issues of social change.\textsuperscript{1256}

On January 17, 1969, the ever-growing tendencies within the Movement towards dissension and violence helped lead to the shooting death of two students at the University of California at Los Angeles. The incident involved two black power groups “jockeying for control”: the Black Panther Party and the rival United Slaves (US) Organization.\textsuperscript{1257} Both students killed were influential members of the Southern California Chapter of the Black Panthers, and had just attended a meeting “to determine the leadership of UCLA’s newly created Afro-American Program.”\textsuperscript{1258} While the United Slaves had lobbied for their “preferred candidate without a student vote,” the Black Student Union (now the Afrikan Student Union) asked the Panthers to help them maintain student control over the selection process.\textsuperscript{1259} The meeting was peaceful, but after most students had already left the
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room, Black Panther John J. Huggins, Jr. got into a fight with US member Harold “Tuwala” Jones, which ended with another US member, Claude “Chuchessa” Hubert, killing both Higgins and fellow Black Panther Apprentice “Bunchy” Carter. While rivalry and animosity between the two groups played a major role in the murders, the 1975 Church Committee Hearings revealed that the FBI had created hostility between the two organizations, playing a part in “orchestrating the shootings” and possibly helping Hubert and Jones flee” (they were never apprehended). Meanwhile, two bombings occurred at two different greater Los Angeles colleges the following month. On February 26, explosions went off approximately at the same time in Pomona College and Scripps College, both schools located in Claremont (32.5 miles east of downtown Los Angeles).

At Pomona College a mail bomb went off in the Politics Department in Carnegie Hall, seriously injuring the department secretary, Mary Ann Keatley (“she lost part of her right hand and suffered severe eye injuries”). Another bomb exploded in the women’s bathroom at Scripps College with no injuries. Both incidents took place during anti-war protests and the demand for ethnic study program at the schools.

By the spring semester of 1969 many university officials began reporting “attempted arson and bombings” by students on campus. At the same time, the “National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence” warned of the “escalating risk of assassination,” and declared that “political violence was ‘more intense that it has been since the turn of the century.’” Meanwhile, the U.S. Justice Department reported a dramatic increase in bombings, and an “unprecedented” amount of bombing threats reaching some 35,000 in 1969 alone. While the most militant increasingly advocated the use of bombs, “trashing,” or vandalizing public buildings, was by far the most popular method used to try to get the government to change its foreign policy and for

---

1264 ibid.
1265 ibid.
1266 Scranton, The Report of the President’s Commission on Campus Unrest, 58.
1267 ibid.
1269 ibid.
1270 ibid.
1271 ibid.
“stopping business as usual.” Nonetheless, many in the Movement did turn to more drastic measures. In Denver an activist was charged with setting a series of explosions that destroyed electric transmission towers of the Colorado Public Service Company, while in New York City a group called the “Revolutionary Force 9” claimed responsibility for bombing the headquarters of IBM, General Telephone & Electronics, and Mobil Oil. 

*Time* magazine deliberated on whether the U.S. was heading towards a “Guerrilla Summer” consisting of resistance fighters. On March 22, in Washington D.C., nine anti-war activists invaded Dow Chemical’s office, “spilling human blood and destroying files and office equipment” in protest of the company’s manufacture of napalm. In an open letter to the corporations of America, the “DC 9” wrote that they who kill the poor and powerless in the third world would not be tolerated anymore, and had lost their right to exist. On April 2, New York District Attorney Hogan announced on TV that 21 Black Panthers had been arrested by the FBI for “conspiring” to blow up “various police stations, school buildings, a railroad yard, and the Bronx Botanical Gardens.” The alleged plot by the Black Panthers included the plan to kill police officers and to “dynamite five midtown department stores, a police precinct, six railroad rights-of-way and the New York botanical gardens.” The “Panther 21” trial (consisting of only 13 defendants) lasted from September 8, 1970 to May 13, 1971 and ended with the jury acquitting the defendants on all counts (they had always maintained their innocence).

On April 6, 1969 hundreds of thousands took to the streets throughout the U.S. for the “first major anti-war demonstration during the Nixon administration.” Thousands took to the streets in Atlanta, Austin, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Washington D.C. The lull in massive national anti-war demonstrations was the result of
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granting “the customary period of little or no criticism” for a new president, and not because the Sixties were ending or fading.\footnote{1283} It was Nixon’s clever propaganda campaign concerning his efforts at ending the war that “temporarily dampened the explosive potential of anti-war sentiment in the United States.”\footnote{1284} Nonetheless, the continuing war in Vietnam made it clear to many that “Nixon was continuing Johnson’s fundamental policies in Vietnam.”\footnote{1285} The “scope and size” of these April demonstrations signified that “much of the disorientation within the anti-war movement had dissipated,” and “anti-war coalitions were rebuilt.”\footnote{1286} While groups such as SDS were squabbling in sectarianism, the Student Mobilization Committee was reemerging as “the authoritative national organization of anti-war youth and the major organizer of demonstrations on a national scale.”\footnote{1287} Far from the Sixties being over in 1969, the protests “involved a higher percentage of youth than ever before, showing a marked increase in the numbers of high-school youth.”\footnote{1288} Furthermore, the possibilities for organizing high-school anti-war actions were seen as “extremely favorable,” as these youths had “grown to political consciousness in an atmosphere dominated by a war which they have rejected out of hand.”\footnote{1289} Another source of growth within the anti-war movement in the past year had been the “decided increase in anti-war activity by GIs.”\footnote{1290}

From April 9 to 17, Harvard University, one of Americas most prestigious universities, erupted in protests over the Vietnam War and other social and political issues (revealing that anti-establishment feelings could occur no matter how distinguished the school). Opposed to the continuing war in Vietnam, anti-war activists demanded that Harvard end its Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, or ROTC, program.\footnote{1291} On April 9, around noon, students entered University Hall and “ejected all administrators and staff from the building,” with at least one dean being carried out physically by students.\footnote{1292} As word spread of the takeover, students and faculty gathered outside, while those inside the occupied administration building “chained the doors shut, raised the red and black SDS
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flag outside.”^1293 At 3 a.m. on April 10, the university administrators “made the unprecedented decision to call in city and state police”^1294 Using “billy clubs and mace,” 400 officers arrested more than 100 protesters who had formed a “non-violent” human chain across the doorway.”^1295 The use of force unified the various student divisions that had been growing within the Harvard protest community and led to a boycott of classes for a week.^1296 A poster created by Harvard University students spelled out the reasons to strike, they included: “You hate cops, your roommate was clubbed, seize control of your life, and to smash the corporation.”^1297

On April 19, problems arose at Cornell University, another Ivy League school known for its outstanding reputation and social elitism. In December of 1968, the school’s “Afro-American Society” had demanded a “black studies” program and began agitating, charging that the curriculum at the university was “white, middle-class, and racist.”^1298 In April of 1969, when school officials granted funding for a center of Afro-American studies, some resentful “white fraternity men” (only 250 out of 14,000 students were black) burned a cross, set off fire alarms, and made two bomb threats,” against the African-American students.^1299 In response, blacks seized the student union building for 36 hours until the school administration acquiesced to all their demands (that no charges would be pressed against activists in this and an earlier demonstration, and that they would support the Afro-American center). However, it was the images of the black militants marching out of the building after negotiations, “armed with shotguns and rifles,” that shocked the nation.\(^1300\) It was disturbing for many to see “black students waving shotguns at an elite white university – confronting white authorities.”^1301 The militants proclaimed that they had to defend themselves (which included “armed self-defense”), and as H. Rap Brown declared, “If America chooses to play Nazis; black folks ain’t going to play Jews.”^1302 Cornell demonstrated once again that the idea of “third world liberation” was truly sweeping across the nation, as Chicano awareness “started to get as militant as the blacks,”
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as they occupied the president’s office at the University of California at Berkeley a few days later. Nonetheless, just like the civil rights and the white student movements, there was a rising generational conflict and a “rift between moderates and militants.”

In Berkeley, on May 15, 1969, a long-simmering conflict over a University of California owned property erupted in violent protests, street fighting, vandalism, injuries and death. On April 20, after the university had run out of developmental funds for over a year, hippies and political activists illegally took over the piece of land and began to build their “People’s Park,” a free speech area for radicals and a space for the hippie counterculture to gather (where free food was also handed-out). Notwithstanding, because Governor Ronald Reagan considered the creation of the park “a direct leftist challenge to the property rights of the university,” at 4:30 a.m. on May 15, he sent 300 police officers to takeover People’s Park. After the police cleared an eight-block area around the park, destroying the trees, grass, flowers and shrubs planted in the park, an eight-foot tall “perimeter chain-link wire fence was installed” to keep people out. Following a noon rally at the university, about 3,000 people marched the three blocks down to People’s Park chanting, “We want the park,” and proceeded to attack the police. Street fighting ensued as the activists began throwing rocks and bottles (some attempted to tear down the fence), while the police fired tear gas and then “buckshot into the crowds, ripping flesh.” By nightfall, “all hell broke loose” as 20 police officers and 100 activists were injured and 30 protesters had been shot, one fatally (James Rector). With a Bank of America window smashed, a fire hydrant opened, and hand-to-hand combat between protestors and cops, Governor Reagan sent the National Guard in full battle gear to establish martial law and occupy the campus. For the first time, the hippie counterculture and the radical left had fought to defend something that was “physically, touchably, verifiably there.” For the “Telegraph Avenue revolutionaries,” the taking and defending of the land was a step in creating a “new society in the womb (or ashes) of the old,” and they were willing to be combative. The violent confrontation left (for the
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first time) a white person shot and killed, and another permanently blind (Alan Blanchard). Reagon said afterwards, “If it takes a bloodbath, let’s get it over with. No more appeasement.” At first most of the organized left did not take the park issue seriously, as it sounded “unserious, hippy-dippy,” and they did not understand how “planting tomatoes have to do with the working class or the Vietnam war,” but other politicos had suspected trouble and “savored the possibility of a head-on collision with the university,” many wanting a riot.

The talk within the Movement had become “revolution,” but the question remained individually to what extent, as most people were still new to violence and only intermittently were “ready to go down for each other.” The dedication to the revolution was tested on May 22 in Berkeley when nearly 500 people were herded into a parking lot, arrested and “subjected to incredible humiliations” at the Santa Rita Jail. However, daily confrontations throughout Berkeley quieted by the time of the big Memorial Day march on May 26, when 30,000 people gathered expecting “a massacre,” but only witnessed the barbed wire closing of Telegraph Avenue and machine guns on the top of roofs. On the same day of the march, however, “a 13-point ‘Berkeley Liberation Program’” appeared in the radical underground newspaper the Berkeley Barb (the article was called a “declaration of war” by the conservative Berkeley Gazette). Amongst other things, radicals called for an “open war” against the university, an alliance with the Black Panther Party and “all Third World Liberation movements,” and a commitment to not backing down “against law and order.” It seemed to recommend for those participating in the revolutionary movement to learn the art of self-defense and combat, and be equipped with suitable weapons. Point 10 of the declaration stated: “America’s rulers, faced with the erosion of their authority in Berkeley, begin to take on the grotesque qualities of a dictatorship based on pure police power. We shall abolish the tyrannical police forces not chosen by the people. States of emergency, martial law, conspiracy charges and all legalistic measures used to crush our movement will be resisted by any means necessary –
from courtroom to armed struggle. The people of Berkeley must arm themselves and learn the basic skills and tactics of self-defense and street fighting. All oppressed people in jail are political prisoners and must be set free. We shall make Berkeley a sanctuary for rebels, outcasts and revolutionary fugitives. We shall attempt to bring the real criminals to trial; where this is impossible we shall implement revolutionary justice.”

Finally, on May 30, when twenty-five thousand people again marched peacefully past People’s Park (and the National Guard), it was a sign that radicals had “lost control to liberals and pacifists” concerning the park and immediate revolutionary activity.

Nevertheless, the revolutionaries who wanted to attack and tear down the fence during the latest protest began to approach local Vietnam veterans in hopes of finding out what kinds of guns were needed to shoot down the police helicopter flying overhead. “Movement heavies” began to buy handguns to “keep at home,” envisioning the “preliminary stages of guerrilla war.”

In late May, the Berkeley Tribe underground newspaper (like many others) began to call for “paramilitary training.” Under the headline of “Join the New Action Army,” it ran a cover photo of “a hip young couple in the woods, she carrying a baby and a gun, he pointing a rifle.” This question of “whether to learn to shoot” began to split even radical movement groups during the coming months.

But even hip underground films began to show how it was time to “pick up the gun” as there was an impending revolution ready to occur. However, not all were hopeful about the future. There were those who had dreamed that the battle for People’s Park would “fuse” the counterculture with the political revolutionaries, but instead perceived it to have driven “a wedge between them.”

Others saw People’s Park as the “last glimmering hope in which constructiveness and combativeness occurred all at once.” Stew Albert, of the Yippies, went so far as to proclaim People’s Park as the end of the Sixties (once again). Albert said, “People’s Park ended the Movement really,” because “the repression was so brutal.”
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“There was more repression than revolution, more fear than ebullience.”\textsuperscript{1334} Not able to build allies in the name of “world revolution,” there was much despair within the Movement, and talk of “impending fascism.”\textsuperscript{1335}

Beyond the pessimism on the part of some long-time activists, the revolutionary movement and the anti-war movement as a whole was unquestionably continuing to grow. By the end of the 1968-1969 school year, there had been “well over a hundred politically inspired campus bombings, attempted bombings, and incidents of arson nationwide, aimed at ROTC buildings and other campus and government buildings, high schools, even electrical towers.”\textsuperscript{1336} During the spring of 1969, three hundred colleges and universities experienced “sizable demonstrations,” many involving strikes, building takeovers, disruption of classes and administration, bombs, arson, or the trashing of property.\textsuperscript{1337} High school students also took part in these activities, often leaving school to join the various parts of the Movement. For example, at the Bronx High School of Science in New York City, “as many as fifty seniors dropped out to do politics or to live in communes” during the school year of 1968-1969.\textsuperscript{1338} However, many activities continued to take place outside the school setting. For instance, on May 20, 1969, three people invaded an induction center in Pasadena, California and took 600 “1-a files” and burned them in a field.\textsuperscript{1339} The next day, on May 21, in Silver Spring, Maryland, three anti-war protesters invaded a draft board and threw paint on the files and destroyed equipment.\textsuperscript{1340} Then on May 25, in Chicago, 15 individuals invaded a draft board and took files and burned them.\textsuperscript{1341}

Revolutionary violence continued to intensify in June as a “gunfight” ensued between the Black Panther Party and the police in Sacramento, California. Thirteen policemen were injured on June 1 as they tried to enter the Panther headquarters.\textsuperscript{1342} As the belief in violent revolution continued to grow, unbeknown to them was President Nixon’s secret plan to slow down or fragment the anti-war movement. The strategy consisted of a “three-pronged project,” the first being the “Vietnamization” of the war.\textsuperscript{1343} The slow and continual pullout of U.S. military (and handing over of ground combat to South
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Vietnamese troops) began with the announcement on June 8 that 25,000 troops would be withdrawn, while another 60,000 would leave in December.\footnote{1344} Creating the illusion that the war was gradually winding down, the second course of action consisted of dramatically accelerating the bombing of North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Nixon thought that he could “bomb his way to victory,” while concealing the war from the public as American servicemen and casualties decreased.\footnote{1346} The third aim was to “crush” the anti-war movement by intensifying the use of the FBI and CIA (beyond what President Johnson had done).\footnote{1347} Activists were monitored, jailed, and killed (especially black militants). CIA’s Operation CHAOS, which was established in 1967 on orders from Johnson, had the original goal of unmasking possible foreign influences on the student anti-war movement. Nonetheless, surveillance quickly expanded to using informants as agents provocateur, with the idea that “the more destructive the protest, the easier it was to discredit.”\footnote{1348} Others on the hit-list were those in the news media who were too sympathetic to the protests; they were put on an “enemies list” and intimidated.\footnote{1349} During 1969, the question, as in past years, remained whether to “widen or intensify the protest.”\footnote{1350} Moderates continued to argue for the need to “galvanize supporters in Congress and the media” for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.\footnote{1351} They forged ahead with lobbying, campaigning, writing letters, and marching, to seemingly no avail. While the anti-war movement’s long-time organizers “felt burned out by frustration and factionalism,” those younger and more radical impatiently pushed towards revolutionary struggle.\footnote{1352} After years of beating their heads against a wall, there was a feeling that more and more of the Movement was giving into bitterness and rage. Many in the SDS (since the summer of 1968) even stopped calling themselves the “new left,” and instead began to think that “there was something to be said for ‘turning to dynamite.’”\footnote{1353} Some were
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oblivious of the role played by the U.S. government in encouraging this turn toward all-out confrontation.  

Even without government manipulation, the anti-war movement had throughout the decade taken the path of increased violence and bickering. From June 18–June 22, 1969, the SDS held its last National Convention in Chicago, where the group preceded to fragment into two main factions: the Worker Student Alliance (of the Progressive Labor Party), and the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM). At the convention, both PL and RYM were supported by a third of the fifteen hundred delegates, with the remaining third made up of small groups from the Independent Socialist Club (ISC) caucus and the Joe Hill caucus from San Francisco, but mostly “baffled newcomers” (and tens of thousands of national members staying away perhaps not agreeing with any of the groups). While there had been a long “tradition” of disgruntlement within SDS, it had been acted out creatively; for example, at the 1968 SDS convention, “a Motherfucker nominated a garbage can to run against one of the national office’s slate of ponderous leftists” and almost won. Nonetheless, by June of 1969 it was much more serious, as the various points of disagreement broke the SDS (the largest student activist organization) apart at the height of its membership. Irreconcilable disputes arose over the role of students in the revolution. RYM believed that students were workers “gaining skills prior to employment,” contrasting the PL position that viewed students as being in a separate category from workers (they “could ally, but should not jointly organize”). Another point of contention involved the previously mentioned issue of nationalism in the revolutionary communist struggle. PL’s rejection of nationalism was seen by RYM as positioning itself against the third world groups like the Black Panther Party, which was their role model in many ways, as they increasingly saw white people as being “bought off and therefore likely to be in the enemy camp.” Finally, PL, who believed in “base-building” and “worker-student alliance” (wearing their hair short and avoiding rock ‘n’ roll
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music to avoid offending the workers) opposed the ever-increasing rhetoric to do violence (such as bombing and terrorism) which the soon to be Weathermen part of RYM supported.\footnote{1361}

During the third day of the convention, when the RYM-controlled national leadership realized “that PL might be able to win a majority of the delegates on some of the key resolutions and perhaps even win the leadership,” they walked out of the assembly (the first of two times) with hundreds following them to debate whether or not to expel the PL from the SDS.\footnote{1362} Those who remained with PL’s WSA caucus “held general workshops and waited to see if the others would ‘return to SDS.’”\footnote{1363} Right before RYM’s exit (to meet at the other wing of the Chicago Coliseum), Bobby Rush of the Black Panthers spoke, bitterly attacking the PL “for its refusal to support the black liberation struggle in practice.”\footnote{1364} He stated that he was speaking on behalf of the national organizations of the Black Panthers, the Brown Berets and the Young Lords, and that PL had been “deviating from the Marxist-Leninist position on the right to self-determination of peoples,” and made it known that “they will be considered as counterrevolutionary traitors” if they didn’t change their ways.\footnote{1365} RYM had hoped that Rush would “produce an anti-PL stampede in the convention,” but he failed to do so as he and his Panthers had “seriously discredit[ed] themselves and had been literally booed” the night before for making “male-chauvinist” remarks about “pussy power.”\footnote{1366} Women were greatly offended when Rush told them, “You sisters have a strategic position for the revolution . . . prone” (meaning a sexual pose in which one lies with the front or face downward).\footnote{1367} As the convention neared pandemonium, Jeff Gordon of PL took the floor to defend PL’s views, denouncing the SDS leadership for “trying to use the Panthers as a club against the WSA caucus and for their inability to carry out a political debate themselves.”\footnote{1368} It was then, in response, that SDS leaders declared it “impossible to remain in the same organization with people who opposed self-determination in practice and demanded an immediate split,” and then proceeded to walk out for the first time.\footnote{1369}
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When the final decision (with a vote of approximate 85%) was reached to expel PL, the RYM faction returned to the convention hall the next day and read a statement pronouncing two principles which from that point onward would be the criteria for membership in SDS (admitting the following day that they had forgotten to read a couple other additional points). The first declaration stated: “We support the struggle of the black and Latin colonies within the U. S. for national liberation and we recognize those nations’ rights to self-determination (including the right to political secession if they desire it.).”\textsuperscript{1370} The second declaration read: “We support the struggle for national liberation of the people of South Vietnam, led by the National Liberation Front and Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. We also support the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, led by President Ho Chi Minh, as well as the People’s Republic of China, the People’s Democratic Republics of Korea and Albania, and the Republic of Cuba, all waging fierce struggles against U.S. imperialism. We support the right of all people to pick up the gun to free themselves from the brutal rule of U. S. imperialism.”\textsuperscript{1371} The statements spelled out that “all people who do not accept the above two principles are no longer members of SDS.”\textsuperscript{1372} The next day, Bob Avakian (running for national secretary) announced that if elected “he would work to exclude members of the Independent Socialist Club” for not supporting all the governments listed in the second declaration.\textsuperscript{1373} After Avakian’s statement, screams of “bullshit” and “shame” erupted as RYM leaders and supporters “filed out of the hall” for the second and last time.\textsuperscript{1374} Less than two weeks after the debacle in Chicago, Mary-Alice Waters in \textit{The Militant} summarized what had taken place: “In short, a minority of the SDS convention, in a caucus which excluded those to be expelled, voted to expel what might have been the majority of the convention.”\textsuperscript{1375}

By Sunday afternoon, the last day of the SDS convention, the two factions were meeting on different sides of the city (with many others drifting off). In the Coliseum remained the PL-WSA caucus of around four or five hundred people who tried to become (or stay as) SDS.\textsuperscript{1376} Instead of appealing to the tens of thousands of SDS members who were not at the convention against its undemocratic expulsion, the WSA went ahead and “passed its resolutions, elected its officers, and scheduled a press conference to declare
itself the SDS and to denounce the ‘splinter leadership’ for ‘anti-working-class politics and practices.’” \(1377\) Across town, RYM gathered with some 700-800 members and supporters to decide what form the SDS would continue in. \(1378\) While initially here the general mood was one of great satisfaction at getting rid of PL, very quickly political differences arose within the RYM faction itself. In a matter of several weeks it divided into RYM-1 (which included most of the SDS national leadership that became the Weathermen and conducted a campaign of bombings), and RYM-2 (who rejected the immediate armed struggle of the Weathermen, and instead advocated the building of a new revolutionary vanguard party). Furthermore, RYM II itself fragmented and quickly gave way to various new revolutionary organizations collectively known as the New Communist Movement, the most important being the Communist League (CL), the Revolutionary Union (RU), and the October League (ML) (OL). \(1379\) Thus once again, many social commentators found an event to mark the end to the Sixties, this time with the fragmentation of the SDS – but things did continue.

After the convention the Weatherman faction of RYM (who controlled the SDS National Office) sent a letter to everyone in the organization that began: “By now the news of the Chicago convention has probably reached most of you. This letter is to let you know that despite any news you may hear to the contrary, SDS still lives and the national office is functioning as usual. New national officers have been elected, a program of mass action through the summer and fall has been planned. There is one important thing that has changed. The Progressive Labor Party faction (PLP) has been kicked out of SDS.” \(1380\) This was then elaborated on at length. Meanwhile, on September 12 to 14, 1969 two-hundred SDS activists gathered from all over the country in Detroit for a national meeting of the RYM-2 caucus. \(1381\) The conference discussed the upcoming controversial October 8-11 SDS anti-war actions planned for Chicago by the RYM-1 (Weathermen). The original SDS plan of a “broad-based, mass and militant action centering on making the demand, ‘U.S. get out of Vietnam now,’” was changed to direct actions of “vandalizing homes,
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businesses, and automobiles as well as assaulting police officers.” 1382 RYM-2 denounced
the Weathermen’s new plans as “adventurist and attacks on the people.” Therefore RYM-2
made plans for separate actions in Chicago “consistent with the original SDS
resolution.” 1383 1384

Meanwhile, in July, the Black Panthers called for a “United Front Against Fascism”
and predicted that 1970 would be the year of the “Revolution.” 1385 By the summer of 1969
the Movement had begun to believe that the Revolution was a certainty, and that it was
already unfolding. 1386 Even Lenny Heller wrote a “fantasy novel” about how white
revolutionaries would take their guns onto the streets in Berkeley on July 4. 1387 In reality,
students and their allies were far from pulling off a true revolution due to the lack of
support from “larger sections of society.” 1388 Nevertheless, because the new left was
originally inspired by the civil rights movement, much of it still “extended moral title to
black leadership,” even after the rise of Black Power and as some “were shooting down, or
being shot down in gun battles with police and being convicted of murder.” 1389 Moreover,
with the turn towards revolution, the new leaders of the Movement over the years had
evolved to include such groups as the Black Panthers, Hells Angels, Diggers, and
Motherfuckers, all whom Marvin Garson (underground newspaper editor of the San
Francisco Express Times) described as “young, tough, crime-seared ‘brothers on the block’
with their militaristic drills.” 1390 Movement news during the summer of 1969 included five
people invading a Rockefeller Center draft board in New York City on the fourth of July,
who “shredded 6,500 1-5 files, damaged 1-A keys on typewriters and destroyed cross-
reference books.” 1391 On July 27, Sam Melville, Jane Alpert, and others (with ties to the
Weathermen and the Black Panthers) bombed the United Fruit Company-owned Grace Pier
in New York City. 1392 Then on August 2 and 15, the New York 8 invaded draft boards and
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damaged records in the Bronx, and in the Jamaica, Long Island, part of New York City.\footnote{1393} On August 20, Sam Melville and others bombed the Marine Midland Building in New York City, resulting in 20 injuries.\footnote{1394} Then on the night of August 8, “Manson family hippie crazies” brutally murdered actress Sharon Tate (wife of famed director Roman Polanski), her eight-and-a-half-month unborn baby, and four others in her home.\footnote{1395} The following night they also savagely murdered supermarket executive Leno LaBianca and his wife Rosemary, and once again used the victims’ blood to write revolutionary slogans such as “Rise” and “Death to Pigs” on the living room walls.\footnote{1396} According to Vincent Bugliosi, the Los Angeles County deputy district attorney (who successfully prosecuted Charles Manson and several other members of his “family”), the crimes were committed because of Charles Manson’s Helter-skelter/Armageddon theory of igniting a race war. His plan was to carry out murders that would be blamed on Black Power groups, which according to design would “force a police crackdown on the blacks who would retaliate with war against the whites. The blacks would win. Then Manson and his band would emerge from their magical cave under Death Valley and ‘lead’ (i.e., re-enslave) the victors.”\footnote{1397} What made the news of the murders so shocking, besides their brutality (in the Tate murders, the victims received 169 stab wounds and seven gunshot wounds), was that the killers were young (mostly female) “flower children.”\footnote{1398} \footnote{1399} However, this remained unknown till December 1, when the Los Angeles Police Department gave a press conference announcing that the case had been solved.\footnote{1400} Even so, the Manson family had started during the Summer of Love in Haight-Ashbury, which made them very much a part of the counter-cultural hippie movement, except for Charlie, their guru-type leader, who had been a career criminal all his life.\footnote{1401} Manson taught his twisted ideas to his young followers, one “a theory of opposites,
involving a ‘love’ that called for killing (Susan Atkins would say she had to love Sharon Tate a lot to kill her with the relish she felt).” 1402 The atrocious nature of the crimes made many people, such as author Joan Didion, write afterwards that what had taken place signaled (once again) an end to the Sixties era, as it “sent shock waves through the country.” 1403 During the summer and fall of 1969, hippies still overall had a reputation for peaceful and loving behavior; the murders by the Manson family changed this perception – now there were hippie killers? 1404 On the other hand, violence-bent revolutionary organizations such as the Weathermen and the Yippies cheered and celebrated what Manson and his family had done. The murders were considered “an exemplary political act,” in which the victims were simply “pigs,” and “their murder was a triumph of the revolutionary will.” 1405 In a speech during the December 1969 Flint, Michigan “War Council” meeting, organized by the Weathermen, Bernardine Dohrn (one of its leaders) said, “First they killed those pigs, then they ate dinner in the same room with them, then they even shove[d] a fork into the pig Tate’s stomach! Wild!” 1406 Moreover, many of the delegates at the war council, when greeting each other, often spread their fingers to signify the fork. 1407 Yippie Jerry Rubin declared, “I fell in love with Charlie Manson the first time I saw his cherub face and sparkling eyes on TV” 1408 In his book We Are Everywhere, Rubin later wrote, “His words and courage inspired us.” 1409

On August 15-18, 1969, the Woodstock Music & Art Fair (or informally, the Woodstock Festival) was held at Max Yasgur’s 600-acre dairy farm near Bethel, New York. One of the largest rock festivals in history, over 500,000 young people gathered to enjoy and meet fellow hippies and/or to listen to 32 of some of the most famous rock bands at the time. 1410 It was the most talked-about counter-cultural event, not only during 1969,
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For many people it symbolized the cosmic beginnings of the Age of Aquarius. For others it represented the peak of the hippie movement that had first exploded into mass consciousness awareness two years earlier, during the Summer of Love in San Francisco. Yet, in complete contradiction, others called it “the death throes of the counterculture,” or the end (at least the beginning of the end) of the Sixties. One thing was certain, however: the overly positive portrayal of the rock festival in the documentary film entitled Woodstock (released on March 26, 1970) transformed and elevated the event into some sort of a spiritual epic awakening. Woodstock became the emblem for the whole idealized notion of creating a new world of peace, love, and togetherness.

Nonetheless, similar to the myth of the Sixties in general, the reality behind the legendary rock festival was much more complicated – it was not all optimism, unity, and peace.

Certainly, in some sense, the Woodstock festival was a success as it averted any number of major disasters that easily could have occurred (not to speak of producing some truly loving magical vibes and connections between individuals and their sense of taking part in a now-huge counter-cultural movement and community). Max Yasgur famously told the audience (on August 17) how they were an example to the whole world, of showing that even in not very ideal conditions people could have “three days of fun and music and nothing but fun and music.” Perhaps this favorable portrayal of what had occurred rang true overall, but beneath the surface not all was running smoothly or harmoniously. In fact, Woodstock teetered on catastrophe throughout the whole ordeal. It could have ended on a much sourer note (like Altamont a few months later) with just a little less luck. Moreover, Woodstock was more the exception than the norm of how most rock festivals turned out during the Sixties era, as Newport ‘69 and Denver Pop Festival (both held in June) had experienced “large-scale violence” and “gate-crashing” only weeks before.
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The promoters of Woodstock experienced problems from the start, first and foremost in their difficulty in finding a location for the festival, as local people in several New York towns blocked their plans (especially at Wallkill, where the town voted legally through the Zoning Board of Appeals to stop them). After leasing Max Yasgur’s farm for 50,000 dollars just a month before the scheduled date, there was little time for properly planning certain facilities. Compounding the problem was the fact that hundreds of thousands of more people began to show up than was expected. This deluge caused severe shortages of food, water, medical supplies, and sanitation facilities, to the degree that Sullivan County had to declare a state of emergency (and much-needed supplies were dropped from helicopters). One saving grace that helped avert total disaster was the invitation given to Wavy Gravy and his communal Hog Farm to act as security and all-around helpers. They first of all kept the crowds fairly mellow (as there was an undercurrent of restlessness and frustration), acting as a “Please Force” and not as a police force. With the use of their non-intrusive methods (controlling things with expressions such as “Please don’t do that, please do this instead”) they lessened the chance for major violence to occur. The decision to make the festival free also helped reduce tensions, as the fence surrounding the concert to keep non-paying people out had already been torn down by concert-goers the night before the first officially scheduled day (assuring that the festival would be a financial failure). With no way to control the crowds coming in, the talk of adding more security to protect the perimeter or cancelling the festival, was quickly voted down (mostly over the apprehension that the hordes would turn angry and “tear the stage down,” if not “murder you”). Meanwhile, threats coming from the radical hip underground were still very much a possibility. First of all, Abbie Hoffman of the Yippies demanded $10,000 from the Woodstock promoters, threatening them by saying, “We’re going to bring this whole thing down around your ears and if you don’t want us to do that you’ll write a check.” Another problem arose when the Up Against the Wall Motherfuckers radical group announced that they were going to Woodstock to confront the
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police. On their leaflets it said, “Let’s all go to Woodstock and greet the New York fuzz, who will be up there unarmed. Let’s give them a real warm welcome.” As a result, the New York Police Commissioner issued a memorandum forbidding his men to go up to Woodstock “where they may be subjected to the threat of a mob.” Other threats of violence came from various motorcycle clubs who always seemed to act threateningly and violently towards the counter-culture “milking the community and the kids for all they could get out of it.” Another possibility of bloodshed arose from New York Governor Rockefeller’s intention of sending 10,000 National Guard troops to “remove everyone” at this “illegal gathering” (which he was talked out of doing). Potential violence also revolved around the issue of food. Right before the start of the festival, all the “legitimate” vendor people “pulled out” leaving only the unknown “Food for Love” people in charge, who then threatened to “cause mischief” if their financial demands were not met. Then during the festival many concert-goers got angry at being sold “five-dollar hot dogs,” and at one point a group of these “outraged consumers with torches burning” marched towards the “Food for Love encampment” and threatened “to burn them out” (luckily enough they soon ran out of food and also the Hog Farm distributed free food, which helped diffuse things).

In reality, the Woodstock festival was a far cry from offering a pure vision of how humanity should live “to save the planet.” There were plenty of incidents of violence, dissension, and other overall negative occurrences before, during and after the event. As at other rock festivals, there were near riots during times of music delays. Woodstock artist coordinator Bill Belmont stated, “I know crowds turn ugly especially when things don’t go the way they’re supposed to. . . . The whole concept of peace and love was a state of mind. It was not a reality. Crowds are always crowds.” Additionally, a near riot occurred when hungry people started pushing to get to the food dropped by a military helicopter. Meanwhile, there were some people seen with guns and knives at Woodstock. In town,
a fight at the grocery store ended up with a guy holding a knife to another one’s throat. Abbie Hoffman warned Woodstock co-producer Michael Lang that “somebody’s got a knife” in front of the stage, and “we’ve got to get him.” Biker guards from the “Queens” were ready to “clear some bodies.” Production coordinator for Woodstock John Morris grabbed Sly Stone before he performed on stage and “slammed him into the side of the trailer” during an altercation. In additionally, many people were seen fighting with each other while freaking out on drugs. Some people also taunted the greatly outnumbered police by blowing marijuana smoke in their faces; others were “gassed.”

As far as unity was concerned, it wasn’t always the case, either. For example, there was a special “Movement City” set up for political groups who ran booths and the underground press and had their own music and entertainment but were separated by woods from the main music and camping area of Woodstock, and made little effort to attract people “either by action or signs.” While most festival-goers suffered from severe lack of basic necessities, performers were completely unconscious as to what was going on “out here,” as they were helicoptered to and from the concert site, ate the finest foods, slept in fancy hotels, and were protected by body guards. A heated argument erupted during a helicopter shuttle over whether or not the first priority was to transport cases of champagne for the musicians or stretchers and plasma for the injured. Abbie Hoffman, representing the sick, expressed himself forcefully: “There are goddamned people needing blood transfusions and you’re shipping up grapes and foie gras and champagne for the goddamned singers. You want this goddamned music played to dead people or what?” Meanwhile legendary rock promoter Bill Graham was seen arguing with everyone from a helicopter pilot to the producers of Woodstock; according to Frank Fava (a member of the “‘black shirt’ heavy security” team at Woodstock), Graham “really detested Michael Lang.”

Moreover, main organizers themselves were heard having “heated discussions” with plenty of loud “Fuck you’s,” and a lot of other cursing during
the crisis-filled festival.\textsuperscript{1449} Other bickering involved situations dealing with money. Bands like the Grateful Dead and The Who refused to play unless they were paid in cash (fearing that Woodstock promoters would not have the money afterwards). They forced the promoters to come up with the money in the middle of the night, which they did out of fear that the crowd would tear the place apart in a riot if they found out that these popular bands would not be playing.\textsuperscript{1450} Other incidents included Abbie Hoffman being hit in the head by The Who guitarist Peter Townshend while trying to say something about White Panther Party leader John Sinclair getting a ten-year prison sentence for one marijuana cigarette. Many thought it was “uncool,” “bad vibes,” and an “insult” to knock Hoffman off the front of the stage, as what he had to say was just as important as MC Chip Monck telling the crowd that “Mary, meet Adam at the green tent.”\textsuperscript{1451} Besides, many people (including folk singer Joan Baez) did not think that Woodstock was “political enough”; plenty had wanted to make political statements but didn’t feel they had the chance.\textsuperscript{1452} \textsuperscript{1453} As a result, some at Woodstock printed “anti-Woodstock literature” with their printing press right there in the woods at “Movement City.”\textsuperscript{1454} Finally, Woodstock had a lot of other unfavorable aspects to it. According to the state Health Department report released October 4, 1969, there were 5,162 medical cases reported at Woodstock, out of which 797 were drug-abuse related (one of which resulted in a drug overdose death; another death resulted from a health condition).\textsuperscript{1455} Lots of people were seen “freaking out on drugs” at the festival.\textsuperscript{1456} According to some, a lot of “crazy flip-outs” from LSD occurred after it was announced from the stage that there was “bad acid” going around, and many got paranoid.\textsuperscript{1457} Others had bad drug trips from mescaline, methadone, marijuana, amphetamines, or by taking various other types of pills or tablets.\textsuperscript{1458} “Acid causalities were sent to the ‘freak out center.’”\textsuperscript{1459} One guy there on amphetamines had to be talked down carefully as he had a knife and “he was going to use it if anybody got near him.”\textsuperscript{1460} The Hog Farm helped out tremendously, calming down the many people who were having bad acid trips resulting
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from some sort of “brown acid” that was circulating at the festival. However, what made things into a near “medical disaster” was not only the lack of nurses and doctors, but the lack of antibiotics and anti-convulsant medications for sewing up the small lacerations resulting from “stepping on wire or glass barefoot.” The small medical crew was overwhelmed by the thousands of cases of accidents, injuries, and sickness (such as hepatitis), often going without much sleep, food, or water. Other problems stemmed from the weather. Tornado-type storms hit the festival, especially on Sunday, with fifty- and sixty-mile-an-hour winds. Spotlight towers began to sway dangerously, and with people climbing on top of them to get a better view of the music, there was a real threat of disaster for those on the towers and those people who were underneath. As the rains and lightening came, so did the fear of having people hit by lightning, and the destruction of the “billion volts of equipment,” which was shut down as fast as possible. Another problem at first was that not all the sound system and stage light wires were buried. According to John Morris, just as the bad weather hit, he experienced one of his worst moments in life with Joan Baez having a miscarriage, his wife Annie falling down and breaking her ankle, his dog disappearing, and hearing that there was a guy in the audience with a gun (there was also a fire, but that was the day before). A lot of Sunday was without music because of the rains and by evening many people began to leave the festival site. But for a good three days, the “kids were essentially in control, and it was lawless” as there were “ten square miles where no traffic moved and all the arteries were clogged” with little law enforcement. But this clout was not necessarily congenial, as Leon Greenberg (president of the Monticello Raceway) described how “these kids were dressed in bizarre fashion and no respect for any other’s property. They just would walk onto your property as if they owned it.” After it was all over, people left behind a foot deep of debris in front of the store in Bethel. They also left “soggy wet sleeping bags and cardboard boxes and newspapers and picnic wrappers and just a sea of junk all sunk in the mud” at
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Moreover, abandoned broken chairs and tents, “all knocked down and trampled on” were left rotting away in the fields. A mound of clothes and trash created an “incredible stench” until it was hauled away days and weeks later. Most members of the Woodstock clean-up crew fully expected to find dead bodies of drug overdosed hippies in the garbage and in the surrounding woods (one body of a dead 16-year-old who was run over by a tractor while sleeping was found during the festival). In the end, thirty cars were stolen at Woodstock, and the Hog Farm was accused of stealing everything that wasn’t nailed down. One could say that it wasn’t exactly the awakened state of consciousness required for starting a new world of universal brotherhood (three days is not a really big test, anyway, for creating a new world). A New York Times editorial headline called Woodstock a “Nightmare in the Catskills,” writing about “the lowest state to which youth had fallen.” While most who organized Woodstock would not go that far, most saw the Woodstock festival as a failure and were not very happy about how it turned out (the myth over the years changed many of their perspectives, though). Wavy Gravy tried to give it a positive spin saying, “There is always a little bit of heaven in a disaster area.”

The mystique of Woodstock was said to have been that people were forced to “not freak out” and thus “stay together,” to overcome the mud and all the discomfort, which brought people together in a Woodstock Nation. Ultimately, those who view Woodstock as more of an end of the Sixties than a peak of a movement (or the beginning of a new Age of Aquarius to come), base their perspective on seeing the festival in all its imperfections, but they tend to over-idealize of what occurred during the several years leading up to the summer of 1969. Those who see Woodstock as a symbol of a New Age are in denial of both the negative aspects of the festival and anything contradicting their overly positive account of the early years (and the then-present state) of the countercultural movement.

Throughout September, the Weathermen organized into “squads” and illegally broke into mostly white “blue-collar” high schools, during class hours, to create chaos and
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inspire the teenagers to join them for their upcoming “Days of Rage” protests planned in Chicago and for the coming revolution in general. In various cities (including Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, and Boston), they began “pushing teachers around, binding and gagging them, delivering revolutionary homilies,” and screaming “Jailbreak.” In Pittsburgh, on September 3, about seventy-five Weatherwomen carrying a Vietcong flag marched into South Hills High School and began to distribute leaflets and spray paint “Ho Lives” (in reference to North Vietnam leader Ho Chi Minh, who had recently died) and “Free Huey” (the Black Panther Party leader who had recently been arrested after a gunfight that left a police officer dead) onto the school’s main entrance doors. They also interrupted classes, telling the students that what they were being taught “was false information,” and they needed to participate in a “jailbreak.” As some students followed them outside, a fight erupted between the protesters and a group of construction workers. Twenty-six Weatherwomen were arrested and charged with “rioting, inciting a riot, and disorderly conduct” (some reports claimed that “the women ran through the school topless”). The end result was not a unified youth. In fact, only a handful of students “joined up for the chance to vent some class spleen,” and the majority instead turned on the radicals and “threw punches at them,” and in some places literally chased them out of their neighborhoods. Moreover, the Weathermen invaded colleges too in September. At Harvard, twenty Weathermen marched on the school’s Center for International Affairs (known for counterinsurgency research) and “smashed windows, yanked out phones, shoved secretaries and beat three professors.” It was at this point that the RYM II began to view the Weathermen as violent “maniacs.” They quickly distanced themselves, and then completely broke off their alliance to “find their own working-class base.”
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In other news, on September 16, thousands of students throughout the Southwest skipped high schools in what was the “First National Chicano Boycott.”\(^{1491}\) The rise of the “Chicano Power Movement” consisted of rejecting not only the political mainstream, but also the “white-dominated student Left” for “initially marginalized people of color.”\(^{1492}\) Their goal became “cultural regeneration, the negation of assimilation into the dominant society, and Chicano self-determination” (similarly to all the other third world groups).\(^{1493}\) However, some white student activists increasingly felt that the third world emphasis on “cultural nationalism” fragmented their efforts in sustaining a unified revolutionary movement, and now marginalized them - forcing them out of leadership positions.\(^{1494}\) The only choice for whites now seemed “to either join in the world revolution led by the blacks, the yellows, and the browns, or being put down as U.S. imperialist pigs by the people of the Third World.”\(^{1495}\) Another point of contention continued to be the use of explosives as a protest tactic by radical groups, as 1969 saw a dramatic jump in the assault of the symbols of power. A striking example was the September 19 bombing of the offices of the Department of Commerce and the Army Inspector General in New York City, carried out by Sam Melville and his group.\(^{1496}\) On October 7 they struck again, this time bombing the Army Induction Center on Whitehall Street in New York City.\(^{1497}\) A letter sent to the *New York Times* by the bombers read: “The Establishment is in for some big surprises if it thinks that kangaroo courts and death sentences can arrest a revolution.”\(^{1498}\) In the meantime, on September 24, the Chicago Seven trial began by charging the defendants - Abbie Hoffman (Yippies), Jerry Rubin (Yippies), David Dellinger, Tom Hayden (SDS), Rennie Davis (SDS), John Froines, and Lee Weiner – of crossing state lines to incite a riot, to teach the making of an incendiary device, and to commit acts to impede law enforcement officers in their lawful duties related to the countercultural protests that took place in Chicago, Illinois, on the occasion of the 1968 Democratic National
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Convention. On October 9, the United States National Guard was called in for crowd control as demonstrations grew outside the courtroom (the trial extended for months with many celebrated figures from the American left and counterculture called to testify, including folk singers Phil Ochs, Judy Collins, and Arlo Guthrie, writer Norman Mailer, LSD advocate Timothy Leary, and Reverend Jesse Jackson).

From October 8 to 11 the Weathermen held their “Days of Rage” protests in Chicago, against the war in Vietnam that was “killing two thousand innocent people a day.” They decided on a series of violent direct actions around the theme of “bring the war home,” which meant the Weathermen would “bring to American streets the taste of the violence which they saw the U.S. delivering in Vietnam.” During all four days they vandalized businesses, homes, and automobiles as well as assaulted police officers, resulting in dozens of injuries and at least 280 members of the Weather Underground being arrested. Moreover, as a warm up to the planned confrontations, on October 6, the statue commemorating the policemen killed in the 1886 Haymarket affair in Chicago was blown up, during which time it was predicted that “20,000 angry youths would come to ‘pig city,’” to help ignite an “all-out civil war.” Nonetheless, despite major efforts in recruiting youth for the riots, only about 800 Weatherman members showed up to face 2000 police officers. The hoped-for vision was to destroy the American imperialist and racist society with trained “fighters” that would be a “first step in building a new Communist Party and a Red Army.” However, the disappointing turnout for the “Days of Rage” showed that most student radicals were still unwilling to take the next step of joining violent groups of “anti-imperialist fighters” that were “willing to die in battle.” Nonetheless, on October 8, the Weathermen, while waiting for more people to arrive, met in Lincoln Park and began chanting, “Revolution’s begun! Off the pig! Pick up

---

1502 Ibid.
1506 Gitlin, The Sixties, 392.
1507 Ibid., 391.
the gun! That evening, John Jacobs of the Weathermen stood on the pedestal of the bombed Haymarket policemen’s statue and declared: “We’ll probably lose people today... We don’t really have to win here... just the fact that we are willing to fight the police is a political victory.” The goal for the “Days of Rage,” according to Jacobs, was as follows: “Weathermen would shove the war down their [the government’s] dumb, fascist throats and show them, while we were at it, how much better we were than them, both tactically and strategically, as a people. In an all-out civil war over Vietnam and other fascist U.S. imperialism, we were going to bring the war home. ‘Turn the imperialists’ war into a civil war,’ in Lenin’s words. And we were going to kick ass.” At 10:25 p.m., 350 people, many of them wearing motorcycle or football helmets and carrying steel pipes, chains, sling shots, and baseball bats, began to “charge south through the city toward the Drake Hotel and the exceptionally affluent Gold Coast neighborhood, smashing windows in automobiles and buildings as they went. The protesters attacked “ordinary cars, a barber shop... and the windows of lower-middle-class homes, as well as police cars and luxury businesses.” When they met up with the police, they began to assault them too, but quickly lost the hand-to-hand combat as the officers were better trained and armed, using their nightsticks to aim at the “necks, legs and groins” of the young rioters. Moreover, large amounts of tear gas were used on the rioters. Hastily, an “an unmarked” police car also arrived “firing revolvers,” while two regular police cars ran “full speed” into the crowds. This first round of combat ended after only a half an hour, with a total of “28 policemen injured (none seriously), six Weathermen were shot and an unknown number injured, and 68 protesters were arrested.”

The next day, a “Women’s Militia” of seventy or so female Weatherman members were “overpowered by police” at Grant Park before they could set out to “raid a draft board office.” Afterwards, the Weathermen cancelled their evening protests as Illinois Governor Richard Ogilvie announced that he had requested that 2,500 National Guardsmen
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come and “protect Chicago.” Notwithstanding, for the next three days banks and other businesses were attacked in Chicago by roaming groups of radicals, with a final assault to “reignite the revolution” occurring on October 11. This concluding attempt at disorder consisted of about 300 protesters marching through Chicago’s main business district; they successfully broke through police lines and again went on a rampage of smashing windows of cars and stores. However, once again the police retook control of the situation, arresting more than half of the crowd, but not before Richard Elrod, a city attorney, was paralyzed after he attempted to tackle a Weatherman member but hit a concrete wall (or as a result of receiving several blows to the neck, as he claimed). Feeling no sympathy for the critically injured, “the Weathermen later produced a song mocking Elrod, a parody of Bob Dylan’s ‘Lay Lady Lay,’ including the lines Lay, Elrod, lay || Lay in the street for a while || Stay, Elrod, stay || Stay in your bed for a while.” The Weathermen had also uncovered a police informant amongst them and severely beaten him.

With much less publicity, other groups also protested during the “Days of Rage,” but peacefully. RYM II held rallies almost every day, consisting of “several hundred people” in front of the federal courthouse, an International Harvester factory, and the Cook County Hospital. At the October 9 RYM II rally (at the courthouse), Black Panther leader Fred Hampton disassociated his group from the Weathermen, saying, “We do not support people who are anarchistic, opportunistic, adventuristic, and Custeristic” (as he knocked Weatherman Mark Rudd down on the ground, calling him “a motherfucking masochist.”) Moreover, he said that the actions of the Weathermen could “alienate potential allies and invite an escalation of police oppression” and “bring down the wrath of the police on the ghetto.” Indeed, the “Days of Rage” tactic of using violence to open up “another front against imperialism right here in America” split the Movement even further apart; it “permanently damaged the relationship between Weatherman, SDS and the
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Black Panther Party. The Weathermen turned against the other fragments of SDS (RYM II and PL) now in disarray since June, calling them “wimpy,” as their new goal was bringing in and training working-class street toughs in order to achieve “a life-or-death revolutionary struggle for power.” Nevertheless, the largest event of the “Days of Rage” occurred on October 10, when RYM II led a peaceful “interracial march of 2,000 people through a Spanish-speaking part of Chicago.” In the aftermath, the Weathermen, “shaken by casualties and defections,” wrote that “mass street action is a necessary, but a losing tactic.” Soon they went underground and conducted a campaign of bombings through the mid-1970s.

On October 15, 1969 the more moderate types in the anti-war movement staged a successful national mass protest called the Vietnam Moratorium. It was a one-day pause, a moratorium in business as usual involving for the first time America’s middle class and middle-aged in large numbers. An estimated 10 million people took part in what was the “largest public protest ever held in America.” People participated in “teach-ins, vigils, rallies, boycotted classes, wore black armbands symbolizing peace, etc.” Moreover, 600,000 activists converged in Washington, D.C., in what the Boston Globe newspaper described as “Political Woodstock.” While things were mostly peaceful, outside the White House there were “scuffles” and several people were arrested after the police “clamped down on black activists.” Moreover, in Portland, Oregon, 400 protesters clashed with police after they attempted to prevent conscripts from entering an army induction center. The supporters of the war made their views known in various ways. However, contrary to political analysts who claimed that the anti-war movement
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was on the decline in 1969, the first of many major national demonstrations against the Nixon administration’s handling of the war were just beginning.

By the late 1960s the divisions within the Movement included dissent between black versus white women, and revolutionary women versus the mostly white feminist women. All revolutionary women disagreed with the “white” women’s fight for “equal rights” and the “right to work,” the “right to organize for equal pay, promotions, better conditions,” while they and everyone else was “trying to destroy imperialism.”

Black and revolutionary women saw the white feminist movement “as racist,” and part of the ruling class, as they were willing to fight for “a few more crumbs,” but not with men to fight against “pig Amerika,” the true source of oppression. Their liberation, they said, came from the “political power” that grew “out of the barrel of a gun.” Revolutionary women saw the need to change themselves and break out of their “passivity” and “inexperience” and “destroy the pigs.” The women from the Weathermen organization wrote, “Our victory will be political and military – so we must pick up the gun and use it until this system is dead.”

Actions to destroy the U.S. ability to wage war in Vietnam continued during the fall as draft board records were set on fire in mid-October in Akron, Ohio. On October 31, the “Beaver 55” (consisting of only 8 people) shredded records of 44 Indianapolis draft boards, stopping “any possible induction, from these local boards for up to a year.” On November 7, Washington Dow Chemical offices were hit again with “files strewn and ink and chemicals splashed around.” Also, on the same day, the “Boston 8” entered four Boston locations that housed eight draft boards and shredded files. Still another action on this day consisted of the “Beaver 55” invading Dow Chemical’s center in Midland, Michigan, and erasing magnetic tapes “filled with biological and chemical research.” Then on November 11, the Silver Spring draft board was again invaded and “draft files were taken and left on a railroad track.” Also on this day, Sam Melville, assisted by Jane Alpert and others, carried out bombings in three places in New York City: Chase
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Manhattan Bank headquarters offices, the General Motors Building, and the Standard Oil offices in the RCA Building, as they became increasingly involved with the Weather Underground and the Black Panther Party. Then on November 12, Melville and his group bombed the New York City Criminal Courts Building on Center Street, where the Panther 21 trial was being held. Hours after the Courts Building bombing, however, the police arrested Melville as he and an FBI informant “placed dynamite charges in National Guard trucks parked outside the 69th Regimental Armory at 26th Street and Lexington Avenue.”

On November 15, 1969, somewhere around 500,000 people attended a second Moratorium demonstration against the war in Washington D.C., while smaller demonstrations also were held in a many other cities and towns throughout the country. In the capitol, the rally featured speeches by anti-war politicians, which included Eugene McCarthy, George McGovern, and Charles Goodell. There were also musical performances by protest favorites Peter, Paul and Mary, Arlo Guthrie, and Pete Seeger (who led the crowd in the singing of John Lennon’s new song “Give Peace a Chance”). The crowd, according to the New York Times, was “predominantly youthful” and a “mass gathering of the moderate and radical Left . . . old-style liberals; Communists and pacifists and a sprinkling of the violent New Left.” While once again the overall Moratorium demonstrations went relatively peacefully, this second one in the District of Columbia did turn violent near the end. According to Mobe, the co-organizers of the event, the violence that erupted was “deliberately provoked by zealots and crazies.” The Weathermen led a “splinter march” on the South Vietnamese embassy, where they fought with the police and trashed store windows. Another militant splinter group marched on the Justice Department led by Yippie leaders Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman (then on trial as part of the Chicago 8). They threw smoke bombs, rocks, and bottles, built barricades, set fires, and took down the “Amerikan” flag and put up the NLF flag as police sprayed them with tear gas.

1549 Jacobs, The Way the Wind Blew, 144.
1553 Ibid.
1554 Ibid.
1555 Unger and Unger, The Times Were a Changin’, 297.
1556 Gitlin, The Sixties, 394.
1557 Ibid.
After the November Moratorium (called the “largest single demonstration in American history” with some claiming up to 750,000 in attendance) the great divisions within the anti-war movement not only persisted, but accelerated. First, radicals asserted that afterwards the moderates went into a “hiatus,” not knowing “what to do for an encore.” Meanwhile, they, the new left, continued in the direction of “growing militancy” and “growing commitment to the Revolution,” which moderates claimed would lead the radicals to “growing isolation” from the rest of the Movement and society as a whole. Moreover, instead of having a united front, the revolutionary groups continued to fragment into factions and grow in their hatred towards each other, as they had “competing imaginations” on what to do. Also, the “old new left” began to drop out, especially after SDS splintered in June, “demoralized, gazing in fascinated horror” on how their organization had moved from “echoing Albert Camus and C. Wright Mills” to chanting either “Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, Dare to Struggle, Dare to Win,” or “Mao, Mao, Mao Tse-tung.” Nonetheless, while many students were calling themselves revolutionaries by the end of 1969, they were still in the minority, and only “three-quarters of a million students out of more than 7 million identified themselves as ‘radical or far left.’” No matter, the growing desire for an open revolt fogged the understanding of many on how difficult it would be to stage a real revolution, as the “radicals for most part were from the privileged class and the working class were conservatives.” Unfazed and “unwilling to give up the revolutionary dream,” some in the SDS came to conclude that since the working class in the U.S. was “hopelessly integrated into capitalism,” to use terror was therefore legitimate.

Then on November 20, American Indian protesters, or “Red Power,” landed and took over Alcatraz Island (in San Francisco Bay), the prison facility that the federal government had abandoned in 1963. Despite an attempt by the U.S. Coast Guard to create a blockade, a group of 89 Indians led by Richard Oakes claimed the island. Describing themselves as “Indians of All Tribes,” these mostly college students (but also
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married couples and children), declared that an 1868 U.S. treaty with the Sioux gave “Indians rights to unused federal property on Indian land.”¹⁵⁶⁷ A few days later, on Thanksgiving Day, 300 people were on the island celebrating, and announcing their first of many demands: to receive federal funding to turn Alcatraz into a “Native American Studies center, spiritual center, an ecology center, and an American Indian Museum.”¹⁵⁶⁸ While the U.S. government had given the Indians 24 hours to leave the island, the occupiers gave the U.S. government “two weeks to surrender the facility” to them, as “Keep Off U.S. Property” signs were repainted “Keep Off Indian Property.”¹⁵⁶⁹ Although the protesters eventually failed to achieve their specific goals, they helped catalyze the Indian community into activism, which had a direct positive effect on federal Indian policy, resulting in major benefits for American Indians.¹⁵⁷⁰ Moreover, the occupation of Alcatraz was an enormous symbol that helped “restore the dignity of the more than 554 American Indian nations in the United States.”¹⁵⁷¹ American Indians, like other “people of color,” were fed up with making only “one-fourth the national average” in earnings, and having a life expectancy of only 44 compared with 65 for white Americans at the time.¹⁵⁷² By the late 1960s, not only Blacks, but Chicanos, Asians, and now Native Americans had taken to the streets in protest of discrimination and inequality. During the 19-month takeover, many activists, including the American Indian Movement (AIM) and numerous tribes (over 5,600 American Indians in total) joined the occupation, some for the whole duration, others “for just part of a day.”¹⁵⁷³ During the first days of the takeover, the occupiers sent the following note to the San Francisco Department of the Interior: “We invite the United States to acknowledge the justice of our claim. The choice now lies with the leaders of the American government - to use violence upon us as before to remove us from our Great Spirit’s land, or to institute a real change in its dealing with the American Indian. We do not fear your threat to charge us with crimes on our land. We and all other oppressed peoples would welcome spectacle
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of proof before the world of your title by genocide. Nevertheless, we seek peace.”\textsuperscript{1574}

Fearing that the occupation “could be mishandled and violence would ensue.” President Nixon’s Special Counsel Leonard Garment took over negotiations with the Indians, as John Trudell (one of the occupiers) began daily radio broadcasts from the island in December and others began publishing a newsletter in January of 1970.\textsuperscript{1575} However, once again, even during the Alcatraz actions division and chaos with some violence occurred. Soon after the initial success of the takeover, other “new occupiers” came to the island. Many of these were hippie drug users or other types of drug addicts and their presence resulted in the prohibition of non-Indians from staying overnight.\textsuperscript{1576} Then on January 3, 1970, Oakes’s 13-year old stepdaughter “fell onto a concrete slab” on Alcatraz and died. A few days later, Oakes and his family left the island for good, “creating a leadership void and a power struggle among the remaining occupiers.”\textsuperscript{1577} Nevertheless, things had already begun to turn for the worse as early as December 4, when all electrical power and telephone service was cut by the government.\textsuperscript{1578} Moreover, the primary water main and the fuel line began to leak, and as many of the original occupiers went back to college, the newer ones were “less idealistic” and had an assortment of disorders.\textsuperscript{1579} Stories of beatings and assaults on the island were reported. Some activist groups had resented the media attention that Oakes received from the beginning. The situation at Alcatraz continued to deteriorate throughout 1970, as a fire destroyed many buildings in June, with the Indians blaming the whites who might have “slipped past their security after dark and set the fire.”\textsuperscript{1580} Not having electricity meant that “the lighthouse and fog signals were inoperable,” which created concerns about “navigation safety.”\textsuperscript{1581} However, when the Coast Guard went to restore the “navigational aids,” they were met by the island occupiers with weapons. Public opinion began to turn in earnest when a “crowded excursion boat” was fired on and hit by a “two and a half foot long arrow with a metal tip,” and the Alcatraz protesters were now seen to be “potentially violent.”\textsuperscript{1582} Support for the occupiers
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eroded even further in January of 1971 when “two supertankers collided near the Golden Gate Bridge, dumping 800,000 gallons of crude oil into the ocean,” and the media falsely blamed the broken lighthouse for the accident.\footnote{Ibid.} It all ended finally, on June 11, 1971, when a large force of federal marshals, GSA Special Forces, Coast Guard, and FBI agents removed the 15 remaining people from Alcatraz, who gave no resistance.\footnote{Ibid.}

Finally, December of 1969 arrived, and so did the so-called end of the Sixties era alleged by many authors. The high ideals of the 1960s decade, they claimed, had degenerated into destructiveness.\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 400.} It was true that an ever-growing part of the Movement was saturated in violence, dissension, and pessimism by this time, as witnessed by the December 4 Chicago police attack on a local Black Panther headquarter (a shoot-out that left four Panthers wounded and two dead).\footnote{Kirkpatrick, \textit{1969}, 226.} Both the Movement’s turn to the idea of revolution and the government’s response to it were factors that led to evermore bloodshed and destructiveness over the years. On the other hand, the government from the beginning of the decade onward had tried to suppress all the various aspects of the Movement that could lead to social change, which created ever increasing frustration and bitterness in the first place. Over time, the FBI intensified its nationwide secret COINTELPRO program of “surveying, infiltrating, discrediting, and disrupting domestic political organizations.”\footnote{“A Break-in to End all Break-ins; In 1971, Stolen FBI Files Exposed the Government’s Domestic Spying Program,” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, March 8, 2006, A8.} Groups such as the Black Panthers and AIM were especially targeted, with raids that seemed to want to “exterminate” them (28 Panthers were killed as a result of COINTELPRO).\footnote{Anderson, \textit{The Movement and the Sixties}, 327.} In fact, the Illinois Panther leader Fred Hampton was assassinated while sleeping in his apartment.\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 405.}

The reality was that the Movement had for years turned progressively ugly. By December 25, 1969, when the Weathermen held their “National War Council” in Flint, Michigan, rage had turned into near insanity. At the entrance of their meeting place hung from the ceiling a cardboard machine gun, and on the walls hung slogan such as “Piece Now,” “Sirhan Sirhan Power,” and “Red Army Power.”\footnote{Ibid., 399.} Weathermen spokespersons predicted a successful revolution, as youth would move away from passivity and apathy and “toward a new high-energy culture of ‘repersonalization’ brought about by drugs, sex,
and armed revolution.” Mark Rudd said, “It’s a wonderful feeling to hit a pig. It must be a really wonderful feeling to kill a pig, or blow up a building.” John Jacobs followed, saying, “We’re against everything that’s ‘good and decent’ in honky America. We will burn and loot and destroy. We are the incubation of your mother’s nightmare.” Finally, Ted Gold declared, “Well if it will take fascism we’ll have to have fascism” to change things. Nevertheless, more than anything else, it was the dual events in early December, we are told, that allegedly spelled the end of the Sixties era: the revelation that the Tate-LaBianca murders were committed by hippie killers, and the disaster at the Altamont rock festival (Woodstock West), which included the stabbing death of someone in the audience. While the Tate-LaBianca slayings were committed by the Manson family and written about here in the August 1969 section when the butchering occurred, now it is time for an indepth look at what really happened at Altamont, and why the actions of the Hells Angels motorcycle gang could never have ended the Sixties era counter-culture.

II. 5. The Altamont Rock Festival:

The Myth that Hells Angels Were Part of the Movement

The 1969 Altamont Rock Festival has been called the event that signaled the end of the countercultural sixties area in America. The hippie (and the new left) dream of creating a better world supposedly got shattered because of the havoc caused by the Hells Angels motorcycle club who had been hired to guard the stage. The Angels beat up concertgoers throughout the day and stabbed to death one person who had a gun, this all at a gathering of thousands who saw themselves “as harbingers of a new age based on peaceful coexistence.” Many historians seem to agree with author Todd Gitlin’s statements that Altamont “burst the bubble of youth culture’s illusions about itself” and “had witnessed the famous collectivity of a generation cracking into thousands of shards.” The fact that young idealists emphasizing peace and love of one’s brother came to realize that there were both good and bad in and around their movement (to change the world and liberate
themselves) seemed like a startling new discovery. Nonetheless, the notion that the sixties counterculture “really” ended at Altamont is a myth. While Altamont did signify, for some, a sort of awakening to the fact that their youth culture was not made of perfect people (and that there were severe differences of opinion), one could argue that this was nothing new and that there had been a continual awakening or disillusionment over the years for those involved. As for the fragmentation of the sixties generation (leaving out the enormous fact that those who made up the counterculture were but a small part of their own generation), one must question if the term “counterculture” (as popularly used) was ever in reality meant to signify such a broad term that could include both hippies and bikers. To make such an assertion, one would have to claim, for example, that the Hells Angels (who caused most of the problems at Altamont) and the “hippies” in the audience were like-minded. This of course could not be further from the truth. While the Angels had indeed hung around the hippie scene for several years, and both groups were attracted to each other for various reasons, they represented very different worlds holding diametrically opposing views concerning hierarchy, rules, discipline, the Vietnam War, racism, sexism, and violence. The hippie youth culture believed in creating a world of peace, love, and no war. This contrasted with the Hells Angels belief in the necessity of physical, brutal retaliation and confrontation to make right some supposed wrongs. For the Hells Angels, beating people bloody was a frequent reality. As a result, the Altamont rock festival can in no way symbolize the end of the sixties based on the Hells Angels’ behavior on that day, because they who created the violence did not believe in the Age of Aquarius philosophy of peace. The truth was that the Hells Angels were not really part of the counterculture – they were part of a totally different subculture.
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The Hells Angels, to begin with, predated the sixties hippie counterculture by many years, first forming in Fontana and San Bernardino, California in 1948. The outlaw motorcyclist phenomenon in general had existed on the American landscape at least since the end of WW II, getting their first taste of national recognition in Hollister, California in 1947 with the Fourth of July celebrations and motorcycle hill climb that attracted cyclists and clubs from all over the state. The event turned into “40 hours of lawlessness and a drunken take-over of the town by rowdy motorcyclists,” and was the inspiration for the Marlon Brando/Lee Marvin film The Wild One (1953). Unlike the later more docile hippies, the growing “outlaw” motorcycle club subculture throughout the 1950s and early 1960s engaged in violent incidents in various California towns involving clashes with townspeople and law enforcement. The “1%er” patch worn by Hells Angels (as legend has it) was inspired by the American Motorcycle Association (AMA) claims that 99% of motorcycle riders were law-abiding citizens, and so they identified themselves as the other 1%, who disregarded the law. Eventually, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Canadian Security Intelligence Services classified the Angels as one of the “big four” motorcycle gangs, contending that members carried out widespread violence, drug dealing, trafficking in stolen goods, and extortion (and later murder).

The name “Hells Angels” (as opposed to the more positive hippie names such as heaven, bliss, love, beauty, earth, truth, etc.) was believed to have been inspired by the common historical practice, in both world wars, of naming squadrons or other fighting groups with death-defying names. Born of war instead of peace, one American squadron of P-40s in Burma and China, in fact, did call themselves the “Hells Angels.” While the notion that former pilots, bored with middle-class life, made up the original motorcycle club seems not to be true, some cite returning wartime bike-riding veterans as
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the beginning of “outlaw motorcycle types” during the late 1940s.\textsuperscript{1612} After WWII, both the aggressive spirit of war and combat and the look – leather bomber jackets, flight goggles, and long scarves – remained.\textsuperscript{1613} Not surprisingly, the Hells Angels over the years (again contrary to the hippie anti-war counterculture) very much did support the military efforts of the United States government, including the Vietnam War.\textsuperscript{1614}

The two Hells Angels chapters most associated with the Altamont rock festival fiasco both started out in the 1950s in San Francisco and Oakland, California.\textsuperscript{1615} At first, they were told by existing chapters in other cities about how a motorcycle club should and should not be. Procedures, many borrowed from the Army, were set-up: meetings, dues, rules and regulations.\textsuperscript{1616} Unlike hippies, the Hells Angels were not very inclusive regarding who could join them, nor very accepting of other motorcycle clubs in the area. One group that was violently run out of California after a nasty turf war was a motorcycle club called the Gypsy Jokers.\textsuperscript{1617} Similarly, another motorcycle club, called the Diablos, disbanded after the Angels terrorized them in a series of stomplings, beatings, and chain-whippings.\textsuperscript{1618} The Hells Angels, showing no signs of brotherly love, hunted them down one by one and “did them in.”\textsuperscript{1619} In complete opposition to the hippie counterculture, they were young toughs loving a street-fight, swinging chains and big wrenches, using knives, and displaying no mercy.\textsuperscript{1620} The Hells Angels motorcycle club gained mass notoriety by the mid-1960s due to their involvement in many highly publicized run-ins with the law and rival biker gangs. Sensational articles began to appear about motorcycle gangs over-running California with names such as Coffin Cheaters, Comancheros, Galloping Gooses, Gomorrah, Iron Horsemen, Nightriders, Presidents, Question Marks, Road Rats, Satan’s Slaves, Stray Satans. No matter, according to town folk throughout the state, the most hard core and “rottest motorcycle gang in the whole history of Christendom” were these Hells
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Angels. 1621 Almost all of its members had long police records including offenses such as vehicle theft, assault and battery, burglary, rape, narcotics, and public cunnilingus.1622

By late 1964, California Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch began an investigation concerning the Hells Angels motorcycle gang, after public outcry following a notorious Monterey incident allegedly involving the rape of minors (described later).1623 A fifteen-page report released in March, 1965, profiled their activities over the previous ten years. From 104 California sheriffs, district attorneys, and chiefs of police, Lynch amassed a mountain of evidence against the Hells Angels, the thrust of which showed that the group had more than lived up to its “sinister moniker” of being angels from hell.1624 The “bikers” described as being tough, mean, and “potentially as dangerous as a pack of wild boars.”1625 According to 1965 figures, the police counted 463 Hells Angels: 205 around Los Angeles and 233 in the San Francisco-Oakland area. Among them, they boasted 874 felony arrests, 300 felony convictions, 1,682 misdemeanor arrests, and 1,023 misdemeanor convictions.1626

In the section of the Lynch report entitled “Hoodlum Activities,” the following instance provides just one example of how the Hells Angels’ belief in total retaliation had made them both a terrifying law unto themselves and a far cry from the spirit of peace and harmony of the hippies. As told, on November 4, 1961, “a San Francisco resident driving through the town of Rodeo, struck a motorcycle belonging to a Hells Angel parked outside a bar. A group of Angels pursued the vehicle, pulled the driver from the car and attempted to demolish the rather expensive vehicle. The bartender claimed he had seen nothing, but a cocktail waitress in the bar furnished identification to the police concerning some of those responsible for the assault. The next day it was reported to officers that a member of the Hells Angels gang had threatened the life of this waitress as well as another woman waitress. A male witness who definitely identified five participants in the assault including the president of Vallejo Hells Angels and the Vallejo Road Rats told officers that because of his fear of retaliation by club members he would refuse to testify to the facts he had previously furnished.”1627 While the Angels often claimed that they don’t start trouble, their idea of provocation was dangerously broad, and their biggest problem was that
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nobody else seemed to understand it, leading to incidents like Altamont, where they got into fistfights all day.\textsuperscript{1628} When anyone got into an argument with the Hells Angels, one could generally count that person’s chances of emerging unscathed to be small. In that 1961 incident, one of the Angels declared, “I smashed his face, he got wise. He called me a punk. He must have been stupid.”\textsuperscript{1629} Even dealing with them personally, on the friendliest terms, wrote Hunter S. Thompson, you could “sense their hair-trigger readiness to retaliate.”\textsuperscript{1630}

According to the Lynch report, the favorite activity of the Hells Angels seemed at times to include terrorizing whole towns.\textsuperscript{1631} One story in the report described what happened in the town of Porterville, California (pop. 7,991) in September of 1963 after the Hells Angels roared in on their “chopped hogs” (customized Harley-Davidson machines). By Saturday evening they had assembled in the center of the city. Most of them started to drink in the local bars and became obnoxious and vulgar. They stood in the middle of the street, where they stopped vehicles, opened car doors, and attempted to pet and paw female passengers in the automobiles. The women who accompanied the group lay in the middle of the street, where they went through suggestive motions. At about this time, some half-dozen motorcyclists invaded a bar and brutally beat an old man and attempted to abduct the barmaid. Shortly thereafter some dozen motorcyclists went to the local hospital, where they pushed in every door of the hospital looking for the victim of the beating.\textsuperscript{1632}

While the sexually lewd conduct of the Hells Angels might not seem that different from that of the hippies, the ethic of vengeance was diametrically opposite. For example, on September 19, 1964, a large group of Hells Angels converged on a bar in the South Gate (Los Angeles County), “parking their motorcycles and cars in the street in such a fashion as to block one-half of the roadway. They told police later that three members of the club had been recently asked to stay out of the bar and that they had come to tear it down.”\textsuperscript{1633} Upon their approach the bar owner locked the doors and turned off the lights, and while they did not enter, the Angels demolished a cement block fence outside. After the police arrived, the Hells Angels reluctantly left the city after being ordered to do so. Nonetheless, as they were leaving, several threatened to come back and obliterate the bar. The ethic of total retaliation once again contrasted completely with the hippie
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countercultural ideals of peace, love, understanding, and forgiveness. One member of the
Angels stated that, “If you’re asked to stay out of a bar, you don’t just punch the owner;
you come back with your army and destroy the whole edifice.”

More than any event, however, it was the previously mentioned Monterey
motorcycle run incident, during the 1964 Labor Day weekend, marred by violence and rape
charges that transformed the Hells Angels image to menacing savages, and made them
known to a wider audience. The Labor Day weekend newspapers all over California
gave front-page reports of a “heinous gang rape in the moonlit sand dunes” near the town
of Seaside on the Monterey Peninsula. Two girls, aged 14 and 15, were allegedly taken
(charges were dropped for lack of evidence) from their dates by a “gang of filthy, frenzied,
boozed-up motorcycle hoodlums called Hells Angels,” and dragged off to be “repeatedly
assaulted.” A deputy sheriff, summoned by one of the dates, said he “arrived at the
beach and saw a huge bonfire surrounded by cyclists of both sexes. Then the two sobbing,
near-hysterical girls staggered out of the darkness, begging for help. One was completely
nude and the other had on only a “torn sweater.” What happened that weekend would
make the group notorious for being “rumbling barbarians looking for young woman to
gang bang, and scores to settle.” These stories, exaggerated or not, got the Hells Angels
publicity, and put them into the limelight.

On March 15, 1965, the releasing of the Lynch report marked the end to anonymity
for the Hells Angels and other outlaw clubs collectively. The Attorney General’s report
became the basis of most of the initial information that the press had to go on concerning
the clubs, as can be seen in many of the magazine articles released during that time, which
quote and cite Lynch’s report. The May 17, 1965 issue of The Nation in which Hunter S.
Thompson’s influential article called “The Motorcycle Gangs, Losers and Outsiders”
appeared only two months later, and combined with the Lynch report, started the ball
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rolling as far as national attention. Quickly, another incident kept the cyclists’ subculture in the news, the Weirs Beach riot in Laconia, New Hampshire. It took place on June 19 and 20th, 1965, during the 44th Annual New England Tour and Rally, and this too made the headlines in national publications, including *Life* magazine. On that occasion, thirty-four cyclists were arrested, while 70 people were injured fighting the police. Until then the outlaw motorcycle clubs had been a West Coast phenomenon, but by 1966 they had reached the peak of their media coverage, and had become rebel antiheroes to some all across the country. In effect, the onslaught of numerous magazine and newspaper articles put the images of outlaw motorcyclists like the Hells Angels in the forefront of popular culture, and imagination of the then-budding youth counterculture.

For some who would later make up the sixties counterculture, as children, their initial views about Hells Angel types were already being shaped by 1950s pop culture. A biker archetypal image portrayed them as individualistic heroes, which incorrectly linked them with other early countercultural rudimentary elements of the period. Through *The Wild One*, the future members of the counterculture were duped into believing that all bikers were fashioned from the same mold as Marion Brando’s hip character Johnny, a sullen individualist who bucks the ultra-conformity of 1950s America. It would take several negative encounters with the Hells Angels in the 1960s for the hippie counterculture to understand that this assumption was very incorrect. One striking example of the linking of the two groups comes in the form of a scene from *The Wild One* in which members of a biker gang called the Black Rebels converse with an elderly bar owner. The bikers confuse the old man with an array of slang meant to evoke the language of the jazz musicians and the Beat poets of the era. While a case can be made for the Beats being the originators of what would later be called the counterculture, they were in no way connected to the outlaw bikers of the 1950s, and outlaw bikers almost definitely did not speak in this type of lingo.
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bikers with the Beats comes from rock ‘n roll musicians like Gene Vincent (1956 top ten hit “Be Bop A Lula”) and even early Bob Dylan (before being famous), who performed in black leather in an effort to mimic the image of a biker inspired by The Wild One movie.\textsuperscript{1651}

Another inaccurate depiction of bikers as heroes against the establishment had to do with imagining them as being some sort of modern Wild West outlaws.\textsuperscript{1652} The 1950s was the heyday for movies about the old American wild West. A later-day president of the Ventura Hells Angels, George Christie, explained the romanticism of the Angels as the “desire for non-bikers, hippie or otherwise, to recreate such nonconforming western outlaws as Jesse James, Billy the Kid, and Doc Holiday.”\textsuperscript{1653} Throughout the 1960s, the counterculture, with the rest of America, was fed the image of the biker as the new American outlaw through dozens of so-called biker movies. These movies had the same misleading effect on the counterculture as The Wild One did in the 1950s when they were children, but unlike the bikers in The Wild One, the bikers in these movies were portrayed usually as Hells Angels. These films, often set in the deserts of the American southwest, relied so heavily on the image of the frontier and the outlaw figures of the “old West” that they called these movies “biker-westerns.”\textsuperscript{1654} These low-budget films held religiously to a standard plot revolving around the plight of an individualist biker who (like the hippies and student radicals) battles against conformity and modern society.\textsuperscript{1655}

Not surprisingly then, starting in the mid-1960s, both California hippie flower children and student intellectuals saw the Hells Angels and other bikers as fellow rebels against the establishment, and allowed them to “hang-out” with them at such early countercultural events as Ken Kesey’s “acid tests” and the Human Be-In.\textsuperscript{1656} Many members of the counterculture, who saw the Angels as being similar to the “violent and independent yet goodhearted bikers romanticized in The Wild One,” envisioned the Angels as their protectors from the establishment.\textsuperscript{1657} Sixties popular culture continually fueled the counterculture’s belief in the supposed link between the Angels and themselves with
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movies such as 1969s *Easy Rider*, which portrayed bikers as little more than “motorized hippies.” Yet it was Kesey, more than anyone, who first got the Hells Angels to associate with the counterculture by inviting them to his LSD parties.

The invite was during the summer of 1965, the year that the sixties counterculture began to emerge in earnest. It was the first big year of the Vietnam War, folkies were turning electric, younger “new beatniks” (soon to be called hippies) were beginning to gather in Haight-Ashbury part of San Francisco, and the Hells Angels at their “notorious all-time high” were celebrities in California. As mentioned, intellectuals around San Francisco, particularly in Berkeley at the University of California, were including the Hells Angels into the equation of “alienation” and “a generation in revolt.” While this idea of motorcycle outlaws was not consistent with reality, and the Angels themselves “did not understand their own new image of being symbolic heroes to people with whom they had almost nothing in common,” they were eager to gain access to a “whole new reservoir of women, booze, and drugs.” At Ken Kesey’s Merry Pranksters hideout, there were plenty of all three!

Freelance Journalist Hunter S. Thompson introduced Kesey to a group of Hells Angels in July of 1965. The Hells Angels were said to be “as impressed with Kesey as he was with them,” and in August were invited to Kesey’s first ever “Acid Test,” which was held at his home in La Honda, California. Nobody knew what to expect, and Thompson thought it might be a disastrous mix since the Hells Angels had never tried LSD. Kesey posted a sign on his gate saying “The Merry Pranksters welcome The Hells Angels,” which surprised the Angels as it was perhaps the first time that anyone had wanted to befriend them. The party was wild and loud with people dancing half-naked to “rock-'n–roll sounds piped out through the trees from massive amplifiers, reeling and stumbling in a maze of psychedelic lights.” Many of the Angels were posturing and defensive until they got drunk, while some never got over the idea that they were “going to be challenged

1663 Miller, *The 60s Communes: Hippies and Beyond*, 19.
1664 Lee and Shlain, *Acid Dreams*, 126.
1665 Thompson, *Hells Angels*, 221.
and whipped on at any moment.” As a group, the Hells Angels eventually realized that most people at the party were too “stoned out of their heads” on LSD to be much concerned about the Angels. This lack of spotlight put them at first a bit off balance, and rendered them a little less confident, and mellower.

The parties usually went for two days and two nights. There was little optimism, at first, on the part of many about these “LSD orgies”; some worried about what might happen when the “violence and rape worshiping, and swastikas wearing Hells Angels would mix with a crowd of intellectual hipsters, Marxist radicals and pacifist peace marchers.” Indeed many who came to these parties were “made fearful” and they never came back. Even the Pranksters were uncertain about the Angels at the first party and had noticeably less LSD. Then, once the “threat of violence seemed to fade,” there was acid in great abundance. The Hells Angels used it cautiously at first, but after several Kesey parties they began to eat LSD as often as they could get their hands on it. Contrary to expectations, most of the Angels became peaceful on acid. With a few exceptions, it made them much easier to get along with than they were normally. The acid dissolved many of their conditioned reflexes. There was less of the readiness to fight that usually pervaded their attitude towards strangers. For a while, the aggressiveness went out of them; they lost the quality of “wild animals sensing a snare.” Some went into “long fits of crying and wailing, babbling incoherent requests to people nobody else could see.” Others fell into “catatonic slumps” and said nothing for hours at a time, “then sprang to life again with tales of traveling to distant lands and seeing incredible sights, or went off into the woods and became panic-stricken screaming for help until somebody led him back to the light.” Yet some had an uneasy feeling that it was a “lull before the storm,” that sooner or later, the whole party would be “razed by some kind of hellish delayed reaction.” One Hells Angel did try to strangle his “old lady” on Kesey’s front porch. While the philosophy of the Acid Tests was that of “We are all One,” implying

1666 Ibid., 222.
1667 Wolfe, The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test, 170.
1668 Thompson, Hells Angels, 225.
1669 Wolfe, The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test, 171.
1670 Lee and Shlain, Acid Dreams, 126.
1671 Barger, Hells Angel, 129.
1672 Lee and Shlain, Acid Dreams, 126.
1673 Thompson, Hells Angels, 226.
1674 Ibid.
1675 Ibid.
1676 Ibid.
1677 Ibid., 227.
that everyone could and should hang out together in these altered states of awareness, “dropping acid with the Angels was an adventure.” Keeping company with an Angel lent a feeling of menace, similar to being with a tiger and not knowing when it will strike. After three or four months of “chronic overindulgence on acid,” most of the Hells Angels began to taper off the drug, or had quit completely. Nonetheless, quickly finding their own sources of LSD, they would soon sell it to Ken Kesey. In the meantime, Kesey, after several highly publicized public Acid Tests (from the fall of 1965 to the spring of 1966) held in various places around California, served time in prison for the possession of marijuana (which for the Angels was a badge of honor and made them respect Kesey even more).

Throughout 1966, and peaking during the summer of 1967, the new hippie counterculture began to gather and grow dramatically in the Haight Ashbury district of San Francisco. The Hells Angels, thanks to Kesey, were already familiar with this new scene. Always on the lookout for new action, they began to linger around the hippie flower children, which became the hippest place to be for the whole nation’s young. Accepted in the environment of “do your own thing,” the Angels became fixtures, playing the role of “another heavy fraternity,” similar to the more politically minded anarchist group the Diggers. The slang “heavy” was not in the least positive, as it meant to be “troublesome or threatening.” Nonetheless, the Hells Angels during this period seemed to have been around all of the most influential counterculture leaders and events. Some of the Hells Angels would drop by at Michael Bowen’s place, the renowned artist who co-founded the underground newspaper the San Francisco Oracle and was the primary organizer for the first Human Be-In. They were friends with beatnik-hippie poet Michael McClure. Although not allowed to wear their colors, they attended the legendary concerts at Bill Graham’s Fillmore Auditorium. In the streets, they often participated in parades, guerrilla theaters, and riots. During the “death of money now” party, notorious Hells Angel Hairy Henry Kot (recently released from San Quentin prison) was arrested with fellow
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Angel Chocolate George Hendricks for disturbing the peace.\textsuperscript{1688} In this case, the hippies marched to the Park Police Station chanting, “Free the Angels – Free the Angels” to demand their release.\textsuperscript{1689} The president of the San Francisco chapter of the Hells Angels, Angel Pete, reciprocated by putting on a free New Year’s Day party to bring in 1967. \textsuperscript{1690}

On the other hand, the reality between the hippies, student activists, and the Hells Angels in Haight-Ashbury and other places was not always harmonious or integrated. While most of the counterculture believed in love, compassion, and equality, the Hells Angels in many cases did not see hippies and others as equals in return, and often would judge those whom they did not like and push them around. There were many incidents, even during the 1967 Summer of Love, in which the Hells Angels would brutally beat those they did not fancy, including peace marchers.\textsuperscript{1691} The relationship between the Hells Angels and the counterculture always seemed unstable. While the hippies at times had a softening effect on the Angels, they too often would revert to their primary instincts of violence. Moreover, the strict membership requirements always separated the Hells Angels from other rebellious elements. To them, all comparisons to other groups were either presumptuous or insulting. “There’s only two kinds of people in the world,” explained the Hells Angels, “Angels, and people who wish they were Angels.”\textsuperscript{1692}

A first shocking incident (and an early reality check concerning the Hells Angels’ relationship with the counterculture) was during an early anti-war peace march in 1965. On October 15, after a teach-in at the UC Berkeley campus, around 15,000 mostly students (but also a busload of Ken Kesey and his Merry Pranksters) attempted to march to the Army induction center in neighboring Oakland, California.\textsuperscript{1693} At the city line, the protesters could see about 400 Oakland police in riot gear blocking the way. After negotiation, the march proceeded to Oakland Civic Center Park instead, where the teach-in was continued and another march called for the next day.\textsuperscript{1694} The following day, between two and five thousand marchers returned (about 100 had remained in the park overnight) but were stopped at the Oakland City line by the police. The police asked the protestors to sit down in the street to avoid violent confrontations. Just when Beat poet Allen Ginsberg began chanting “Hare Krishna” at the front of the march, the Hells Angels motorcycle gang
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appeared, and began ripping down banners, attacking protestors, yelling, “Go back to Russia you fucking communists!”1695 When the Angels threatened to attack the next peace march scheduled for mid-November, Ginsberg, Kesey, and Kesey’s Pranksters quickly visited the home of Oakland Hells Angels president Sonny Barger to discuss the situation and share some LSD with Barger and his friends.1696 According to hipster legend, “by dawn the two groups had chanted together” and all was all right.1697 Nonetheless, after the LSD had worn off, the Hells Angels were already changing their minds.

During the coming weeks, Neal Cassidy, Ginsberg, Kesey, and others spent much time trying to persuade Barger and his people not to attack the marchers. The hipster leaders tried to explain to the Angels that that cops were just using them, and that the “secret Right Wing money” given to them had “temporarily turned their heads.”1698 They wanted to persuade them that the Hells Angels beating peace demonstrators was just a misunderstanding, and that they would “adjust their allegiance just as soon as they knew the score.”1699 On the Wednesday before the march, another meeting took place, where “a lot of LSD was taken, and foolish political discussion was resolved by phonograph voices of Joan Baez and Bob Dylan, all concluding with the whole group chanting the text of the Prajnaparamita Sutra, the Buddhist Highest, Perfect Wisdom Sermon.”1700 The outlaws had never met anyone quite like Ginsberg, who they considered otherworldly. “Man, you shoulba been there when he told Sonny he loved him,” said Terry one of the Angels, “Sonny didn’t know what the hell to say.”1701 The Angels never really understood what Ginsberg meant, but his “unnerving frankness,” and the fact that Kesey liked him, gave them second thoughts about attacking a march that he obviously considered a right thing to do.1702 Nevertheless, the Angels remained ambivalent. Despite Ginsberg’s pleas, Sonny Barger was still telling others about how he was going to meet the peace march with “the biggest bunch of outlaw bikes anybody ever saw in California.”1703 Allen and his friends
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meant well, he said, but they just “didn’t know what was happening.” So it came as somewhat of a surprise when, on November 19 – the day before the march – the Angels called a press conference to announce that they would not show up the next day. Their explanation was written in a mimeographed press release. “Although we have stated our intention to counter demonstrate at this despicable, un-American activity, we believe that in the interest of public safety and the protection of the good name of Oakland, we should not justify the Vietnam Day Committee by our presence – because our patriotic concern for what these people are doing to our great nation may provoke us to violent acts and that any physical encounter would only produce sympathy for this mob of traitors.”

The goal of bringing the Hells Angels and other motorcycle gangs into the counterculture was from the beginning a lot more complicated than the hipsters realized. The idealistic honeymoon lasted about three months, after which “the existential heroes” who had passed the joint with Berkeley liberals at Kesey’s parties suddenly turned into a “venomous beast,” assaulting the same liberals with fists and shouts of “Traitors,” “Communists,” “Beatniks!” When push came to shove, the Hells Angels lined up with the enemies of the counterculture: “the cops, the Pentagon and the John Birch Society.” Moreover, the attack was an awful shock to those who had seen the Hells Angels as “pioneers of the human spirit,” but to anyone who knew them it was entirely logical. The Angels’ collective viewpoint had always been fascistic, not really in doctrine but in attitude and mannerism. Their wearing of swastikas was very symbolic, and perhaps more than just a “gimmick to bug the squares.” During the numerous meetings between the anti-war brain trust and the Hells Angels, Barger would sit in his living room and listen patiently to everything the Vietnam Day Committee had to say, afterwards brushing it all aside. The Berkeley anti-war people argued long and well, but they never understood that they were talking on a different frequency. “It didn’t matter how many beards, busts or acid caps they could muster; Sonny considered them all chicken shit – and that was that.”
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The Angels, like all other motorcycle outlaws, were rigidly anti-communist. Their political views were limited to the same kind of “retrograde patriotism” that motivated the John Birch Society, the Ku Klux Klan, and the American Nazi Party. They were blind to the irony of their role, “knight errants of a faith from which they have already been excommunicated.” The Angels would be among the first to be locked up or killed if the politicians they thought they agreed with ever come to power.

The highlight of the November 1965 press conference was the reading, by Barger, of a telegram he had already sent to the President of the United States:

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON
1600 Penn. Ave.
Washington D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

On behalf of myself and my associates I volunteer a group of loyal Americans for behind the lines duty in Viet Nam. We feel that a crack group of trained gorrillas [sic] would demoralize the Viet Cong and advance the cause of freedom. We are available for training and duty immediately.

Sincerly

RALPH BARGER JR.
Oakland, California
President of Hells Angels

For reasons never divulged, President Johnson was slow to capitalize on Barger’s offer and the Angels never went to Vietnam. However, they did not bust up the November 20 protest march either, and some people said this meant the outlaws were coming around to their side, and getting hip to things, and so they should be given another chance.

From the summer of 1965 onward, the new beatnik hippies and the political radicals both claimed the Hells Angels as their own. As mentioned before, both parts of the counterculture were enamored with the Angels, and envisioned them as an important element of the Movement. For many, old hopes died hard, especially as the Movement for change met resistance, and things became bitterer. Underneath the counterculture’s philosophical facade of peace and non-violence, there existed an undercurrent of entertaining the role of violence in bringing about change, especially as the 1960s decade progressed. The Hells Angels fit the old radical dream of making contact with delinquent
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gangs, theorizing about “our violent brothers” and their role in the coming revolution.\footnote{1715} The peaceful hippies, on the other hand, had fantasies about “Angelic Barbarians” protecting them from straight society, the police, and the neighboring ghettos.\footnote{1716} Indeed, during the first Human Be-In gathering, in San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park (on January 14, 1967), the Hells Angels volunteered and guarded the sound system’s generators from neighborhood teenage punks who tried to disrupt the event. Although there were fights throughout the day, and knots of violence, nobody came close to the generators, not wanting to take on the Angels.\footnote{1717} The Hells Angels also warned San Francisco’s Fillmore ghetto, in July of 1967, that their force would meet any black uprisings spilling over into the Haight-Ashbury.\footnote{1718} Indeed, by the fall of 1967, it looked as if there would be a race war between “longhaired, shaggie honkies” led by the San Francisco Hells Angels on one side, against the “back-stabbin, women-killin niggers” from the Fillmore.\footnote{1719}

When put in a situation of protecting generators and such (in contrast to Altamont, their role was usually off to the side of the stage) the Angels and other gangs usually did quite well. However, to share a living space with bikers, in either a commune or a neighborhood, was another matter. On August 12, 1967, a biker gang called the Gypsy Jokers took over Morning Star Ranch commune in Sonoma County California.\footnote{1720} The commune was a so-called free land sanctuary for anyone who needed a place to live. It was where the Diggers grew food to help supply their free meals that were passed out every day at Golden Gate Park Panhandle, next to the Haight-Ashbury.\footnote{1721} After sheriffs had rousted the Jokers for camping on public land, they moved to Morning Star, where the rule was that nobody could be kicked out. The bikers moved onto the ranch and ordered everybody out of the Big House and took it for themselves, while everyone else was forced into shanties and the surrounding sheds. Unable to share and live as equals with the hippies, the bikers forced the Sonoma County sheriffs to deal with the problem, but not before gunfire erupted on September 7 due to a rivalry over a seventeen-year-old girl.\footnote{1722}

In the Haight-Ashbury, sharing the same main street was often a problem too. The south side of Haight Street on which the bikers hung out had a reputation for having many

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item\footnote{1715} Perry, \textit{The Haight-Ashbury}, 20.
\item\footnote{1716} Ibid., 12.
\item\footnote{1717} Ibid., 78-80.
\item\footnote{1718} Ibid., 135.
\item\footnote{1719} Grogan, \textit{Ringolevio}, 446.
\item\footnote{1720} Perry, \textit{The Haight-Ashbury}, 140.
\item\footnote{1721} Ibid., 126.
\item\footnote{1722} Ibid., 143.
\end{itemize}
more “eerier” things occurring. Those who did not respect the bikers enough could be beaten or humiliated in other ways. Those with guitars and other musical instruments were often forced to play for hours against their wishes. Cute girls would often be sexually harassed (usually aggressively grabbed and kissed) and at times, more seriously molested. Some had to share whatever they had beyond normal expectations even for hippies, while others were simply robbed. Refusing to give money was not an option. On August 24, 1967, Chocolate George, one of the Hells Angels most popular with the hippies, died after an automobile collided with his motorcycle at the corner of Haight and Shrader. On August 28, some 1,500 people attended a wild wake after the funeral services in Lindley Meadow part of the Golden Gate Park. There were many bands such as the Grateful Dead and the Big Brother and the Holding Company playing music, and various motorcycle clubs joining the Hells Angels. The event turned into a drunken riot as the motorcycle gangs beat up several hippies for fun! Some hippies would be stomped for disobeying orders such as, “Get me six cans of beer and get it in a hurry.” Most hippies would jump at the command, but not all. However when a “Negro hippie” refused to follow orders, he was chased through the crowd by the Hells Angels and kicked repeatedly till his “face was cut open and blood spurted out.”

Still the Hells Angels were an accepted part of the Haight-Ashbury street scene. Most of the time they would sit on or near their bikes stoned on drugs and alcohol. The hippies usually sanctioned the Hells Angels, who according to hippie beliefs were only “doing their thing.” Somehow ignored was how the Angels behavior contradicted the counterculture principles of love and peace. While some of the Angels, over time, began to act as if they loved and were protectors of the hippies, this so-called love would often erratically change to violence. At almost any time, and often for unknown reasons, they would go on violent rampages that involved blood flowing, and fists and boots stomping on someone. As mentioned before, often the Hells Angels ruled many hippies who came near them by inflicting subtle terror. The Angels commandeered whatever they wanted;
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they considered themselves elite people. Perhaps for these two reasons, the anarchist improvisational group, the Diggers, was attracted to them.

The Diggers were a radical countercultural group of community activists and actors operating from 1966-68 in the Haight-Ashbury. They were often referred to as the conscience of the hippie counterculture. Like the Hells Angels, they too called themselves 1%-ers, suggesting that free people were the minority, and inciting others to step up and help. The group sought to create a mini-society free of money and capitalism. The Diggers provided a free food service every day at 4 p.m., generally feeding (often with stolen food) over 200 people who had no other source of food. They opened numerous Free Stores in which all items (frequently shoplifted) were free for the taking or giving. The stores offered items that even if discarded were still in usable condition. Moreover, they also arranged free “crashpads” for homeless youth drawn to the Haight-Ashbury area. Being more aggressive and closer in temperament than the spaced-out, spiritual hippies, several amongst the Diggers tried to form closer connections to the Hells Angels, not always ending well.

For example, during the summer of 1968, one of the founding members of the Diggers called Peter Coyote moved into a house shared by a Hells Angels named Pete Knell. Knell helped Coyote get a motorcycle together, and had interesting talks about current events, and politics in general. However, wrote Coyote, “The time I spent at Peter Knell’s was unnerving and stressful. Having to be preternaturally alert all the time around the Angels was exhausting and required even more self-medication.” He continued to relate how his status at Pete’s house was curious, because he was not a “Prospect” seeking admission to the Hells Angels but was there often at the start of “club business,” which he was not privy to know. When three or four Angels would congregate in his living room and the “wooden soup bowl of pills were passed around,” it was never long before someone “wheeled around demanding to know just what the fuck I was doing there.”
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He learned quickly when to “get lost.” Emmett Grogan, another founder of the Diggers, would also come over and hang out with the Angels; it was sort of a test to pass, “a way of measuring our courage, as well as forging an alliance that supported our social agenda.”

One night several members decided to give Emmett a beating, “as a warning to the rest of us about getting too close.” Even so, by the late 1960s, many in the counterculture began to ride motorcycles and wore leather. A few even became full members of various motorcycle clubs. However, the Hells Angels (and the other gangs) never knew what to think of most hippies and student radicals. In their eyes, they were a combination of friends, pretenders, and potential adversaries.

What set the Hells Angels apart especially from the hippies, more than anything, was the built-in structure of bylaws and hierarchy. The Angels were a very secretive group and it took a long time to get in. To protect their activities, the Hells Angels maintained strict discipline over their members. While anyone could be a hippie, there were stringent rules, requirements, and systematic stages that applied to those who could be a Hells Angel. As mentioned, the Hells Angels hung around hippies for many reasons: because of potential sex with loose hippie girls, a good setting to buy and sell illegal drugs, the exciting music scene, but perhaps most importantly, to find either Angels sympathizers or recruits. The bottom level of the Angels hierarchy consisted of the Hang around, the Associate, and the Prospects.

The Haight-Ashbury hippie neighborhood was a good place for finding people who were useful for the Hells Angels. Either these folks were general supporters, or they wanted to join; these were called the Hang around. Both types were people who thought of themselves as allies, and could be counted on to help during an emergency: to give a place to sleep, tools, money, food, etc. In exchange, a Hang around would be allowed to mingle with the Angels and attend some club events. A fair number of hippies during the late sixties did indeed become sort of Hang arounds. Moreover, if some Hells Angels

---

1743 Ibid.
1744 Ibid.
1745 Ibid.
1746 Grogan, Ringolevio, 489.
1747 Coyote, Sleeping Where I Fall, 111.
members took a deeper liking and interest in a Hang-around, an Associate status could be
given to him.\textsuperscript{1751} However, to be offered this higher status, or that of a Prospect, one had to
fit the following instructions:

- Be a motorcycle enthusiast who uses a motorcycle as a primary means of
  transportation.
- Ride an average of 20,000 miles (32,000 km) a year. As the Hells Angels brochure
  said, “this means [in] rain, snow, or sunshine.”
- Never have applied to be a police officer or prison guard.\textsuperscript{1752}
- Be a male and not gay.
- Be white, since the Angels have had alliances with such groups as the Aryan
  Brotherhood and its fondness for Nazi symbolism.\textsuperscript{1753}

To become a Prospect, on the other hand, was a full acknowledgement that an
individual was in the “pipeline” for consideration to join their group. These persons could
participate in all club activities but had no club voting privileges.\textsuperscript{1754} But both Hang
arounds and Prospects were expected to do chores, which included things that needed to be
done around the clubhouse, “like fixing the dishwasher, repositioning the television
satellite, cleaning out the bathroom cupboards, power washing the deck, cleaning the
coffee machine, ice bins and gym, and to ’pledge’ the wood.”\textsuperscript{1755} However, sometimes the
Hells Angels would turn against and abuse both Hang arounds and Prospects, at any time,
when they were not satisfied. Thus, the road to Full membership was not easy for
wannabes, and the process could last years.\textsuperscript{1756}

Successful Prospects graduated to Full member or Full-patch status. The step of
attaining Full membership was referred to as “being patched.”\textsuperscript{1757} To become a Full
member, the Prospect had to be voted in by the rest of the Full club members. Prior to
votes being cast, a Prospect usually had to travel to every chapter in the sponsoring
chapter’s geographic jurisdiction (city/county/state) and introduce himself to every Full-
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Patch. This process allowed each voting member to become familiar with the subject and to ask any questions of concern prior to the vote. Successful admission usually required more than a simple majority, and some clubs rejected a Prospect by a single dissenting vote. Some form of formal induction followed, wherein the Prospect affirmed his loyalty to the club and its members at an initiation ceremony. Furthermore, the Full-Patch, or “being patched,” referred to the fact that the member now had the right to wear all the sanctioned jacket patches, including the Hells Angel “death head” logo, the words “Hells Angels” on the top patch panel (called a rocker), and the club location on the lower rocker. These patches were sewn on the back of a usually sleeveless denim or leather jacket. In addition, some members wore various types of Luftwaffe insignia and reproductions of German iron crosses for mostly decorative and shock effect. Others had badges reading 1%-er, or the number 13, which represented the letter M, the 13th letter of the alphabet, and indicated that the wearer was a user of marijuana. No matter what, after becoming a Full member, there was no let up; each member had to continue to maintain a stringent behavioral code at all times.

Hells Angels members and prospects followed strict rules that lent to their mystique and gave them some security. Part of that security meant that rank-and-file members (as opposed to the leadership) could not talk to the media and could never talk to the public about their codes or other members. In addition, if one Hells Angels member was pulled over by law enforcement officers, the entire group traveling with him would also pull over, making it less likely that it would happen. The Hells Angels would never go out together without their “colors” – the winged death’s-head patch on the back of their leather vest or jacket. Even after a member was patched-in, the patches themselves remained the property of the Hells Angels Motorcycle Club rather than the individual members. It was easy to know who were Prospects and who were Full members because the word “Prospect” was stitched on the front of their vests while the backs of
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their jackets were missing the words “Hells Angels” and the flying skull – the full colors for the gang. 1765 Once someone was a Full member, nonmembers would not dare touch the vest of a Hells Angel unless allowed. Getting colors on your vest was so sacred that often if one of the Angels was arrested, he would try to give their jacket to another member to take for safekeeping. 1766 They were sensitive to any so-called desecrations of their symbols. Nevertheless, on leaving the Hells Angels, or being ejected from the group, everything had to be returned to the club. 1767 Even though a person was voted in as Full member, and got a jacket with an mc (motorcycle club) patch on it, he could keep it only as long as he was a Hells Angel in good standing. If a person got on the bad side of the Angels, the club would come and take the patches from the individual. People kicked out of the club with a Hells Angels tattoo on their body would have them cut and burned out with no anesthesia. 1768

The various Hells Angel’s rules and codes were enforced by strict discipline, which included beatings and sometimes expulsion. For each chapter, there were weekly meetings called “church” by some members. 1769 Whether an applicant would get into the Hells Angels or not was debated at this time. Minutes of each meeting, for all the chapters, are gathered together as information for the particular regional Hells Angels executive body. 1770 While the Hells Angels had no national or international hierarchy, chapters were grouped into regions, which monitor both individual and even chapter behavior. At the regional level, business decisions were made, for example, on which new chapters were accepted, falling out of favor, below expectations, or who should get new favors. 1771 Moreover, at these assemblies, new rules were established, information was shared, and all individual chapters disciplined and maintained through a rigid power structure. The overall arrangement was very similar to that of the military because of its top-down approach.

The following is the hierarchy for each Hells Angels chapter, from the highest to the least important: President, Vice President, Sergeant at Arms, Intelligence Officer, Road
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Captain, general Club members, Prospects, Associates, Hang arounds. Under the chapter power structure, the president was the absolute leader and had veto power over decisions made by members. The vice-president replaced the president in his absence. The sergeant at arms was responsible for discipline at club meetings, funerals, and special events. The secretary-treasurer kept minutes of club meetings and managed the club’s finances, including member dues, fines, and paying club bills and expenses. He also sometimes acted as an intelligence officer, gathering information about police and rivals. The road captain was in charge of organizing mandatory club runs, including the destination and stops for food and gas. Moreover, the order of rank also included riding formations. When the Angels would go out for a group ride, they had set positions for the different members in the group. In the pole position was the road captain. He had the responsibility of making sure that the group got where it intended to go. Spaced out 10 to thirty feet (roughly 3 to 9 meters) behind the road captain was the president of the chapter, then the sergeant at arms, followed by the vice president. Following them were the rest of the members with the Prospects and finally the Hanger arounds of the club bringing up the rear. In the case of a major ride, a scout might be riding five to ten miles (8 to 16 km) ahead of the main pack to warn of any roadblocks or other obstacles. They would all pull over together to avoid disrupting the order.

By the time of the Altamont festival, the Hells Angels and the hippies had coexisted for over four years. Altamont was a free concert put on by the Rolling Stones near the San Francisco Bay Area on December 6, 1969. It came on the heels of the legendary Woodstock music festival held during August, which had captivated the entire country with 400,000 to 500,000 youthful “hippies” and its “three days of peace and love.”

During the fall, the media were ablaze with stories of the hopefulness of a New Age dawning. Altamont was supposed to be the West coast version of Woodstock, but perhaps even better. The Altamont concert was simply the next logical upward tick of the “youth explosion” that had already risen in a steady, ascendant line from the early
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1960s (arguably since the mid-1950s) to December of 1969.\footnote{Ibid., 169.} It had always (at least in myth) seemingly gotten bigger, always gotten better, always gotten loftier.

The original idea for the free Rolling Stones concert stemmed from the Stones’ successful free concert in London’s Hyde Park in July 1969.\footnote{Santelli, \textit{Aquarius Rising}, 162.} In early November, the Stones began their first U.S. tour in more than three years. The first concert was in Los Angeles, and the last would be the free one in San Francisco a month later.\footnote{Ibid., 163.} The plan was to have the free concert in the Golden Gate Park, next to the Haight Ashbury district where the hippie movement had started from a few years earlier. The Hells Angels, at the suggestion of Emmett Grogan, would escort the band in and out of the park. “We’ll have one hundred Hells Angels on their hogs escort the Stones . . . nobody will come near the Angels, man. They wouldn’t dare.”\footnote{Barger, \textit{Hells Angel}, 160.} However, this did not happen, as the San Francisco City Parks and Recreation Department turned down the application for the event on November 30.\footnote{Grogan, \textit{Ringolevio}, 490.}

Next, Sears Point Raceway in Sonoma County became the alternative site. Chip Monck (who was also the stage manager at Woodstock) was in the process of building the stage with his crew when things hit a snag again. A disagreement concerning the ownership of film rights forced the concert to move once again, this time only two days before the concert date.\footnote{Ibid., 491.} With less than 48 hours and still no location, Dick Carter came through with his Altamont Speedway, in the desolate brown hills near Livermore.\footnote{Russell, \textit{Let It Bleed}, 168.} Still, the sound system, the lights, the partially built stage, everything was all driven down eighty miles (129 km) to the southeast in time for the event. Nevertheless, the Altamont rock festival should not have taken place because of the lack of time for needed preparation for such a large event. Most rock festivals took months of planning, and even then they were usually not “hassle free.”\footnote{Santelli, \textit{Aquarius Rising}, 170.}

The Altamont rock festival ultimately ended in disaster, but Woodstock (after the fact considered the peak of the counterculture) and other rock festivals too barely avoided this same fate.\footnote{Kirkpatrick, \textit{1969}, 265.} It had nothing to do with the end of the Sixties, or it being the end of the 1960s decade, nor was Altamont predestined to fail. The role of the Hells Angels would
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have been different also if the stage had been built higher. Indeed, one of the biggest reasons that things went wrong at Altamont was that the stage was less than a meter in height.\textsuperscript{1788} At Sears Point (where it was originally constructed) it would have been sufficient, because there was a ten-foot drop in front of the stage, so no one could have gotten onto it.\textsuperscript{1789} Unfortunately, the organizers took that same stage to Altamont and compounded the problem by placing it in the foot of a hill in the neck of a valley, or as some called it, “in the bottom of a bowl.”\textsuperscript{1790} Either way, its location was the worst possible for a concert of 400,000 people eager to get close to the stage.\textsuperscript{1791} Thus, the stage at Altamont was in need of protection from the huge crowd, especially in light of the hysteria usually generated by Mick Jagger and the Rolling Stones. As a result, Monck decided to build a barricade of cars and trucks to shield the back area from the throngs\textsuperscript{1792} The Hells Angels, on the other hand, were to expand their role and take care of the front of the stage. While the Grateful Dead had used the Angels for security in the past without incident, and the Stones themselves had used the British arm of the Hells Angels for an “honor guard” earlier that year at their Hyde Park memorial show for Brian Jones, this was a different set of circumstances.\textsuperscript{1793} For perhaps the first time, the Hells Angels received center stage authority, and were placed in a difficult situation.\textsuperscript{1794}

The Rolling Stones allegedly hired the Hells Angels as security for $500 worth of beer. The deal was simple: the Oakland and Frisco Angels would sit up on the stage, watch the crowd, and drink free beer.\textsuperscript{1795} Soon enough, though, the Stones would find out that California Hells Angels were different from their English counterparts. As Rolling Stones guitarist Mick Taylor would say, “These guys in California are the real thing. They’re very violent.”\textsuperscript{1796} With hundreds of thousands of optimistic and excited people arriving already the day before, it was a beautiful start to the festival. The Rolling Stones’ other guitarist Keith Richards helped inspire the workers building the stage by his presence as he
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wandered around through the crowd.\footnote{Russell, \textit{Let It Bleed}, 171.} \footnote{Ibid.} 

"The night before the concert was just mystical . . . it was nice and laid-back and beautiful, sitting around the campfire, drinking wine, everybody talking . . . a great prelude to what we all thought was going to happen" \footnote{Ibid.}. Then came the next day, with the Hells Angels deciding to show everyone who was in charge by going right through the crowd of thousands on their motorcycles to park in front of the stage.\footnote{"Rock Concert Death 69," online video clip, Youtube, June 19, 2009, \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFKcdBZBg-w}. Accessed May 3, 2011.} \footnote{Lachman, \textit{Turn Off Your Mind}, 306.} \footnote{Santelli, \textit{Aquarius Rising}, 170.} It is said that the beauty of the festival began to end when the power-tripping Hells Angels showed up carrying sawed-off pool cues. Their idea was to intimidate people, and to have everyone see them as cops carrying nightsticks.\footnote{Ibid., 172.} \footnote{Ibid.} As far as the real cops went, there were perhaps only a half a dozen near the stage and at the whole festival. They said that they did not come because of how spontaneously the festival was organized; there was no time for arrangements.\footnote{Ibid.} Unlike the other rock festivals, such as Woodstock, they irresponsibly did not show up to help (control the crowd and the Angels). The Hells Angels, on the other hand, untrained in crowd control and having free reign, acted like the thugs that they were.

The first hint of violence to come occurred sometime after 11:30 a.m. Down by the stage someone allegedly insulted a Hells Angel and was punched and kicked by several bikers until he fell on the ground and "begged for mercy."\footnote{Ibid., 173.} Another fight broke out some thirty yards away when an Angel rode over a blanket of food with his motorcycle. When the person objected to this rude act, he was hit across the legs with a "rusty chain."\footnote{Ibid.} Santana was the first band to perform on the Altamont stage, and played the same songs as they had at Woodstock a few months before. The quick tempo and energy of the music, however, fed the hostility of the Hells Angels.\footnote{Ibid.} Santana’s set was marred twice by violence, as Angels battled with ecstatic fans who attempted to climb onto the stage. During the second incident, Carlos Santana made his band stop playing. He pleaded in vain with the people up front not to come near, but the temptation was too strong. As soon as the Santana band began to play their music, excited fans rushed to the front of the stage again. When they realized how easy it was to climb on, some of them tried to do just
The Hells Angels, in the meantime, acting on emotion and pride, used brutal force in often-uncontrollable fashion. As the day went on, the Hells Angels began to attack the crowd for the sheer pleasure of beating people up.\textsuperscript{1806} Santana had intended on playing for more than forty-five minutes, but cut their set short because of the fighting.\textsuperscript{1807} The next band to perform was the Jefferson Airplane, who met with the same fate. The Airplane deliberately started with the song “We Can Be Together” in hopes of toning the mood down.\textsuperscript{1808} While it seemed to work briefly, the crowd got on its feet and pushed towards the stage during the next song. Two Hells Angels were pushed, one briefly to the ground. Fellow members quickly retaliated by jumping on whoever was closest and “hammering them with punches and kicks.”\textsuperscript{1809} Marty Balin, one of the singers of the band, jumped off stage to stop further beatings of the crowd. The Angels did not care who he was and punched him in the head and groin, knocking him unconscious.\textsuperscript{1810} Bill Thompson, the Airplane’s manager, had to come down from the stage and assist Balin to his feet. Guitarist Paul Kanter quickly motioned for the Airplane to stop playing. Like Carlos Santana before him, he pleaded with the Angels to cease their brutality, but a Hells Angel confiscated his microphone. Then another Angel walked up to Kanter and nearly punched him.\textsuperscript{1811} After about ten minutes, the Angels cleared the stage and allowed the Airplane to finish their set, which consisted of another three songs, including, “Somebody to Love.” Later, when Thompson asked why they attacked Balin, the answer was that, “He spoke disrespectful to an Angel.” He supposedly said, “fuck you” to a Hells Angels named Animal who was beating on a black kid.\textsuperscript{1812} However, some had the feeling that it went deeper, that the Angels resented these original psychedelic Haight-Ashbury hippie longhaired musicians singing about peace and love, during a time when “communists in Vietnam needed killing.”\textsuperscript{1813} The third group to play at Altamont was the Flying Burrito Brothers. They quickly went on to play for fear that any long pause in the music might allow the Hells Angels to grow restless and provide their own entertainment of choosing people to punish.\textsuperscript{1814} The
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Burritos played a type of country rock style that was much more mellow and soothing than that of the previous two bands. Their mild sound temporarily soothed emotions, and no fights erupted during their performance.\textsuperscript{1815} They were careful not to play anything that would instigate a surge by the crowd toward the stage. For a while, it seemed as though the remainder of the festival would be free of conflict, but hope was short-lived as the Hells Angels began a new series of assaults.\textsuperscript{1816} 

Not long after the fourth band, Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young, began to play, a young man under the influence of either alcohol or LSD walked up to an Angel’s bike that was parked alongside the stage and kicked it.\textsuperscript{1817} Perhaps the person was angry over the way the Angels had been treating the crowd; nevertheless, a group of Angels sitting on the side of the stage jumped and kicked him until it looked as if he might be dead. The Angels looked down at him, convinced that he had received his rightful punishment, then went back to sit on the stage.\textsuperscript{1818} A little later, another round of violence occurred when the Angels decided to beat an obese young man who had taken all his clothes off. To some of the Hells Angels, he was simply too ugly to be naked and they set about clubbing him just for that fact.\textsuperscript{1819} The Grateful Dead were to follow Crosby, Stills Nash and Young, but decided not to go on because of all the violence.\textsuperscript{1820} Thus, all the opening bands had finished playing, the sun was still out and it was time for the Rolling Stones to come out to play, but they made the crowd wait till it got dark and cold.\textsuperscript{1821} 

Wintertime in California, especially during the night, can be quite nippy. The crowd had waited all day to see the Stones perform, and was getting restless and angry. Meanwhile, the Stones, “acting like prima donnas,” stayed in their trailers, wanting the crowd to get more and more agitated and frenzied before they came out on stage.\textsuperscript{1822} This strategy worked, and as they finally began to play the crowd went wild and crazy. While the Hells Angels had eventually succeeded in creating a buffered roped-in area around the stage with their motorcycles by late afternoon, people rushed back in, trying to jump on the stage. In response, the Angels began pushing people off and beating those who they saw “messing with our bikes.”\textsuperscript{1823} At one point, smoke was seen coming out around the battery
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of one of the motorcycles. Some fan kneeling on the seat had caused contact with his weight between the springs and the electrical storage unit, shorting out the bike.\textsuperscript{1824} A number of Hells Angels jumped down from the stage and pushed their way through the crowd to get to the burning motorcycle. This incident ignited even more tension between the Angels and the crowd, as many people were hit and shoved. Many hippies began to retaliate by throwing bottles and smashing the motorcycle. That was a big mistake, according to Oakland Hells Angels leader Sonny Barger: “That’s when we entered the crowd and grabbed some of the assholes vandalizing our bikes and beat the fuck out of them.”\textsuperscript{1825}

The Hells Angels really hated hippie talk of peace and love. Now that the situation had totally spun out of control at Altamont, the Rolling Stones began to talk of “brothers and sisters type of hippie shit.”\textsuperscript{1826} This they considered an insult, as they blamed most of the problems on the Stones. Everyone who tried to rush the stage was thrown off to protect what the Angels called “a bunch of sissy, marble-mouthed prima donnas.”\textsuperscript{1827} One such person was a big fat topless girl who was trying to climb up; a Hells Angels simply kicked her in the head, and she fell off.\textsuperscript{1828} Keith Richards told the Angels that they were not going to play anymore until they stopped the violence. “Either these cats cool it, man, or we don’t play.” Mick Jagger announced to the crowd.\textsuperscript{1829} Barger replied by sticking a pistol into Richards’s side and told him to play or he was dead!\textsuperscript{1830} Wave after wave of violence swept through the crowd causing people to be jammed against each other. There was some sort of commotion halfway through every song, it seemed. There was no space, but the crowd would suddenly open and six or seven Angels would be seen whacking people with pool cues.\textsuperscript{1831} During one of these episodes, a young black man pulled out a gun and was promptly stabbed to death by the Hells Angels.\textsuperscript{1832} It was argued that one could not fault the Angels for killing a person with a gun in his hand. Moreover, he allegedly took a shot in the direction of the stage, and supposedly grazed an Angel with a bullet.\textsuperscript{1833} Nonetheless, as seen on photos and on a video, these Angels seem to rather have enjoyed the ghastly

\textsuperscript{1824} Kirkpatrick, 1969, 262.
\textsuperscript{1825} Barger, Hells Angel, 164.
\textsuperscript{1826} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1827} Ibid., 163.
\textsuperscript{1828} Ibid., 164.
\textsuperscript{1829} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1830} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1831} Russell, Let It Bleed, 212.
\textsuperscript{1832} Gitlin, The Sixties, 406.
\textsuperscript{1833} Coyote, Sleeping Where I Fall, 123.
encounter. A couple of minutes afterwards their faces seem to reveal a state of celebration and ecstasy in some sort of “death ritual.” Afterwards, Barger wrote in his book, “I didn’t feel too bummed about what had happened at the concert. It was another day in the life of a Hells Angel.” Basic physical intimidation and a natural inclination the bust the heads of people who as much looked at them funny was just natural behavior for the Hells Angels.

Ever since the end of World War II, wild men on motorcycles had strangely plagued California. They usually traveled in groups of ten to thirty, booming along the highways and stopping here or there to get drunk and raise hell. There was plenty of mad action, senseless destruction, orgies, brawls, perversions, and many innocent victims. Nevertheless, their outlaw attitude elicited a certain popular appeal in California and elsewhere in the West where the outlaw tradition was still honored. “We’re bastards to the world and they’re bastards to us,” one of the Oakland Hells Angels told a newspaper reporter. “We are complete social outcasts – outsiders against society.” Nonetheless, their attitude and conduct was not the type conducive to creating a better world based on peace, love, justice, and equality as espoused by the counterculture. The Hells Angels, though outsiders to the rest of society, were not the visionaries that the hippies and the student activists had hoped they would be.

The Hells Angels’ massive publicity in 1964 and 1965 came right after the widely publicized student Free Speech rebellion at the University of California in Berkeley. The liberal-radical-intellectual circles mistakenly thought that there was a natural alliance between them and the bikers. The Angels’ aggressive, antisocial stance, their perceived alienation, had a tremendous appeal for the more passive Berkeley temperament. “Students who could barely get up the nerve to sign a petition or to shoplift a candy bar were fascinated by tales of the Hells Angels ripping up towns and taking whatever they wanted.” Most importantly, the Angels had a reputation for defying police, for successfully opposing authority, and to the frustrated student radicals this was a powerful image indeed. The Angels didn’t masturbate, they raped. They didn’t come on with
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theories and songs and quotations, but with noise and muscle and sheer balls.”1840 In spite of that, what the counterculture came to realize was that Angels were not “some romantic leftover from the American individualist tradition,” but perhaps the “first wave of a future of losers, dropouts, failures and malcontents.”1841 With the vast majority of motorcycle outlaws being uneducated, unskilled men between 20 and 30, they came from a vastly different economic background than themselves. While the majority of the counterculture came from upper-middle class or middle class environments, the door to financial prosperity was still open to them if needed.1842 The Hells Angels, on the other hand, were mostly from working-class families rendered useless in a highly technical economy. They were part of a fast-growing group of young unemployables whose untapped energy was beginning to find some kind of destructive outlet (the same type of youths joined the Punk movement just a few years later).1843

For the outlaw bikers their lifestyle reflected more than a wistful yearning for acceptance in a world they had never made it in; their real motivation was an instinctive certainty as to what the reality was. “They are out of the ball game and they know it – and that is their meaning; for unlike most losers in today’s society, the Hells Angels not only know but spitefully proclaim exactly where they stand.” 1844 The paradox for these outlaws was that after a man blew all his options, he could not afford the luxury of changing his ways. However, instead of losing quietly, one by one, they banded together with a fierce loyalty, creating strength in unity.1845 The Hells Angels’ view of humanity was completely different from that of those in the counterculture. Their feeling of society screwing them led to an ethic of total retaliation, or “at least the kind of random revenge that comes with outraging the public decency.” 1846 They were rejects looking for a way to get even with a world by causing problems, not by building a new and better one.

On the other hand, the Hells Angels were not very political, to the disappointment of the political left. This was especially true before the Angels got all their publicity. As late as early 1965, they seemed to have had no interest in what was happening during the Free Speech movement on the Berkeley campus, CORE’S civil rights picket lines in Jack London Square in the middle of downtown Oakland, or the first Get Out of Vietnam
demonstrations.\textsuperscript{1847} However, the responsibilities of fame made the Hells Angels very conscious of their image, and as they dealt more and more with the press, they commented on the issues of the day. “Tell me, Sonny, do the Hells Angels have any position on the war in Vietnam?”\textsuperscript{1848} Other questions would include, “How do you feel about the civil rights movement, Tiny?”\textsuperscript{1849} As it turns out, the Hells Angels supported social political positions in opposition to the counterculture. Most of them, or at least not enough of them, simply just did not care.\textsuperscript{1850} “But if Sonny had a beef with some pinko demonstrators, then by God, they all had a beef. And that was the way it went.”\textsuperscript{1851} Group loyalty was one consistent, and it often got them in trouble as a fellow Angel was always right when dealing with outsiders.\textsuperscript{1852} This sort of reasoning made a group of offended Hells Angels nearly impossible to deal with.

Finally, at Altamont, all the differences between the counterculture and the Hells Angels became clear. Their behavior shocked even the most permissive supporters. Even those in the counterculture with the most liberal views of accommodating all types of behavior had to acknowledge the limits to their beliefs. While they seemed to pop up wherever anything significant was happening, the Hells Angels instilled fear in anyone who crossed their path.\textsuperscript{1853} A black-sheep counterpoint to the hippie movement, they became increasingly less appealing after Altamont.\textsuperscript{1854} The disillusionment was surprising only because it took so long to occur. Disregarding the beards and long hair, the Hells Angels were from the beginning a motorcycle gang, a group of criminals who progressively committed more beatings, drug distributions, racketeerings, rapes, riots, stabbings, eventually fatal shootings and fire bombings.\textsuperscript{1855} Instead of living in togetherness as the hippies believed, they escalated turf wars between themselves and their rivals such as the Pagans, Outlaws, Bandidos, and the Los Angeles-based Mongols.\textsuperscript{1856} Even thus, the counterculture graciously tried to create a role for the Hells Angels, and other bikers, within their countercultural movement. That is why at Altamont, Grace Slick
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(on stage with the Jefferson Airplane just a couple of minutes after the Angels had knocked out her band mate) could say, “People get weird, and you need people like the Angels to keep people in line. But the Angels also – you know, you don’t bust people in the head for nothing. So both sides are fucking up temporarily. Let’s not keep fucking up.”

To claim that the actions of the Hells Angels biker gang had showed, at Altamont, that the counterculture did not work (and thus the Sixties had ended) would be like saying the same if the FBI, the U.S. Army, or the KKK had been entrusted in that same role. In other words, these groups were not, and never had been, part of the counterculture. Though the counterculture had embraced various biker gangs during the 1960s, put simply, the Hells Angels were neither hippies nor student protesters. They were around the counterculture (as were criminal drug addicts, mainstream and religious cult groups, social scientists, and curious tourists) but not truly part of it. Instead, they were an outlaw syndicate that, in numerous ways, mimicked many of the values of mainstream American society that they, the counterculture, had opposed: discipline, hierarchy, patriotism, rules, and violence. As a result, it is contradictory to claim that the Sixties counterculture ended because of the actions of some group that was not really a part of it in essence! The Altamont rock festival did not mark the disintegration of the sixties hippie/anti-war counterculture; instead, it once again showed the reality that not all subcultural groups were the same, and thus were not truly united to each other in the first place. Finally, Sonny Barger of the Angels said it clearly (the next day on the radio) when describing why they beat hippies at the festival: “I am not no peace freak by any sense of the word.”

II.6. Conclusions on the 1960s

As we examined the history of the Movement during the 1960s decade, it became obvious that it was consistently filled with an undercurrent of dissension, despair, and violence. These negative features of the Movement did not begin in 1969. On the other...
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hand, the unfavorable characteristics, while inherent from the start, did increase in intensity throughout the years. At first, the high moral rhetoric of the African-American civil rights movement outshone the likes of Robert F. William and others who espoused meeting “violence with violence.” Similarly, the early student and anti-war activists, who believed America to be a benign country – which merely needed a little positive pressure to stop the war – greatly outnumbered the more radical types who wanted to tear down “pig” Amerika from the start. Likewise, early hippies who espoused the taking of LSD as beneficial for the new Aquarian consciousness (to see how they were One in “the unity of mankind, the wholeness of being”), ignored how many among them were but plain drug addicts, criminals, or crazy individuals. Over time, however, all three aspects of the Movement grew increasingly frustrated and bitter, as accomplishing their goal of changing the world hit a wall. More and more individuals began to think that additional aggressive actions were needed. For some members of the Movement these feelings of discouragement led to a skepticism that questioned the entire validity or value of what they were doing. When this self-criticism reached a tipping point, what originally seemed great now shifted to its opposite. For example, being “spaced out” for the hippies was first considered very positive; it meant being aware of higher consciousness, i.e., beyond that of the material world. Yet, after an individual had shifted his/her point of view, “spaced out” became a derogatory term for someone unbalanced, bizarre, or mentally ill (or at the very least impractical). Those writing the history of the Sixties also fell/fall into this trap of initially seeing the Movement as idyllic, then later jumping to opposite conclusions when negative circumstances reared their ugly head. Nevertheless, this about-face is not the ordinary waking up to Movement defects, but is an abandoning of the ship, a complete giving up on the Movement. Music critic Robert Christgau wrote, “Writers focus on Altamont not because it brought on the end of an era but because it provided such a complex metaphor for the way an era ended.” For Christgau the “good sixties” had shifted into something wrong/not good. However, although he does admit that the Altamont festival did not literally end the Sixties era, he still upholds the myth that something uniquely bad had occurred there that symbolized the conclusion of the Sixties. I disagree with this celebrated Altamont metaphor for the following three reasons. First of all, none of those negative things that occurred at the rock festival were terribly new: not

1861 Williams, *Negroes with Guns*, xxiv.
drugged-out hippies, not fighting, not even the murder. Secondly, the chaos at Altamont fit right into the above-mentioned overall trend towards ever-increasing unruliness (on the other hand, there continued to be many positive rock festivals and protest rallies for years to come). Finally, the Sixties era could not have ended at Altamont because those who created the violence were not part of the Sixties-era Movement. The Hells Angels had no part in trying to create a better world; instead they were (and still are) a vicious and criminal motorcycle gang that, it so happens, were given ultimate police authority over thousands of counter-culture people. It is just as likely that if there had been a proper amount of time devoted to preparing the site (build the stage higher), and the police and not the Angels had been in charge of crowd control, Altamont would have been remembered as something similar to, or even greater, than Woodstock.

Instead of seeing the Altamont rock festival as that event that suddenly shocked everyone into the awareness that the Sixties had ended, a better way to describe the process of what happened throughout the 1960s decade was that the various social movements had always encompassed both the positive and the negative; only the degree had changed. From the beginning, the Movement contained unity and division, optimism and pessimism, non-violence and violence, even though overall it did gradually and continually shift more toward the negative side of the spectrum. Nonetheless, this unfavorable turn did not mean that the Sixties era really ended at the end of the 1960s decade (it did not); instead, the 1970s only continued the trend towards ever greater violence and splintering of groups that started nearly ten years earlier within the anti-war and other social movements, and which kept going for many more years. While it is true that the peak in the activities of violent revolution vanguard groups was in the early and middle 1970s, this again did not signal a new era (it was the continuation of the Sixties era). The roots of resorting to violence, in fact, went back to the beginning of the (mid-1950s) civil rights movement, to those who opposed Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “non-violent direct action.”

According to the 1963 Louis Harris poll, 22 percent of “black respondents” believed that change would only come through a violent “showdown with whites.” On the other hand, the following decade was far from consisting of only negativity; the 1970s had a lot of positive too (as contradictions persisted as well). While there was a lot of division during the 1970s, there still existed an overarching unity of purpose to stop the war and to create a more just world.
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(even if tactics differed). Also, though the inclination of the vanguard was to continue with ever more violent revolutionary actions (from January 1, 1969 to April 15, 1970 there were 8200 total bombings, attempted bombings, and bomb threats), a majority of people still believed in non-violence.\footnote{Scranton, \textit{The Report of the President’s Commission on Campus Unrest}, 49.} Far from feeling pessimistic, many of the individuals who believed in violent revolution were actually optimistic too, seeing themselves as realists. Jane Alpert (a secret member of a freelance bombing collective) wrote, “The real division is not between people who support bombings and people who don’t, but between people who will do them and people who are too hung up on their own privileges and security to take those risks.”\footnote{Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 401.} Finally, the flames of hope were still shining in many quarters, well into the 1970s, as the end of the Vietnam War and the resignation of President Nixon over Watergate were seen as positive events, in fact victories that would lead towards a larger future victory or change (there was a feeling by many in the Movement that they had won and it was only a matter of time before they would take over).

In this 1960s section, I demonstrated how the Movement was always more fraught with division and violent tendencies than is normally acknowledged. The question of when the Sixties era ended is perhaps confusing because for most people, the criteria used in order to judge is based on violence/loss of hope reaching a certain threshold – which is arbitrarily selectable according to one’s own inner myth-making about the 1960s decade. So when was there a large enough discouraging event to justify the claim of an end to the era (for those who believed that non-violence was a necessity)? As I have mentioned, a good many claim that it was the Altamont rock festival and the Manson family murders, both conveniently occurring (or coming to the public’s attention) in December of 1969.\footnote{“The Manson Murders and the End of the Flower Children Era,” Charles Manson and the Manson Family Murders. \url{http://www.exampleessays.com/viewpaper/43619.html}. Accessed September 25, 2011.} However, as we have seen in this segment, for others the Sixties had ended even earlier, for example: SDS fragmenting in June 1969, the election of Nixon in November 1968, the Chicago Democratic National Convention protests in August 1968, the assassination of Robert Kennedy in June of 1968, the assassination of Martin Luther King in April 1968, the Pentagon Protests and the Death to the Hippie in October 1967, the civil rights movement pronounced dead or dying as early as 1965 after the Selma, Alabama marches (and every year afterwards), and so forth.\footnote{Civil Rights Movement – Definition, \url{http://www.wordiq.com/definition/Civil_Rights_Movement}. Accessed September 25, 2011.} Various activists and authors have pronounced each of these above events (and others) at various times as that which sealed
the end of the Sixties era.\textsuperscript{1871} As I demonstrated, optimism within the Movement was continually ebbing and flowing depending on the particular circumstances throughout the decade (the \textit{San Francisco Chronicle}, in mid-December 1969, wrote to reassure, “Despite a spate of East Coast doomsaying in the past week, indications here are that the Vietnam peace movement is alive and well but shifting its focus to the West Coast”).\textsuperscript{1872} The fact was that there were major losses of hope going back to the earlier 1960s as well, for example: the Great Society programs relegated to the dust bin because of the Vietnam War in 1966, President Johnson lying about not starting a war in Vietnam in February 1965, the ridiculous Warren Commission report of September 1964, and the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963.\textsuperscript{1873} Indeed, many people who were part of the early civil rights movement claim that the Sixties already began to go downhill as a result of the great loss of hope after Kennedy’s murder (less than four years into the 1960s decade); if so, the 1970s only continued this discouraging overall feeling that had permeated most of the 1960s decade since Kennedy’s assassination. Nonetheless, surely, we cannot claim that the Sixties ended in November of 1963?

Perhaps the construction of the Sixties myth (of equating the 1960s as good and the 1970s as bad) needs to be better evaluated. Conceivably, the misconception on how to judge the progress of the Movement stems from the sudden burst of “rising hope” and expectation that emerged during the late 1950s/early 1960s, and how it at first overwhelmed the awareness of the negative aspects of the struggle. Many in the Movement suppressed their feelings of the possibilities of failure, and continued to conceal their “undertow fury at the denial of hope,” as the Movement began to experience more resistance from the establishment.\textsuperscript{1874} It was easier to see everything with rose-colored glasses during the early part of the 1960s decade as the Movement was still very new, experiencing great exuberance with every protest and demand. However, things were never all positive within the Movement, and believing so became less possible, as there were many major contradictions throughout the 1960s decade. While the hippie counterculture and the anti-war movement (both emerging in the mid-1960s) focused on love and peace, there was an intense anger over war, the assassinations, and disillusionment over
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liberalism. It was not all “We Shall Overcome,” as the Movement was filled with bickering, division, and discontent, on college campuses and in the streets, and as enthusiasm was coupled with hostility as well as optimism “jumbled” with a view of “quasi-fascist ‘Amerika.’” Thus the negativities concerning Altamont and the Manson crimes at the end of the decade (or the SDS’s last National Convention and the violence between rival black power groups) did not just happen out of the blue. Youth culture’s “illusions about itself” continually (and ever more frequently throughout the decade) met with a dose of reality concerning how righteous and pure their movement was. The dark side of increased hatred and violence towards the “pigs,” LSD casualties, drug murders, and the raping of teenage runaway hippie girls (even before and during the Summer of Love) was overlooked or rationalized away. For the counterculture, the Woodstock and Altamont rock festivals (both in 1969) symbolized the ongoing dynamics of the polar opposites in attitudes and actions that existed within the Movement during the Sixties era: unity/division, hope/despair, and non-violence/violence. However, the question arises, can one truly divide reality so definitively?

In a sense, the Sixties era is mythological, built from a static dream, a concept, and state of mind based on perfection that bursts over time. The absolute idealism of how the world should be, and the mode of action for getting there, simply met the reality of an imperfect world and flawed individuals. As the Movement experienced increasing resistance and significant change seemed blocked, the turning away from Martin Luther King’s non-violent action (vision) was assured (but how and why would this turning away end the Sixties)? Even President Kennedy said, “Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.” However, not fitting into the myth was that even before the 1960s decade began (in late 1959), Civil Rights leader Robert F. Williams debated Martin Luther King about the question of violence vs. non-violence as an instrument of change. In other words, there never was a unified agreement on this and other questions. Williams argued, “Where law and order have broken down . . . only self-defense can prevent murder by armed zealots” (he also advocated warfare if need be).

Critics all along argued that non-violence was an attempt to “impose the morals of the bourgeoisie upon the proletariat, [and] that violence is a necessary accompaniment to
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revolutionary change, or that the right to self-defense is fundamental.”¹⁸⁷⁹ While most activists wanted to change things peacefully, as time went on many became open to the possibility of fighting back and even taking the offensive (as in guerilla war). Militants stated that the creation of confrontation was a good strategy that could arouse even the “moderates into action.”¹⁸⁸⁰ It was common to hear people talk of peace and love, but also of violent revolution in the same breath. Perhaps some in the Movement’s early years (i.e., MLK) envisioned a set of ideals for social change that was humanly unattainable; if so, should we judge the 1960s and 1970s decades on how purely the Movement upheld its own conceptualized ethics? If we try, we fall short, because ideals stand for perfection, with their “shoulds and should-nots,” and their fulfillment never truly exists.¹⁸⁸¹ Thus, if one begins to look beyond the contradictions of the Movement, one sees grey ethical areas that go beyond the rigid boundaries of right or wrong actions. In other words, the Sixties era begins to expand well into the next decade, clearly seen if the criterion used is that of concrete events (the end to the wars in Indochina, military draft, anti-war demonstrations, rock festivals, etc.).

III. The 1970s

III.1. Introduction to the 1970s

To state that the Sixties era movements ended in December 1969 completely ignores the reality of the large part of the next decade. While many history books paint an image of the seventies as being exclusively concerned with disco music and fashions, self-absorption, and of an overall sense of it being a “me” decade, this did not truly begin till the latter part of the decade. In fact, the term “me decade” was not even coined by novelist Tom Wolfe until August of 1976, when his article appeared in New York magazine describing the “new American preoccupation with self-awareness and the collective retreat from history, community, and human reciprocity.”¹⁸⁸² Moreover, the film Saturday Night Fever, which significantly helped to popularize disco music, dancing, and the disco look (with three-piece suits for men and rayon or jersey wrap dresses for women) was not

released until December of 1977. Instead, the unquestionable reality was that the seventies decade began with a continuation of the hippie/radical mentality and look from the late 1960s. Both men and women wore long hair, jeans remained frayed, and tie dye shirts and Mexican peasant blouses were still popular for many years to come. Music well into the middle 1970s, moreover, included many hippie-type folk rock artists such as Canned Heat, Cat Stevens, Crosby Stills Nash and Young, the Doobie Brothers, the Grateful Dead, Joni Mitchell, Melanie Safka, Seals and Crofts, and many others. On the other hand, harder or more progressive rock bands were also favorites among the counterculture during this period, such as Aerosmith, Black Sabbath, Deep Purple, Jefferson Airplane/Starship, Led Zeppelin, Pink Floyd, Rush, The Who, and Yes. Nonetheless, it was not only fashions and music that showed that the Sixties era had not yet ended; more importantly, it was the continuation of the Vietnam War and the fight for peace, justice, equality, and the vision to transform society, the world, and themselves.

On the anti-war front, the Vietnam War not only extended into the 1970s but the fighting expanded into Cambodia in 1970 and Laos in 1971. Moreover, 1972 saw the heaviest U.S. bombing of North Vietnam during the war, while 1973 had the heaviest bombing of Cambodia (as the war simmered on until May of 1975). Anti-war protest activity always picked up during these new developments (to a lesser extent in 1973 because it was kept mostly a secret). The continuation of military conscription also kept the young people agitated, with the last ones reporting for duty in June 1973. In March 1973, 1974, and 1975, the Selective Service assigned draft priority numbers for all men born in 1954, 1955, and 1956, in case conscription was extended, but it never was as draft registration ended in late January 1976.

In the realm of minority rights, liberation and other radical left groups/movements, they too continued strong for many years into the 1970s decade. While the Black Panther Party did experience a split in 1971, and many chapters were closed in 1972, it remained
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strong, especially in Oakland, California until 1977. The same was true for the Chicano Movement, the Puerto Rican Liberation Movement, and the American Indian Movement (AIM). In the example of AIM, the 1969 Alcatraz island takeover did not end until 1971, the cross-country protest known as the “Trail of Broken Treaties” occurred throughout 1972, the Wounded Knee armed standoff with federal forces in 1973, and the shootout with armed government forces (also on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation) happened in 1975. The Yippies, meanwhile, carried on their antics also, invading Disneyland in Los Angeles and the U.S. border town of Blaine, Washington (in protest of Richard Nixon’s invasion of Cambodia and the shooting of students at Kent State) in 1970. Moreover, they were part of the coalition of anti-Vietnam War activists who tried to shut down the U.S. government in Washington D.C. in 1971, were charged with inciting riots in Columbus, Ohio (in response to Nixon’s mining of North Vietnam’s Haiphong harbor) and at the Republican Presidential National Convention in Miami in 1972, led many taunting rallies against Nixon during Watergate during 1973 and 1974, and conducted harassing demonstrations against President Ford in 1975. Moreover, starting in 1970, the Yippies began their yearly Smoke-In demonstrations for the legalization of marijuana, which were very popular throughout the decade. Finally, there were many other radical left-wing organizations also carrying on the revolution, who went beyond demonstrating and vandalizing to arson, bombing, and even kidnapping. To name a few of these hard core groups, they included the Black Guerilla Family, Black Liberation Army, Brown Berets, FALN (Frente Americano para la Liberación Nacional), New World Liberation Front (NWLF), Red Guerrilla Family, Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA), and the Weathermen/Weather Underground Organization (WUO). Examples of bombing by the WUO in 1970 include the San Francisco Police Department, the New York house of Judge Murtagh (who was presiding over the Panther 21 trial), the National Guard Association of the United States building in Washington, D.C., the New York City Police headquarters, the United States Army base at the Presidio in San Francisco, the Marin County courthouse in California, and the Bank of America headquarters in New York City; in 1971 examples included, the United States Capitol Building (to protest the invasion of Laos), the Office of California Prisons in Sacramento and San Francisco (in retaliation for the killing of George Michael X. Delli Carpini, “Black Panther Party: 1966-1982,” University of Pennsylvania (2000), http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=asc_papers. Accessed November 26, 2014. "American Indian Movement: Past, Present & Future,” A.I.M. Interpretive Center (2014), http://www.aim-ic.com/AIM-PastPresentFuture.pdf. Accessed November 26, 2014. Beal, Blacklisted News, 5-6.
Jackson of the Black Panthers), the New York Department of Corrections in Albany, New York (to protest the killing of 29 inmates at Attica State Penitentiary), and William Bundy’s office in the MIT research center in Cambridge, Massachusetts; in 1972 examples included, the Pentagon (in retaliation for the U.S. bombing raid in Hanoi); in 1973, the 103rd Police Precinct and the ITT headquarters in New York (in response to ITT’s role in the Chilean coup) was bombed; in 1974 examples of bombing included, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare offices in San Francisco, the Office of the California Attorney General (in response to the killing of six members of the Symbionese Liberation Army), Gulf Oil’s Pittsburgh headquarters (to protest the company’s actions in Angola, Vietnam, and elsewhere), and the Anaconda Corporation (in retribution for Anaconda’s involvement in the Chilean coup the previous year); in 1975 examples included, the State Department (in response to escalation in Vietnam), the Offices of Department of Defense in Oakland (related to the Vietnam war), the Banco de Ponce (a Puerto Rican bank) in New York (in solidarity with striking Puerto Rican cement workers), and the Kennecott Corporation in South Jordan, Utah (in retribution for Kennecott’s involvement in the Chilean coup two years prior.1891

The hippie movement with its communes and rock festivals also kept going well into the 1970s decade. In fact, the trend of building intentional communities in the countryside, which exploded at the end of 1960s decade, progressively increased until around 1975. Famous communes that started after 1969 include the Lichen Community in Oregon and The Farm in Tennessee in 1971; Flying Frog Farm in Kentucky and the High Valley Farm in Washington in 1972; East Wind Community in Missouri and the Stelle community in Illinois in 1973; Cerro Gordo in Oregon and Four Winds Farm in 1974; The Abode of the Message in New York in 1975; the Adelphi Community in Texas in 1976.1892

As far as rock festivals, they too remained very popular into the middle 1970s, often attracting hundreds of thousands of young people to a single one. Some famous American rock festivals after 1969 include the Atlanta International Pop Festival, Goose Lake International Music Festival, Powder Ridge Rock Festival, and Vortex I in 1970; Celebration of Life in 1971; Concert 10 /Mt. Pocono Rock Festival, Erie Canal Soda Pop Festival, and Mar Y Sol Pop Festival in 1972; Summer Jam at Watkins Glen (the largest
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festival of the 1960s/1970s decades) in 1973; California Jam I, and the Ozark Music Festival in 1974 (there was also California Jam II in 1978).  

Although not part of my main focus, there were many other facets of the Movement that began during the decade of the 1960s (or earlier), and continued to grow in strength throughout the next decade. The following were just some of these social movements: alternative medicine, anti-nuclear, consumer, disability rights, environmental, gay rights, organic foods, and women’s rights. The following is a brief sketch outlining the achievements of the environmental movement during the 1970s: in 1970, the First Earth Day (on April 22), the Clean Air Act, and the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency; in 1971, founding of Greenpeace; in 1972, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, Clean Water Act, and the banning of DDT; in 1973, the Endangered Species Act; in 1974, the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act; in 1975, the Eastern Wilderness Areas Act; in 1976, the Toxic Substances Control Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. A brief timeline concerning the women’s movement includes a U.S. Court of Appeals ruling in Schultz v. Wheaton Glass Co. that jobs held by men and women need to be “substantially equal” but not “identical” to fall under the protection of the Equal Pay Act (an employer cannot, for example, change the job titles of women workers in order to pay them less than men) in 1970; Ms. Magazine is first published in 1971; the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) is passed by Congress (but fails to achieve ratification and the bill dies in 1982), the Supreme Court rules in Eisenstadt v. Baird that the right to privacy includes an unmarried person’s right to use contraceptives and Title IX of the Education Amendment bans sex discrimination in schools in 1972; in Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court establishes a woman’s right to safe and legal abortion (overriding the anti-abortion laws of many states) in 1973; the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in Corning Glass Works v. Brennan that employers cannot justify paying women lower wages (because that is what they traditionally received) in 1974; the first marital rape law is enacted in Nebraska (making it illegal for a husband to rape his wife) in 1976; and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act bans employment discrimination against pregnant women in 1978.
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My goal in this part of my work is to present the 1970s in a condensed form, as they happened, in order for one to clearly see and get a feel for how the first years of the 1970s decade truly were. Reading the summaries of each year from 1970 to 1976 will be like viewing a short film or reading only the headlines of a newspaper. The intention, as I have repeatedly stated, is to present how the Sixties era did not end with the turn of the calendar from 1969 to 1970. In fact, my claim is that the peak years for the revolutionary countercultural movements were in the early 1970s, they were very strong in the middle 1970s, and they were still very much alive at the end of the 1970s. Yet the news media began to report anti-war demonstrations, protests of any sort, and counter-cultural activities and events less and less. In a sense, the downfall of the Sixties era could be viewed as stemming from the fact that the Movement was dependent on the capitalist news media for publicizing their actions (underground media was much too small and not on TV), and when the news media cut back, much of that movement became isolated and out of public view. Moreover, powerful interests in control of the mass media used propaganda (especially effective after the 1973 ceasefire in Vietnam) to manipulate the youth movement into believing that the Sixties were over, and that it was time to come back into the system and conform (which most did). Powerful elites in the Trilateral Commission even published a report stating how they must push back against this display of “access of democracy.” Thus much information about what happened during the 1970s has been dropped from the official historical narrative. This distortion of history has the effect, on many, of causing them to perceive the 1960s social and cultural upheavals as if they were but a fad, instead of the peak of an ongoing and recurring cycle of history that concerns itself with trying to make the world a better place to live in.
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III. 2. Summary of 1970:

War Expands to Cambodia, Kent State Killings, and the National Student Strike

On the anti-war front, major actions not only continued throughout 1970, but increased in their intensity. Anti-war moratoriums (held on October 15 and November 15, 1969) continued in January of 1970, as twenty-eight cities around the country held protests. On February 16, a police station was bombed in San Francisco, followed by three major riots later that month in a college town near Santa Barbara, California. On February 18, major protest rallies and riots in Berkeley, Chicago, and Seattle after the Chicago Seven verdict convicted five defendants of crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot, and each was fined $5,000 and sentenced to five years in prison (reversed by and appeals court on November 21, 1972). On March 19, New Mobe marched on the military draft board in San Francisco, and on April 15, New Mobe organized anti-war protesters across the nation to rally against the use of tax dollars to finance the war (fires were set in several cities, windows were smashed, and battles with police ensued). After President Nixon announced the invasion of Cambodia on the last day of April, violent protests erupted all over the country. After four students were killed (and nine others wounded) by the National Guardsmen at Kent State University in Ohio on May 4, more than 450 universities, colleges, and high school campuses were shut down by a national student strike involving more than 4 million students (in the only nationwide student strike in U.S. history). On May 9, up to 100,000 young people converged in Washington, D.C., to protest the continuing war and the killings. May 14-15 witnessed more killings of student protesters, this time at Jackson State College, where city and state police shot 14 students, two of whom died. In August, a few days after a draft office in Baltimore, Maryland was bombed (destroying some records of draftees), an anti-war

---

bombing at the University of Wisconsin–Madison campus resulted in the death of a university physics researcher and injuries to three others. On August 29, the police killed three demonstrators at the Chico Moratorium, including Ruben Salazar, a Chicano television broadcaster and columnist for the *Los Angeles Times*. On October 31 the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) held demonstrations in forty-one cities across the country. Movement violence in 1970 included hundreds of bombings by left-wing revolutionary groups, three members of the Weathermen blowing themselves up in a “bomb factory” in New York City, a death of four in a failed kidnap attempt of a Superior Court judge in California, committed in order to negotiate the freedom for the radical African American Soledad Brothers, and six African-American students being shot in the back for looting by police following civil rights demonstrations.

The hippie counter-culture also thrived in 1970 with many new communes and music festivals springing up throughout the country. Contrary to myth, not all hippies abandoned San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district after the “Summer of Love” in 1967. Many events such as the March 21-22 “Instant Karma Be-In” on “Hippie Hill” (a part of Golden Gate Park) were attended by hundreds to celebrate the vernal equinox. Other group of hippies enjoyed taking over San Francisco cable cars in the nude, as stripping in public became an increasingly popular pastime. On April 22, the first “Earth Day” demonstrations/celebrations were held all over the country in protest of spreading pollution. While on July Fourth, the first annual national smoke-in was held in Washington, D.C., with Yippie organizers advertising how one million free marijuana joints would be distributed to demonstrate for legalization. In August, a hundred Yippies managed to shut down Disneyland in California in what they called their “Yippie invasion.” In September, LSD guru Timothy Leary escaped from federal prison with the help of the radical Weatherman, creating a merger between “dope and dynamite,
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Major music festivals in 1970 (similar to Woodstock in 1969) included the “Kickapoo Creek” Music Festival held in late May in Illinois, the second Atlanta International Pop Festival in early July with 350,000 people, which was, like Woodstock, promoted as “three days of peace, love and music,” and the August 7-9 Goose Lake International Music Festival in Jackson, Michigan attracting over 200,000 fans. The July 31-August 2 Powder Ridge Rock Festival near Middlefield, Connecticut, was cancelled as a result of a legal injunction; however up to 50,000 youths arrived anyway, to create a “people’s free festival of life.” Last but not least, a late summer “Biodegradable Festival of Life, or Vortex I” was put on in part to avoid another violent type “Chicago” confrontation in Portland, Oregon at a National American Legion Convention; out of Vortex I evolved the still ongoing counter-cultural Rainbow Gatherings.

### III.3 Summary of 1971:

**Invasion of Laos, May Day Protests, and the Pentagon Papers**

On the anti-war front, violence erupted at Stanford University on February 7 as student demonstrators reacted to the report of the start of Laos’s invasion. Seeing the invasion as further escalation of the war, in the coming days thousands of anti-war protesters fought in the streets with police in several cities throughout the country. On February 28, the Weather Underground bombed the U.S. Capitol Building in “response to the expansion of the Vietnam War into Laos.” In Washington D.C., on April 24, between 200,000 and 300,000 protesters took part in one of the largest anti-war demonstration in history of the United States. On the same day in San Francisco, anywhere from 150,000 to 300,000 protested against the war. Then on May 3, in Washington, D.C., 7000 anti-war demonstrators were arrested in the largest mass direct action in U.S. history under the slogan, “If the government won’t stop the war, we’ll stop
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the government."\textsuperscript{1932} The next day another 2,680 protesters were arrested, pushing the two-day total to 10,810.\textsuperscript{1933} On June 13, the \textit{New York Times} began front-page articles on secret United States Department of Defense history involvement in Vietnam from 1945 to 1967 in what would be known as the Pentagon Papers. The Papers provided evidence that the anti-war movement was right in their claim that the "Vietnam War was no mistake; rather it was a deliberate calculated maneuver to assure U.S. hegemony in Southeast Asia and the Asian Pacific."\textsuperscript{1934} Thus, anti-war rallies continued throughout the year, including the moderately large November 6 demonstrations held in 17 cities, of which San Francisco’s, with an estimated 35,000 attendees, was the largest.\textsuperscript{1935} During a four-day series of Vietnam Veterans Against the War meetings in Kansas City, Missouri in mid-November, it was proposed that the powerful opponents of the anti-war movement should be assassinated, including members of United States Congress.\textsuperscript{1936}

In other politically related activities, rallies were held throughout the country all year in support of various American Indian tribes in their quest to take over land that was once taken from them many years before. On June 11, the Native American “Indians of All Tribes” occupation of Alcatraz Island ended after nearly one and a half years (as the Richmond Police and regular U.S. Army troops arrested the last remaining activists).\textsuperscript{1937} In Berkeley, peaceful protest concerning “People’s Park” turned to violent confrontations with the police on May 15 (exactly two years after the “Bloody Thursday” battle in 1969 with the National Guard).\textsuperscript{1938} Solidarity rallies for Angela Davis, who had been in prison for the last nine months, continued to grow during the summer.\textsuperscript{1939} On August 21 San Quentin prison guards killed Black Panther Party Field Marshall and the co-founder of the Black Guerrilla Family prison gang, George Jackson.\textsuperscript{1940} From September 9 to 13, a prison rebellion in Attica, New York, ended with New York state troopers killing 39 people (ten guards and twenty-nine prisoners) including revolutionary Samuel Joseph
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Melville, who had bombed eight government and commercial office buildings in New York City in his opposition to the Vietnam War and U.S. imperialism in 1969. Bombings of government buildings, corporate headquarters, banks, and police stations continued to increase dramatically this year.

In the world of hippiedom, twenty-eight people were arrested at the Good Earth Commune in San Francisco in early January, continuing the trend of police harassment. Three carloads of “pigs” kicked the door in and tore the place up allegedly finding “cocaine, acid, hash and grass.” March 19-21 saw the grand opening for the One World Family commune’s natural foods restaurant and entertainment center at the corner of Telegraph and Haste streets in Berkeley. On March 22, John Lennon released his “Power to the People” single record calling for revolution. In Washington, D.C., on May 2, more than 2600 police cleared 45,000 demonstrators out of Potomac Park “in an attempt to derail the protesters’ plans to bring government operations to a halt.” At dawn, the park had nearly 50,000 dancing, smiling, hippies “making love, drinking wine and smoking pot.”

On May 11, in Sonoma County, California, the government bulldozed the hippie commune called Morningstar Ranch for the fourth time, leaving 35 people homeless. The Green Earth Ecology Festival on June 6, in Los Banos, California, attracted between 30,000 to 50,000 people, after announcing that the event would feature B. B. King, Chuck Berry, Elvin Bishop, Cold Blood, Blues Image, Tower of Power, Joy of Cooking, Loading Zone, and Bola Sete. The chaotic Celebration of Life rock festival in McCrea, Louisiana, was held from June 21-28 with 50,000 in attendance. Performers included Amboy Dukes, Chuck Berry, Bloodrock, Country Joe McDonald, It’s a Beautiful Day, Melanie, John Sebastian, Steven Stills, Stoneground, War, and a few local groups. On August 1, two benefit concerts for Bangladesh attracted 40,000 people at Madison Square Garden in New York City. George Harrison and Ravi Shankar organized the event to fund a relief effort for refugees from East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) following the
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Bangladesh Liberation War. It featured a supergroup of performers that included Ravi Shankar, Bob Dylan, Eric Clapton, George Harrison, Billy Preston, Leon Russell, Badfinger, and Ringo Starr. Moreover, in September, John Lennon released his song “Imagine,” a plea for world peace, as the “people’s music” movement continued to grow, consisting of underground counterculture musicians, sometimes bands from hippie communes that self-produced their own records and printed a “people’s financial reports” on the album jacket. At the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan, many famous musicians and important movement activists joined 15,000 others at the John Sinclair Freedom Rally. As far as books go, perhaps the most famous was Abbie Hoffman’s Steal This Book, about how to grow cannabis, start your own pirate radio station, live in a commune, steal food, shoplift, steal credit cards, prepare a legal defense, make pipe bombs, and obtain a free buffalo from the Department of the Interior.

III.4. Summary of 1972:

Nixon’s Escalations of the Air War, U.S. Mining of North Vietnam Harbors, and the Miami Presidential Conventions

On the anti-war front, as the number of U.S. ground troops decreased, the focus of the anti-war movement increasingly turned to protesting against the “air war,” which had escalated against North Vietnam. On February 23, an anti-war demonstration targeted the Air Force recruiting office in Oakland, California. Nonetheless, the spring’s first major protest was held on April 1 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where 10,000 people gathered to demonstrate against the war and support the Harrisburg 7 then on trial. Then on April 11 and 16, the first of many protests against “Nixon’s latest escalations of the air war in Southeast Asia” began in San Francisco. By April 17, the anti-war protests spread across the country, ignited by the American bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi.
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leaders called for a nationwide campus strike as demonstrations took place at colleges that included Amherst, Columbia, Colgate in New York, Grinnell in Iowa, the University of Florida, and the University of Illinois. At Holy Cross College in Massachusetts, they firebombed the ROTC building. In the Bay Area, 41 people were arrested at the Alameda Naval Air Station after the demonstrators attempted to block an intersection. In San Francisco, 1500 protested at the old Federal Building, setting a Navy car on fire, with several smaller protests around the city. Hundreds of students at both San Francisco State and Stanford universities held demonstrations, those at the latter turning violent. Violent and non-violent anti-war protests continued daily for weeks across the country. By April 22, 100 university campuses coordinated student anti-war strikes as huge rallies exploded simultaneously in many cities around the country (including Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, and San Francisco). May 9 was the start for what was considered the most “turbulent” anti-war outburst since May of 1970 (and arguably, since the anti-war movement began). Throughout the country, thousands of students on countless campuses rallied, marched, staged sit-ins and sit-downs, or violently vented their unhappiness over the U.S. mining of North Vietnam harbors. “Protesters across the nation blocked highways, besieged government buildings, and battled police.” Next day the intense anti-war protests continued throughout the nation as thousands clashed with police on college campuses and in the streets. On May 11, protesters demonstrated, blocked trains and major roadways, besieged government installations, and battled with police (in Germany, the “Red Army Faction” a revolutionary guerilla unit, bombed a United States Army barracks, killing a U.S. officer and injuring 13 others in protest of the “mining of the harbors of North Vietnam and the continued U.S. presence in Viet Nam”). May 12 saw still another day of nationwide anti-war protests, pushing arrest totals since May 8 to over 2,500. Some of the most violent anti-war protests ever held continued at various
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universities, including one at Princeton on May 15.\footnote{1975} Bombings continued, including one at the Wells Fargo Bank at UC Santa Cruz in California, as Arthur Bremer shot Presidential candidate George Wallace five times, paralyzing him for life.\footnote{1976} On May 17, anti-war protesters tried to shut down the Army terminal shipping area in Oakland, California by setting bridges on fire and blocking intersections.\footnote{1977} \footnote{1978} On May 19, the Weather Underground bombed the Air Force section of the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.\footnote{1979} The Black Panther Party, on June 24, organized the first-ever black organized anti-war rally, handing out 10,000 bags of free groceries and 2,500 pairs of “rubber sandals.”\footnote{1980} July 9, Florida police broke up a demonstration at the Democratic National Convention sponsored by the Students for the Democratic Society (who according to Sixties myth did not exist after June of 1969).\footnote{1981} Several protests were held on July 11 at the Democratic National Convention, including one in front of the Convention Hall, one at Senator George McGovern’s Doral Hotel headquarters, and one at the Americana Hotel, where the Florida governor’s wife held a fashion show and reception.\footnote{1982} \footnote{1983} While the SDS chanted, “The poor need jobs, the poor need clothes, what do we get? Fashion shows,” two young women staged a “counter-culture” fashion show inside the ballroom before police hauled them off. On July 12, “hostile” anti-war demonstrators heckled, chanted, and drowned out McGovern as he tried to answer some of their questions about why he had pledged to “keep some U.S. forces in Southeast Asia until all prisoners of war come home.”\footnote{1984} In the meantime, actress Jane Fonda broadcasted an anti-war plea to American pilots and soldiers over “Voice of Vietnam Radio” during her visit to North Vietnam.\footnote{1985} On July 31, a new anti-war group called “Americong” exploded a bomb outside the Air Force Academy in Denver, Colorado, as the FBI announced that 145 bombing incidents had occurred in June and 973 bombings had occurred during the first six months of 1972.\footnote{1986} The Republican National Convention protests began in Miami Beach, Florida on August 20 as 500 anti-war demonstrators blocked a main thoroughfare
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and “roughed up some Republican delegates arriving for a $500-a-plate convention eve party.”

Fights broke out outside the Republican National Convention as anti-war protestors “massed peacefully” outside the hall on August 21. On August 22, police arrested 212 protesters as anti-war groups clashed “sporadically” with police. During the last day of the Republican National Convention on August 23, police arrested about 1,000 anti-war protesters who caused havoc as they broke up into roving bands that blocked streets, damaged vehicles, and smashed windows throughout the night. “It was at this point,” wrote arrested Berkeley Barb correspondent Bill Freedman, “that it could be veritably said that Miami had indeed turned into Chicago (1968 Chicago Democratic National Convention).” At the Alameda Naval Station in California, on September 12, anti-war protesters attempted to block the world’s largest war ship from leaving to Vietnam. On October 14, the last major anti-war demonstrations before the November presidential elections were held in Los Angeles, New York, Seattle, and 17 or 18 other cities throughout the country. On November 4, three days before voting, nearly 5,000 people demonstrated against the war in New York City. The day after the elections, November 8, 200 demonstrators attended the “De-Elect the President Rally” held at noon on the U.C. Berkeley campus. On November 16, two students were killed and 23 wounded at a “peaceful” protest at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Violence broke out “after several hundred students seized the main administration building and took over the office of the president.” The police, National Guard, state troopers, and sheriff’s deputies charged the students using tear gas, and apparently some fired buckshot. Calls for a nationwide boycott of the educational system of America, similarly to that after the Kent State and Jackson State student killings in 1970, were made on November 24. In the meantime, on November 18, anti-war demonstrations were held in 20 cities throughout the country, sponsored by the National Peace Action Coalition “to
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protest America’s continued involvement in Vietnam.”\textsuperscript{2001, 2002} Finally, from December 18 to 29, Nixon re-escalated the Vietnam War with an aerial bombing campaign called Operation Linebacker II, nicknamed the “Christmas Bombings.” The bombings against targets in North Vietnam were the largest “heavy bomber strikes launched by the U.S. Air Force since the end of World War II.”\textsuperscript{2003} Many claimed that it was the “heaviest bombing in human history.”\textsuperscript{2004} Anti-war demonstrations were quickly organized to protest the unexpected re-start of bombing of North Vietnam.\textsuperscript{2005}

In other activist news, on March 24, Indians of California occupied the Mission San Antonio de Padua in Monterey County as part of a plan to retake all mission property throughout the state of California.\textsuperscript{2006} From March 29 to 31, three Black Panther Survival meetings were held in three various places in Oakland, California concerning free clothing, shoes, plumbing, and prison visitation.\textsuperscript{2007, 2008} Thousands turned out for the May 27 “African Liberation Day” marches and rallies held in both Washington, D.C, and San Francisco to protest U.S. military involvement in Africa, in particular, Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau.\textsuperscript{2009} From November 1-9, led by AIM (American Indian Movement), over 1,000 Native Americans (representing 250 tribes) arrived in Washington, D.C., after caravanning across the country in what they called “Trail of Broken Treaties” with a series of 20 demands. On November 2, after feeling “double crossed” (BIA officials would not talk to them or give them a place to stay), the Native Americans took over the Bureau of Indian Affairs building and occupied it for a week.\textsuperscript{2010} They had arrived at the BIA to negotiate for better living standards and treaty rights. When the police ordered the Indians to leave, they refused, and after “scattered fighting,” they managed to barricade themselves in and “lock all the pigs out.”\textsuperscript{2011} After the government agreed not to prosecute the Indians for occupying the building, they left, leaving an estimated $700,000 in damages and stealing many Bureau of Indian Affairs official records.\textsuperscript{2012}
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In hippie counter-cultural news, the California Marijuana Initiative announced plans, on February 11, to open offices in various cities and on college campuses around the state to coordinate a drive to obtain more than 300,000 voter signatures necessary to get a legalization initiative on the ballot in November. On February 14-18, John Lennon and Yoko Ono co-hosted the Mike Douglas TV show, bringing on guests from the radical counter-culture such as Jerry Rubin of the Yippies and Bobby Seale of the Black Panther Party. Bread and Soup Line demonstrations began in Berkeley on March 10, against the new food stamp regulations to “prohibit food stamps assistance to communal families of un-related individuals.” March 24 saw the Sacred Free Love Om Commune return to Berkeley. The leader of the commune, Richard Thorne (now known as Om), had founded the Sexual Freedom League in 1966. In 1972, he called his new religion the OM United New World Crusade. Two thousand hippies showed up for the April 2nd Easter Sunday rock festival held on Venice beach, California. On April 8, the Mar y Sol Rock Festival was held in Baja, Puerto Rico (a territory of the United States). Thirty thousand people listened to the music of the Allman Brothers Band, Emerson, Lake and Palmer, B. B. King, John McLaughlin and Mahavishnu Orchestra, Alice Cooper, Black Sabbath, Bloodrock, Rod Stewart, and many other well-known bands. An April 9, a hippie happening held on Telegraph Avenue in Berkeley, with “guitars, flutes, bells, Guerilla Theater, anti-war displays, children, crafts, and . . . soup” turned into a police confrontation with fires set and arrests made. April 11 saw three young political radicals gain control of the five-member Cotati, California City Council. Cotati, a small college town in Sonoma County, had a large hippie counter-culture population. President Nixon believed that John Lennon’s anti-war activities (including possibly playing at the upcoming Republican National Convention) and successful anti-war songs such as “Give Peace a Chance” and “Happy Xmas (War Is Over),” could cost him his re-election, and tried to
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have him deported.\textsuperscript{2023} A major victory for the counter-culture occurred on May 8-9, when the People’s Park fence in Berkeley was torn down after a three-year battle with the university in which one person died and another was blinded in May of 1969.\textsuperscript{2024} Nevertheless, the Good Earth Commune, in San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district, was raided again for political purposes by “federal agents, U.S. marshalls, and 42 San Francisco police officers.”\textsuperscript{2025} On May 31, Yippies announced plans for a “Woodstock with politics” at the Democratic National convention in Miami Beach, Florida for July 8-13.\textsuperscript{2026} Yippie leader Jerry Rubin revealed plans for over 100,000 youths to show up to demonstrate. “The theme for the two conventions festivals (Democratic and the Republican) will be ‘A Celebration of Change, Ten Days to Change the World.’”\textsuperscript{2027} On June 4, an anti-war “Nude-In” was held at People’ Park in Berkeley.\textsuperscript{2028} People stripped naked to “celebrate life and protest the war.”\textsuperscript{2029} Participants brought “food, wine, Frisbees, and drums.”\textsuperscript{2030} After a brief chanting of “OM” people danced, sunbathed, and picnicked; “fucking was discouraged.”\textsuperscript{2031} June 18, 1972 – Berkeley’s first “Pagan festival” happened in Provo Park sponsored by Jefferson Fuck Poland and the Kali Church. Poland and several others “sat nude in the Park their bodies painted with astrological signs and Kali Church symbols.”\textsuperscript{2032} Afterwards, all participants at the event were invited to the first Rainbow Gathering in Colorado on July 1.\textsuperscript{2033} A hippie caravan left Berkeley June 29, heading to Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado for the first ever Rainbow Gathering. “The Gathering of the Tribes is a whole earth type of religious celebration for all races, tribes, communes, men, women, children, individuals – out of love.”\textsuperscript{2034} The caravan was sponsored by the “Psychedelic Venus Church,” while the gathering was coordinated by the Rainbow Family of Living Light of Eugene, Oregon. From July 1 through 4, 1972, the first Rainbow Gathering of the Tribes was held, a four-day event in Colorado held by the hippie counterculture “tribes” based in Northern California and the Pacific Northwest. Twenty thousand people faced police roadblocks, threatened civil disobedience, and were allowed
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On July 5, John Lennon released his “Sometime in New York City” album with many political songs. According to the music newspaper *Melody Maker*, “They contain the strongest, most heartfelt, sincere comments I think we've ever heard on record.” The Pocono International Speedway Rock Festival was held in Long Pond, Pennsylvania on July 8-9. Two-hundred thousand people listened to performers such as Emerson, Lake and Palmer, Three Dog Night, Rod Stewart with the Faces, Edgar Winter, Humble Pie, and other famous bands. At the same time, there was a Pot Smoke-In protest to legalize marijuana held at Flaming Park in Miami Beach during the Democratic National Convention. The Yippies first opposed the protest, than later “consented” to the Zippie event. One sign at the event read, “We like pot a lot, Drop seeds, not bombs.” On July 21, F. T. A. Released a documentary film starring Jane Fonda and Donald Sutherland and directed by Francine Parker. The movie filmed the touring anti-war satirical revue, which performed at coffeehouses near American army bases for G.I.s opposing the war in Vietnam. In Berkeley, by August, the newly liberated People’s Park saw its population of hippies grow to an estimated 75 living in tents or other structures. The Erie Canal “Soda” Pop Festival (or “Bull Island” Festival) was held on September 1-3 in the state of Illinois. The three-day music event was billed as the “Woodstock of the Midwest” with a crowd of 275,000 to 300,000, a “sea of dope smoking, music-loving, long-haired hippies.” Promoter spokesman Paul Loria stated, “It’s a mellow, beautiful crowd. This is better than Woodstock.” On October 13, the “Naked Crusade,” a new group to legalize nudity in public places, was founded in San Francisco. “All over the world, people are discarding their former fears of themselves and each other to go naked in public.”
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III.5. Summary of 1973

Heaviest U.S. Bombings of the War Continue Even after the Ceasefire, Wounded Knee Occupation, and Watergate

On the anti-war front, the heaviest U.S. bombings of the war continued throughout the first seven and a half months of the year, even after a ceasefire was signed in late January. Before the truce, folk singer Joan Baez led several anti-war rallies around the San Francisco Bay Area, including one at Stanford University on the 11th, Palo Alto on the 12th, and Berkeley on the 15th. In Washington, D.C., on January 20, three different anti-war rallies were held during President Nixon’s inauguration day. The largest protest consisted of 100,000 people marching from the Lincoln Memorial to the Washington Monument. Anti-war demonstrations were also held in Chicago, Illinois, Topeka, Kansas, Montgomery, Alabama, Bridgeport, Connecticut, Honolulu, Hawaii, and many more cities. In San Francisco, there were three different anti-war rallies, one sponsored by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) with the theme, “Stop the U.S. government racism and genocide.” Yet no celebrations occurred on January 23 after President Nixon announced that a peace agreement had been reached concerning Vietnam. In a sampling of comments, most people were skeptical that the war would really end. Indeed, on January 26, the Pentagon indicated that the U.S. military would continue to have around “500 bombers, fighter bombers, and gunships” based in next door Thailand, “ready to carry on military operations.” On January 27, the Vietnam War cease-fire began at 4 p.m. (Pacific Standard Time); however, the war did not end, with “widespread” fighting reported in the central highlands, along the central coast, and around Saigon. Several hours after the supposed end to fighting, two American helicopter crewmen were wounded by ground fire, and two American planes were shot down with four airmen listed as missing. On the other hand, the military draft ended except
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possibly for a few doctors and dentists. Nonetheless, men would still be required to register (in case the draft returned) 30 days before and after their 18th birthdays, and draft lotteries too would continue with “pre-induction physicals.”

January 28, the day after the supposed “cease-fire,” the fighting and “dying” went on in Vietnam. “At least three major battles . . . occurred since the cease-fire officially began.” On January 29, helicopter pilot Dal Pozzo, age 21, was the first American killed in Vietnam after the cease-fire started two days earlier. Meanwhile in Berkeley, on January 31, nine hundred anti-war activists met to discuss what to do now that the war was seemingly over.

A thirty-five mile long peace march, from Port Chicago Naval Weapons Station to Alameda, from February 4-10, marked the “first major post-peace peace action.” On February 9, the San Francisco Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom and 25 other organizations of Northern California combined to protest President Nixon’s budget plans of increasing military spending while cutting welfare and other public services.

On February 13, it was reported that during the 16 days since the peace treaty was signed, the American-supported South Vietnamese government conducted “328 attacks with infantry and tanks” and “213 air attacks and 281 shellings.”

On February 23, an anti-war demonstration was held in Washington, D.C., against the continued bombing of Cambodia, four weeks after the cease-fire in Vietnam. Thousands of tons of bombs were dropped on Cambodia in only the first month after the end of the war. Moreover, the thousands of “civilian advisors” left in South Vietnam (and sent after January of 1973) were in fact military advisors.

On March 9, an anti-war protest was held at the Alameda Naval Air Station against sending the aircraft carrier USS Coral Sea to Vietnam, pointing out that there were now five carriers there, two more than during the “so-called height of the war.”

A new law was passed on March 28 in Canada forcing many of the 100,000 draft evaders back to the U.S., putting them in danger of prosecution, as draft indictments

climbed from “4000 in 1972, to 6000 in 1973, and 8000 in 1974.” On March 29, the so-called last U.S. troops departed South Vietnam, under the provisions of the Paris Peace Accords signed on January 27, 1973. Only a Defense Attaché Office and a few Marine guards at the Saigon American Embassy remained, although roughly 8,500 U.S. civilians (military) advisors stayed on to help the South Vietnamese. On April 2, an anti-war demonstration in San Francisco protested the visit of South Vietnam President Nguyen Van Thieu to the United States. On April 20, reports of imminent landing of Marines in Cambodia stirred the anti-war movement, as did the Pentagon suggesting to Congress the “possibility of bombing North Vietnam again.”

On May 2, more than three months after the Vietnam War cease-fire, the U.S. continued to bomb Laos and Cambodia with over 250 air raids daily. On May 13, two U.S. F-4 Phantom jet fighters bombed South Vietnam, killing 34 people; according to the Viet Cong, it was the second such bombing in the so-called cease-fire zone by the American air force in the last two days. On June 8, the “East Bay Women for Peace” started a campaign to repeal the Selective Service Act, or the “president will again have unlimited power to call up our sons.” In Cambodia, June 30 marked the 116th consecutive day of U.S. warplanes bombing communist troops. Mostly hidden from public knowledge, there were more bombs dropped on Cambodia from January to August than during all of the previous four years. On the other hand, Nixon and the U.S. Congress agreed on a compromise of bombing Cambodia only until August 15, unless Congress approved otherwise. On July 20, an anti-bombing demonstration was held in San Francisco calling for an immediate halt to U.S. bombing of Cambodia. On August 15, the U.S. officially ended its bombing of Cambodia, ending nearly twelve years of bombing in Indochina. President Nixon warned North Vietnam that it would be an error on their part if they mistook the bombing halt as an “invitation to fresh aggression or...
further violations of the Paris agreements.\textsuperscript{2081} Under the cessation orders by Congress, “unarmed reconnaissance flights and noncombat flights to deliver military supplies” and the continuation of military aid to Cambodia and Laos would be permitted. On September 7, two articles written by journalists visiting South Vietnam stated that everyone in Vietnam had agreed that the war was not over, as U.S. helicopters and B-52 bombers flew overhead and a struggle between the National Liberation Front and the Thieu regime continued.\textsuperscript{2083} On December 14, it was reported that $275 million had been budgeted by the Pentagon “for the resumption of bombing in Indochina through June 1974.”\textsuperscript{2085} The real possibility of a renewed “large-scale war” involving the use of U.S. air, sea, and land forces was still conceivable as the war continued to escalate in Vietnam again.\textsuperscript{2086}

In other protest actions, from February 27 to May 5, two hundred (later four hundred) armed Oglala Lakota and followers of the American Indian Movement (AIM) seized and occupied the town of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.\textsuperscript{2087} Oglala and AIM activists controlled the town for 71 days, while FBI agents and United States marshals surrounded the area. Both sides were armed and shooting was frequent, with four deaths (an FBI agent, an Indian, a hippie, and a white civil rights activist, the latter two of whom had joined the protesters several weeks after it started).\textsuperscript{2088} In the meantime, on March 21, Vietnam Veterans Against the War “burned their discharges,” at a demonstration in New York City to protest “lack of jobs & lack of concern shown for vets by the Veterans Administration.”\textsuperscript{2089} On April 28-29, there was a drive in Berkeley and Sacramento to help the peoples of Angola and Mozambique fighting for freedom against colonial rule. Donated were “blankets, towels, strong clothing, and vitamins” (perhaps the largest demonstration concerning the war in Angola was on November 4 held at the Berkeley campus).\textsuperscript{2090} Also on April 28, in San Francisco, the Labor Action Committee organized a demonstration against “high prices and
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On June 1, in response to the loss of 250,000 jobs in New York City in the past three years, the revolutionary newspaper *White Lightning* demanded full employment and socialism.

As the U.S. went into a recession and the war in Vietnam was supposedly over, more protests concerning the economy increased. In showing worker solidarity, the SDS, the Black Panther Party and others organized pickets and boycotts of stores that did not support the United Farm Workers. On the other hand, some protest groups began to combine economic issues with that of war, and the sentiments toward impeachment of President Nixon as the Watergate scandal continued to grow throughout the year. On June 2, the first Bay Area Impeach Nixon march was held in Berkeley by the “people’s movement,” sponsored by the Committee to De-elect the President and the Berkeley Marijuana Initiative. Two hundred freaks chanted, “Four more weeks – four more days – four more hours – four more seconds.” On June 16, the Impeach Nixon march in Washington, D.C., organized by the People’s Coalition for Peace and Justice, demanded that “Nixon cut military spending, increase funds for social welfare programs, end U.S. intervention in Indochina, and stop the bombing of Cambodia” (other notable Impeach Nixon protests and demonstrations occurred on August 7 and August 31 in Washington, D.C., and October 27 and December 1 in San Francisco). On July 28, in Dallas, Texas, 10,000 people demonstrated opposing police brutality against Chicanos after still another police murder of a Chicano youth. There was also continued union organizing, as in August 14, for the third time in three weeks, radicals shut down a Chrysler auto plant in Detroit as the revolutionary union movement spread. The news of CIA covert intervention in Chile (resulting in the violent overthrow of the democratically elected Popular Unity government of Salvador Allende) was met with immediate protests on September 11 in San Francisco. Other notable demonstrations were held on September 15, 19, and 23 throughout the Bay Area. In New York City on September 28,
the Weather Underground bombed the ITT Latin American Headquarters for its support of
the military coup in Chile. On November 28, in Santa Clara, California, a 60,000-volt PG&E
transformer was bombed by a group called the “Americans for Justice,” who wrote that “if there is an energy crisis all of American should cooperate. We see no reason why we the people should tighten our belts while big business gets fatter off us” (bombings and shootouts by revolutionary groups continued to increase as the August Seventh Guerrilla Movement [ASGM] even shot down a police helicopter). By December 3, the first “trucker” road blockade to protest the energy crisis and “government lies” occurred on Interstate 80 near Blakeslee, Pennsylvania.

The youth counter-cultural movement continued to grow even as the anti-war movement began to wind down. One very visible form of counter-culture activity was “hanging out” in the streets talking (even on the coldest nights), “brothers and sisters” listening to music, sharing information, smoking marijuana, and drinking alcohol, turning each other on “to the revolution.” A February 16 article about the popularity of “Glamour rock” (male musicians putting on lipstick and eye shadow, etc.) appeared in the Berkeley Barb, stating that “there were drag queens in 1967 and there are Flower Children right now – it’s merely a matter of who the mass media chooses to cast a spotlight on.” On the other hand, the recent emergence of reggae music was seen in a highly favorable light as Jamaican music of blacks escaping “from their economic bondage.” Still, the “hardcore stuff heard in Jamaican clubs” had not been released in the U.S., as of yet, with only a few American bands incorporating some of their rhythms. On March 13, the trial of LSD guru Timothy Leary began in San Luis Obispo, California. Leary asked many counter-cultural figures to testify, including Jerry Rubin, Dennis Hopper, and even the Rolling Stones rock band. According to a March 16 report, many activists since the reelection of Nixon on November 7, 1972, and the Vietnam War cease-fire on January 27, 1973, began to turn to religion.
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Brando, who had won the Oscar for his role in the film “The Godfather,” refused to accept it because of “the treatment of the American Indians by the movies and on television.”

April 1 brought a hippie Fools’ Day celebration in Berkeley. Also on April 1, John Lennon and Yoko Ono announced the “birth of a new nation” in response to weeks of legal battles involving Lennon’s “right to remain in the U.S. as a permanent resident.” He stated that, “Nutopia has no land, no boundaries, no passports, only people.” Moreover, “Nutopia has no laws, other than cosmic. All people of Nutopia are ambassadors of the country. As two ambassadors of Nutopia, we ask for diplomatic immunity and recognition in the United Nations of our country and its people.” At the press conference, John Lennon and Yoko Ono waved a Nutopian white flag saying, “We surrender to peace and love.”

April 6, 1973, Jimi Hendrix’s “Rainbow Bridge,” movie was released, calling for the psychic coming together of Indian, Black, Chicano, and counter-culture revolutionaries. On April 11, “Godspell,” the movie version of the Jesus freak hit stage play, opened at movie theaters. In “Godspell,” Jesus gathered a diverse band of youthful hippie type disciples to follow him. There were also very positive reviews for Franco Zeffirelli’s new film called “Brother Sun, Sister Moon.” The movie successfully drew parallels between the philosophy of Saint Francis and the ideology of the hippie countercultural movement.

On April 23, Stephen Stills released his second and last album with his band Manassas. It included the anti-war song called “Isn’t It About Time.” On May 1, 1973, tens of thousands participated in demonstrations held all over the country for the legalization of marijuana, sponsored by the Yippies. On June 2, the British rock group Led Zeppelin drew 50,000 people at Kezar Stadium in San Francisco, playing their hippie type hard rock songs: “Celebration Day,” “Over the Hills and Far Away,” “Misty Mountain Hop,” “No Quarter,” “The Song Remains the Same,” “Rain Song,” “Dazed and Confused (incl. San Francisco),” “Stairway to Heaven,” and
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“The Ocean.” The second annual Rainbow Gathering was held at the Shoshone National Forest in Wyoming on July 1-7; 20,000 hippies showed up. On July 4, 10,000 hippies attended a Marijuana Smoke-In & Impeach Nixon march at the Washington Monument in D.C. sponsored by the Yippies. On July 27-29, billed as “Woodstock revisited, only better,” the largest rock festival ever held occurred at Watkins Glen Grand Prix Raceway outside of Watkins Glen, New York, with an estimated 600,000 people in attendance. On August 3, Stevie Wonder released his “Innervisions” album, which included an angry social political song called “Living for the City.” On August 7, “Freelandia” hippie airlines received its license to operate from the FAA. The atmosphere on board Freelandia’s jet was very different from regular airlines; it was more like a “tribal celebration.” On August 24, an article on street people appeared in the Berkeley Barb, writing about how the elite street people are the ones who live in the streets all year around, and many had been living in the streets since the “Summer of Love” of 1967. On August 31, the Rolling Stones released their “Goat’s Head Soup” album.

The Midwest Monster Peace Jubilee and Musical Festival scheduled for September 1-2, 1973 in Benton, Tennessee was cancelled. On October 12, Allen Noonan, the founder of the One World Family Commune, published his first book called To the Youth of the World. The book wrote of a “World Master Plan” for bringing about a free giving and receiving, a sharing economy that would bring heaven on earth. According to an October 19 article, the Haight-Ashbury district (overrun by 100,000 young people during the “Summer of Love” in 1967) was once again home to the gentler hippie types. On November 2, John Lennon released his “Mind Games” album with several political songs including “Bring On The Lucie (Freeda Peeple),” “Only People,” the three-second silent
“Nutopian International Anthem,” and his hippie type song entitled “Mind Games” (chanting the mantra, “Peace on earth”). On November 8-10, the Divine Light Mission (DLM) held a three-day festival called Millennium ’73 at the Astrodome in Houston, Texas. It featured Guru Maharaj Ji, a 15-year-old guru and the leader of a fast-growing new religious movement that many in the hippie circles joined. On December 1, Graham Nash released his “Wild Tales” solo album, which included the anti-war song “Oh! Camil (The Winter Soldier),” a tribute to Scott Camil, who testified in the Winter Soldier Investigation and was a defendant in the Gainesville 8 trial. On December 28, Comet Kohoutek, first sighted on March 7, attained its peak, falling short of expectations, and evoking predictions of the beginning of either a New Age or the end of the world.


U.S. Continues the War Turning It Over to the CIA, SLA Kidnaps Patty Hearst, and President Nixon Resigns

On the anti-war front, on January 9, not one year after the cease-fire agreement, Wisconsin Congressman Les Aspin reported that the Pentagon was continuing to fight the Indochina war by “removing it from the military and turning it over to the CIA instead.” It was reported on January 26 that during the first year of peace, President Nguyen Van Thieu had received $1.3 billion in military aid from the U.S. and more than 60,000 Vietnamese had been killed. On February 6, Don Luce, a freelance journalist who had just returned from South Vietnam, spoke in Berkeley about how the U.S. still had 24,600 men in Vietnam classified as “observers” and “advisers” for a “war Nixon keeps saying is all over.” In late February, in Washington, D.C., Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden continued their efforts of lobbying congress to cut off economic aid to the Thieu regime in South Vietnam, as over 100 daily “enemy violations of the cease-fire accord” occurred.
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While in Cambodia, more than 2,000 government troops launched a major operation to “clear rebel forces from Phnom Penh.” On March 3, the Weather Underground published a poem about how revolutionary groups who try to stop imperialist aggression are called terrorist by governments who kill millions in wars, while the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that the Pentagon has been hiding from the Congress the amounts of money it still spent to support South Vietnam. On April 5, according to a member of the House Armed Services Committee, the Washington Post, and former Indochina veterans, the United States in violation of a 1970 Act of Congress was still “advising or supporting ground troops in Cambodia.” On April 9, three demonstrators were arrested at an anti-war protest in San Francisco concerning the continuation of U.S. involvement in South Vietnam. According to an April 12 report, the U.S. was preparing to “land a force of 5,000 Marines in Cambodia if the Phnom Penh government falls to the insurgents.” On April 18, 1974, the U.S. Senate and House Armed Services Committees allowed South Vietnam to receive $266 million more military aid by June 30 than had been authorized by Congress because of a “Pentagon accounting error.” Several anti-war protests were held from July 1-4, in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Many of the protests turned violent as police confronted the veterans, injuring 25 at one demonstration, some sustaining “broken arms, broken heads, and cracked jaws.” The demonstrations focused on five demands that included “universal and unconditional amnesty for all military resisters, an end to all aid for the regimes of Nguyen Van Thieu in South Vietnam and Lon Nol in Cambodia, and better benefits for all veterans.” Another overall purpose was to keep the anti-war movement alive to combat the “continuing U.S. imperialism.” On July 9, in San Francisco, folk legend Joan Baez and her sister Mimi Farina played at a demonstration to demand that Vietnam veterans receive “preferential treatment” when businesses like the Bank of America were hiring. One hundred veterans and supporters attended the rally sponsored by a new organization called the Veterans Job Committee. 
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War/Winter Soldier Organization picketed in front of the Veterans Administration building in Washington, D.C., to reject President Ford’s “amnesty proposal” for military draft evaders, which they called “inadequate” because it was not universal and unconditional. In San Francisco from September 29 to October 6, anti-war groups sponsored a week of discussions, films, seminars and teach-ins as part of the “International Days of Concern for Vietnam.” According to the Indochina Peace Campaign, the U.S. was still very involved in South Vietnam, paying for over “three-fourths of the costs of running the Thieu government”; moreover, Congress had just passed legislation for another “$700 million in military aid for Indochina for the upcoming year.” Meanwhile, the Ford administration had so far continued Nixon’s Vietnam War policies, with reports of “American pilots flying support mission in the South” and “reconnaissance flights over the North,” and 10,000 military “advisors” remaining in South Vietnam. Finally, during only the first year after the January 1973 “peace agreement,” 80,000 Vietnamese died in the ongoing war. On November 21, 1974 in Berkeley, a new Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden anti-war film screened for two showings at Wheeler Auditorium (scheduled for release in January of 1975). The purpose of the film was to depict the Vietnamese as ordinary people and not enemies to hate. It was made for the Indochina Peace Campaign (IPC), an anti-war group working “to cut U.S. aid to the Thieu regime in South Vietnam, free the thousands of political prisoners, and press for implementation of the January, 1973 Paris peace agreement.” Fonda and Hayden at the screening told that since the war officially ended, “100,000 Vietnamese have died . . . and perhaps a million more have been made homeless.”

In other protest actions, a demonstration was held in San Francisco on January 8 to protest “the legal massacre of the Wounded Knee defendants” and the continued abuse by the U.S. government. Since the Wounded Knee Incident had ended on May 5, 1973, many American Indian Movement (AIM) members or supporters had been murdered. In Oakland on January 10, a police shoot-out with two Symbionese Liberation Army
(SLA) members (Joseph Remiro and Russell Little) turned up a lot of incriminating information on both the assassination of Oakland Superintendent of Schools Marcus A. Foster, on November 6, 1973, and the SLA headquarters and links to other radical organizations. On February 1, the August Seventh Guerrilla Movement revealed that they had fired on (and hit) two “light” planes in Ramon Valley on January 17. The National Campaign to impeach Nixon (NCIN) held a “Lobby-In” in Washington, D.C. from February 4-8. In addition to meeting with Congressional representatives, there was a march and a “radical tour” to notable protest areas around the city. On February 7, 1974, the Symbionese Liberation Army released their Communique # 3 admitting that they had kidnapped San Francisco Examiner newspaper heiress Patricia Hearst on February 4. A ten-day long anti-energy crisis and anti-inflation truckers’ strike ended on February 10 after President Nixon made an appeal on nationwide radio saying it was essential “to provide food, fuel and other supplies to all Americans.” The strike had created “crippling industrial shortages” and a lot of violence. On February 15, the SLA demanded that if William Randolph Hearst, Jr. wanted to see his daughter alive, he would have to give free food worth millions of dollars to various disadvantaged people. Ongoing “mass” demonstrations were held in Puerto Rico on February 15 for independence from U.S. colonization. On February 21, in a new taped message, the SLA demanded that six million dollars worth of food be given to disadvantaged people, and listed several food distribution points, including “East and West Oakland, East Palo Alto “Nairobi,” Hunters Point and Chinatown, San Francisco.” On February 28, the SLA-forced free food program resumed at ten Bay Area locations, handing out 30,000 bags of groceries filled with meat, fresh vegetables and fruit. There were no problems as there had been on the first day (February 22), only happy “beaming” faces with “armloads
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of groceries.” A third food giveaway was held on March 5 at 12 sites, and a fourth on March 8th. Meanwhile, there were two bombings by revolutionary groups in the Bay Area on March 7, one of which was the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare being bombed by the “Women’s Collective of the Weather Underground,” and the other a bombing of a Shell service station in Los Altos, California, the next day by a revolutionary group called Americans for Justice. They warned that Shell Oil Company had only “24 hours remaining” to halt gasoline price increases. Moreover, 125 people protested (including a half dozen streakers) against Vice President Gerald Ford’s visit to Tampa, Florida, as anti-Watergate demonstrations continued throughout the country. On April 3, Patty Hearst, who 58 days earlier had been kidnapped by the Symbionese Liberation Army, announced on an audiotape that she had joined the SLA and assumed the name “Tania.” On April 15, Hearst took part in a bank robbery in San Francisco; she was photographed wielding an “M1 carbine.” On April 26, the Black Liberation Army called for “a united front of all underground guerrilla groups.” On May 4, an Impeach Nixon demonstration was held in Washington, D.C., organized by the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), which at the time was transforming itself from its former incarnation, the SDS-Worker-Student Alliance (SDS-WSA). The protest, unlike the week before, aimed at “bringing the system down” rather than just focusing on President Nixon. Other impeach protests took place in Spokane, Washington and Ann Arbor, Michigan. On May 17, a Symbionese Liberation Army shoot-out with the police and FBI, in Los Angeles, ended with six SLA members dead. Patty Hearst, the kidnapped heiress turned SLA member, was not among them. Two hundred people watched the gun battle in person, while millions viewed it on live TV because of new technology just developed. As a result, according to some, it was as if the television showed the
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revolution in progress, the revolution televised! On May 31, in Berkeley, 4,000 students marched and chanted, “Power to the People” in a protest over the possible elimination of the “School of Criminology and the Ethnic Studies Program.” Country Joe MacDonald sang his legendary “A-Fixin-To-Die-Rag,” and Bobby Seale of the Black Panthers spoke on how “the student movement was alive and well.” Seale said that the media had created a myth that “students have gone back to moderate, more traditional pursuits.” On June 15-17, the Marxist-Leninist student organization called the Revolutionary Student Brigade (RSB) was founded by “450 students from 80 campuses.” RSB formed out of the Attica Brigade, which was an anti-imperialist student organization, and “one grouping that can be traced to the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) split in 1969.” The Revolutionary Student Brigade, like the Attica Brigade, aimed to fill the vacuum of left wing activism on campuses after the Students for a Democratic Society fragmented. In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on June 17, Gulf Oil Company’s headquarters was bombed by the Weather Underground Organization, in protest of the company’s actions in Angola, Vietnam, and elsewhere. In July, former Woodstock MC Wavy Gravy started a new group to feed the people of Africa called “Relief for Africans in Need in the Sahel” (RAIN). On July 12, 1974 in the Haight-Ashbury part of San Francisco, hundreds of riot police attacked a radical White Panther house and burned it down. A Haight community group, the “Four-O-Nine House,” said the incident was “just part of an emerging pattern of police shoot-out/burn-out mentality.” On August 8, a wild celebration (and near riot) shut down Telegraph Avenue for several hours in Berkeley, after President Nixon announced his resignation effective next day. In Madison, Wisconsin, on August 24, an “anti-Rocky” demonstration was held against the nomination

---

2194 “Uncertainty, Cynicism, on Campus,” Berkeley Barb, June 7-13, 1974, 3.
2195 Ibid.
2196 Ibid.
2199 Ibid.
2205 “Seeing the Bum Off: Avenue Erupts in Great Rejoicing,” Berkeley Barb, August 16-22, 1974, 3.
2206 “There Was Dancing in Streets of Berkeley,” San Francisco Chronicle, August 9, 1974, B5.
of Nelson Rockefeller as the new vice president. Protesters took over the statehouse. On September 3, the New World Liberation Front exploded a bomb in San Francisco; it was the first of many that would be exploded for more than three years. The radical community was shocked and angry at President Ford’s decision, on September 8, to grant Richard Nixon “full, free and absolute pardon for any federal crimes committed by him during his terms in the White House.” Nevertheless, even without Nixon going to trial, the ongoing Watergate Seven (consisting of his advisors and aides) trial continued. On September 9, 2,000 people, led by the Yippies, rallied and surrounded the State Capitol building in Madison, Wisconsin, to protest President Ford’s pardoning of Nixon. In Oakland, on September 11, the Anaconda Corporation (part of the Rockefeller Corporation) was bombed by the Weather Underground. The bombing occurred on the first anniversary of the Pinochet coup in Chile; Anaconda was targeted for its involvement. In San Francisco, three-hundred people demonstrated at the Chilean consulate in support of the murdered Marxist President Allende. While the mass media tried to convince the people that “apathy is overtaking us,” events in San Francisco proved otherwise as bombings, “strikes, demonstrations and rallies flared throughout the city.” On September 16, in San Francisco, two-hundred people demonstrated as President Ford issued a proclamation that offered conditional amnesty to those who evaded the draft during the Vietnam War; anti-war people were not happy, calling instead for a “universal, unconditional amnesty,” or pardon, such as what Ford had given to Nixon just eight days before. In Washington, D.C. on September 28, demonstrators protested the pardoning of Nixon by President Ford, and called for a “new election.” On October 1, California Attorney General Evelle Younger told the “Senate Internal Security Subcommittee” that revolutionary groups within the United States were planning to “mark the nation’s bicentennial birthday” in 1976 with “an era of super violence.”
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4, in the Bay Area, five-hundred people demonstrated against Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller, chanting “Kick Rocky in the ass, for his crimes and for his class.” Several groups protested for various different reasons including the “Attica Prison massacre for unconditional amnesty for war resisters and against high inflation and unemployment.”

In New York City, in October 27, there was a huge protest rally in support of Puerto Rican independence, sponsored by the “Puerto Rican Solidarity Day Committee.” In Los Altos Hills, California, on October 30, the New World Liberation Front bombed the “gatepost” of the home of Robert Hallock, the former president of ITT-Jennings of San Jose, “a subsidiary of the giant ITT multinational conglomerate for its role in the Chilean coup the year before.”

On November 23, in San Francisco, a protest was held at the Civic Center against the “appalling conditions in San Quentin and other state prisons.”

Then on December 14, in Boston, over 20,000 demonstrators marched to protest “institutional racism, racist violence against the black community and the segregationist policies of the Boston School Committee.” And finally, on December 19, the Watergate scandal neared its end as chief trial prosecutor James F. Neal began his summation concerning the remaining five members of the original “Watergate Seven” for their role in the cover-up.

In hippie counter-cultural news, Bob Dylan, an early voice of the Movement, returned to live touring for the first time since 1966. On January 18, Berkeley’s “Housing Committee of the Planning Commission” released its report stating that there were over 16,000 young non-students living in Berkeley, many of whom were from the counter-culture. A Comet Kohoutek “consciousness exploration” Celebration was held in San Francisco from January 26-27. On the other hand, a report from January 30 told how many leaders of the psychedelic counter-culture were being “slammed behind bars.”

On February 7, ABC canceled a Dick Cavett TV show featuring a discussion with four movement radicals: Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Tom Hayden, and Rennie.
An article on February 8 stated that the “Gray Rabbit” alternative hippie bus service was still the best way to get around the country (on land), especially for members of the counter-culture. On February 27, in the Delaware River valley in Pennsylvania, near Tocks Island, U.S. marshalls with guns kicked out hippie squatters and bulldozed 21 of their primitive living structures, many had lived there since the late 1960s. According to a San Francisco Chronicle article, streaking (the act of running nude through a public place) had exploded on college campuses throughout the country, and affected high schools as well. A reporter had popularized the term “streaking” in 1973 when he saw 533 University of Maryland students run nude around campus. By the beginning of March 1974, students had streaked at Baylor, North Carolina State, Pembroke State College, Rice, Stanford, Southwest Texas State University, Texas A&M, Texas Tech., University of Maine, University of South Florida, and the University of Tennessee campus in Knoxville. On March 11, Cat Stevens released his “Oh Very Young” song about changing the world into something more positive before the “young generation” gets old. A Natural Energy Fair was held at the University of California at Berkeley March 21-22, put on by long time counter-culture leader Stewart Brand, who started out as a Ken Kesey Merry Prankster, a Trips Festival co-producer, and later an editor of the Whole Earth Catalog. On April 6, 250,000 people attended the “California Jam” rock festival held at the Ontario Motor Speedway in Ontario, California. Bands that performed at the festival included Black Oak Arkansas, Black Sabbath, Deep Purple, the Eagles, Earth, Wind & Fire, Emerson, Lake & Palmer, Rare Earth, and Seals & Crofts. On the same day, in Madison, Wisconsin, 10,000 freaky people turned out for the Yippie Smoke-In to hear bands play and smoke marijuana. According to a Department of Agriculture report, on April 26, more young Americans were continuing to go back to the land to live.
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in rural communes, or just to farm. On April 27, 10,000 “freaks” showed for the Impeach Nixon demonstration held in Washington, D.C. Similar demonstrations were held in other cities throughout the country, including Chicago, Key Biscayne, Los Angeles, and San Clemente. On the same day, the Paper Lace released an anti-war pop song called “Billy Don’t Be a Hero.” In Dayton, Ohio on May 1, Yippies sponsored a “Freak Streak” to protest a proposed “anti-cannabis bill” and to demand President Nixon’s resignation. “Maniac Yippies” streaked across Wright State University yelling, “We are the naked truth.” They also left a “trail of pre-rolled joints with messages inscribed: Fuck Nixon Screw the System.” In Mendocino County California, on May 3, hippie back-to-the-landers began to face harassment from health and sanitation officials. Also on this day, Ken Kesey started a new counter-cultural magazine called Split In The Ocean, or S.I.T.O. In New York City, on May 9, there was a “Friends of Chile Benefit Concert” with Phil Ochs, Pete Seeger, Arlo Guthrie, and others. In Berkeley, on May 18, Jefferson Clitlick (Jefferson Fuck Poland), the “militant nudist” and long-time “nude-in” veteran, was arrested for “streaking” on the day the song called “The Streak” by Ray Stevens hit #1 on the music charts. On May 26, in Spokane, Washington, the Yippies held their second annual Smoke-In near the ongoing Expo 74. On June 8, in Oakland, the first of two “Day on the Green” rock festivals was held at the Oakland Coliseum Stadium (the second was held July 13-14). On June 22, three thousand people attended the largest “open-air” Golden Gate Park Panhandle concert since
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the 1967 “Summer of Love.”

On June 24, the song “Sweet Home Alabama” was released by Lynyrd Skynyrd and quickly reached #8 on the U.S. music charts. It was the only top hit to mention the Watergate scandal. In Berkeley, on June 30, an estimated 5,000 people attended a Farm Workers benefit concert at the Greek Theater. Also in Berkeley, on July 3, over 1,000 attended a “Veterans Bonus March” benefit concert held at the Berkeley Community Theater. In Spokane, Washington, on July 4, the Yippies held their first “West Coast International Smoke-In” as a “fringe function to the Expo ‘74 World’s Fair.” They also continued to have an ongoing “counter festival” called “Exploit ‘74” downriver from the Expo at High Bridge Park. Hippies from the Rainbow Tribe helped “initiate a free food trip with two free meals served a day.” This year’s Rainbow Gathering was in Utah in the Dixie National Forest on its usual dates of July 1-7. From July 4-7, the “First Annual Counter-Culture Convention and Freak Fair” was held at Shorebird Park in Berkeley. On July 19-21, the Ozark Music Festival was held on the Missouri State Fairgrounds in Sedalia, Missouri. Crowd estimates ranged from 180,000 to 350,000 and it was considered one of the last Woodstock-type rock festivals of the era. On July 25, the Weather Underground Organization (WUO) released their 154-page book “Prairie Fire” “to selected bookstores”; in the book, they sought to “explain the changes in U.S. and world conditions since the Vietnam ceasefire.” They wrote about the “urgent need” for “concrete analysis and the creation of correct strategies and ideologies to win people over to the revolution. In San Francisco, on August 10 (as well as August 31-September 2), there were more People’s Ballroom-produced outdoor concerts, this time in Marx Meadows in Golden Gate Park. According to an August 30
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report, the trend towards communal living was still on the upswing in Berkeley. By September 13, approximately, 20,000 copies of the Weather Underground book *Prairie Fire: The Politics of Revolutionary Anti-Imperialism* had been printed and distributed nationally. In San Francisco, on September 18, a press conference was held by many of the leaders of the counter-culture (including Jerry Rubin, Allen Ginsberg, and Ram Dass) to get the facts straight about Timothy Leary, if he was “finking” on the entire movement. A group calling itself “People Investigating Leary’s Lies, or PILL” sponsored the conference. An article appeared in the *Berkeley Barb* on September 20 regarding the difficulties experienced by the back-to-the-land movement over the past several years. The story began with the counter-culture leaving for the country, as a “rebellion against an increasingly cybernetic society . . . (causing) young people to begin looking for more “natural ways of doing things especially after the “Summer of Love” in 1967. However, moving to the countryside and to small towns had often turned out to be not the “idyllic, trouble-free Shangri Las that dreamers imagine[d] them to be.” First there was often a lot of trouble with the locals who lived there, who were worrying about the “hippies” invading. Other problems stemmed from lack of jobs, lack of intellectual stimulation, the lack of something entertaining to do, and often the fact that “country living is hard work.” On September 28, the first People’s Ballroom counter-culture indoor rock concert was held in Berkeley, put on by a People’s Ballroom Collective consisting of Earth People’s Park commune, the Berkeley White Panther Party and the Hog Farm commune with Wavy Gravy. The goal was to fulfill the needs of the community like, “need for quality rock ‘n’ Roll music at a cheap price.” From October 4-13, in both San Francisco and Berkeley, there was a ten-day “Dharma Festival a mixture of eastern gurus and counter-cultural leaders such as Allen Ginsberg and Michael McClure, focusing on spiritual teachings of Buddhism. On October 11, hundreds of hippies in rural Mendocino County California banded together to pressure the county to change its health
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and building codes, after the county threatened to destroy their self-built homes.\(^{2281}\) On October 18, a “secret inter-office memo” was leaked about the plans to use the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution as a propaganda tool. The memo stated, “The Bicentennial is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to promote the virtues of the domestic status quo in an atmosphere supercharged with emotional patriotism.”\(^{2282}\) Moreover, the plan leading up to July 4, 1976 would consist of “the greatest single peacetime public opinion mobilization effort in our nation’s history.”\(^{2283}\) In other words, it was a great opportunity to end the Sixties Era with flag waving, blind nationalism! On the cultural level, the mass media was already on a propaganda campaign (especially since the Vietnam War cease-fire) claiming that shorter hair for men was the new style (distorting the fact that long hair was a sign of protest and not a fad), to manipulate and form reality to their own interest and liking. On the other hand, many in the counter-culture wished and hoped that 1976 would be the year in which the New Age arrived.\(^{2284}\) On December 13, the progressive rock band Yes released their seventh studio album called “Relayer which featured a 22-minute three-part song called “The Gates of Delirium” and “Soon,” a “very gentle, soothing prayer for peace and hope which represents the aftermath of the battle to establish a New Age on Earth.”\(^{2285}\)\(^ {2286}\) Finally, on December 27, a new book on the Weather Underground called The Weather Eye appeared consisting of all their “significant” communiques from May 1970 to May 1974.\(^{2287}\)\(^ {2288}\)

III.7. Summary of 1975:

The Watergate Trials End, Saigon Falls to End the Vietnam War, and the “End of War” Rally Held in New York

On the anti-war front, the war and the protest movement continued until spring, after which the U.S. finally withdrew from most of Indochina. In the meantime, in San Francisco on January 27, a demonstration on the second anniversary of the signing of the Paris Peace Agreements turned violent as police beat demonstrators, arresting eighteen
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persons. On January 28, the New World Liberation Front bombed the Pillar Point Air Force Radar Station, 15 miles south of San Francisco; it was the second bombing by NWLF in two days against the continuing war. On February 2, an anti-war group called the “Indochina Resource Center” blamed the U.S. and South Vietnamese governments for the ongoing war. It stated that the Saigon regime “added 770 hamlets to its control” in the one year after the January 1973 cease-fire agreement. In Oakland, on February 24, there was an anti-war demonstration against “US support of the Lon Nol dictatorship in Cambodia.” The rally protested “Bird Air Company which under “civilian” contract ferried “arms and ammunition” to Cambodia in violation of the 1973 Paris Peace Agreement. In San Francisco, an anti-war protest on March 22 started in Dolores Park and marched to Union Square to rally against the “$10 million-a-day war in Indochina.” In Oakland on March 29, an anti-war protest was held in front of the “Bird Air” company, the suppliers of “arms and ammunition” to the Lon Nol government of Cambodia. On March 31, President Ford’s military draft evasion “clemency” program expired with 93,000 out of 117,000 men eligible rejecting it, most of whom had refused to serve in Vietnam because they felt in the right for refusing to participate in an unjust war. April 2, 1975, Press Secretary Ron Nessen announced that President Ford would not use U.S. air power to help the “beleaguered” South Vietnam. This announcement was in response to what Defense Secretary James Schlesinger said the day before about how he could not rule out the possibility there might be a “recommendation to use American air power in South Vietnam.” Nonetheless, the previous week the U.S. had sent South Vietnam another $700 million in military aid, and sold another $1 billion in military arms. On April 5, former White House adviser Walt Rostow told CBS morning news that the U.S. should occupy part of North Vietnam with two Marine divisions “to force the communists to honor the 1973 peace agreement.” On April 12, in San Francisco, four hundred anti-war demonstrators protested the “babylifts” from Vietnam. A leaflet at the rally said,
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“Removing these children from their own people and their homeland is not adoption: it is kidnapping.”

The demonstration also called for the “end to all aid to the Thieu Government and the implementation of the Paris Peace Agreement” of 1973.

On April 17, the Lon Nol government in Phnom Penh surrendered just five days after the U.S. evacuated the last 82 Americans from Cambodia. The Communist troops had launched an offensive on New Year’s Day 1975, and after 117 days of the “hardest fighting of the war the Khmer Republic collapsed.

President Ford considered landing 40,000 U.S. soldiers in Vietnam on April 18 to “carve a corridor through which 6,000 Americans and as many as 400,000 Vietnamese collaborators of the Americans” could be safely evacuated.

On April 30, with the last South Vietnamese and American personnel evacuated from Saigon, U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War officially ended. On this last day, two U.S. Marines were killed, as 6,500 persons were rescued, of which 1,373 were Americans.

In Berkeley, 1,500 “ecstatic chanting marchers” celebrated, seeing the end of the war as “victory of the Vietnamese people” and a victory for themselves. While it was the last anti-war march against U.S. involvement in Vietnam, most were sure that it would not be the last anti-war march against “American imperialism.”

In San Francisco, many celebrated, including “40 youths of high school age” who gathered outside the South Vietnamese consulate and chanted “No More War and “Long Live Vietnam ... Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh, the NLF has won.”

On May 1, U.S. Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger announced that the Navy ships that had been picking up refugees fleeing Vietnam in small boats had pulled back from the coast and into international waters. Meanwhile, around 350 U.S. military aircraft (including 17 B52 bombers), a “secret communications base” with a 700 man “advisory force and 25,000 other American soldiers remained on four military bases in Thailand.

In a May 3
interview, folk singer and political activist Joan Baez commented, “Although the Vietnam War is over there is still work to be done.” She told that it was discouraging that it took people “ten years to make it impossible for the administration to continue the war.” On May 7, President Ford “formally declared” the end of “the Vietnam era” in a “proclamation ending wartime veterans benefits for new military recruits.” Ford said, in a statement issued at the White House, “America is no longer at war.” The declared formality ended benefits such as “burial allowances and death pensions for individuals enlisting in the armed services” after this time. On May 11, thousands of people attended the “End-of-War Rally” in New York City, filled with “balloons, flags and peace signs.” Nonetheless, on May 12, a Cambodian gunboat “fired on and sized” a U.S. merchant ship called the Mayaguez in the Gulf of Thailand. The next day 800 U.S. Marines landed in Thailand (over the objections of the Thai government) in preparation for winning the release of the American boat. In Cambodia, on May 14, hundreds of U.S. Marines landed to fight in their first combat role since “U.S. forces withdrew from Vietnam in 1973.” The Marines met strong resistance, forcing the U.S. to send reinforcements and air strikes against the Cambodians. Meanwhile, fighter-bombers sank three Cambodian gunboats out at sea. By the end of the day (or according to U.S. time zones, May 15), the Khmer Rouge government of Cambodia had surrendered the 40 American freighter crewmembers captured three days before, according to initial statements, with at least two Marines reported killed. The “Mayaguez incident called the “last official battle of the Vietnam War ended with 41 U.S. troops killed in the operation (including 23 Air Force personnel who died in a helicopter crash and three Marines inadvertently left behind, who were later captured and executed). Those members of the U.S. military killed during the Mayaguez rescue were the last names added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial
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in Washington, D.C. According to an article in the San Francisco Chronicle, the Cambodian mainland received “extra bombing on May 15, hours after the Mayaguez rescue was over. In Vancouver, British Columbia, on May 17, a “historic meeting” was held involving representatives of U.S. and Canadian anti-war groups and the recently victorious Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. With the war finally and completely over, the last major question would be that of Vietnam War draft evaders and military deserters. At Stanford University, on September 21, loud protesters drowned out President Ford’s speech with chants such as, “Free our brothers, free our sisters, amnesty for war resisters. Then on November 10, demonstrations were held in forty-two cities throughout the country protesting the refusal of the U.S. Treasury Department to “grant licenses for shipping humanitarian aid to Vietnam.” Forbidden items included yarn for clothing, fishnets, and rototillers, all aimed to help “war-ravaged people back to economic independence.” In San Francisco, more than 4,000 people took part in the protest. On November 24, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told the “Economic Club of Detroit” how “the United States cannot remain indifferent to Soviet and Cuban intervention in Angola.” According to many in the Movement, they had to remain vigilant or else Angola would become “if not another Vietnam, at least another Laos.” As a result, in San Francisco, on December 13, a demonstration was held in support of the Portuguese Revolution, and to protest against U.S. involvement in Angola. Recent revelations indicated CIA activities of providing “extensive military aid including arms shipments and efforts to recruit mercenaries.” Sponsored by the “Coalition to Defend the Portuguese Revolution,” the demonstration’s goal was to “prevent a Chile or Vietnam type solution.” Although the war in Indochina was over, the anti-war movement against U.S. imperialism was not. Moreover, witnessed by the growing number of radical groups and their increasing activity, the goal of revolution was very much alive even after the fall of Saigon!
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In other political situations and protest actions, on January 1, in the Watergate trial, three of the “most powerful men” in the Nixon administration were convicted for “conspiracy and obstruction of justice” in trying to cover up the Watergate scandal.\textsuperscript{2338} Found guilty were former attorney general and re-election campaign manager John Mitchell, former chief of staff H. R. Haldeman, and former domestic counselor John D. Ehrichman.\textsuperscript{2339} In other Watergate-related news, special prosecutor Henry Ruth made it known that although the cover-up part of Watergate affair was over, there were many “cases being prepared for trial or still under investigation.”\textsuperscript{2340} At San Jose University on January 3, President John Bunzel continued his attempt to fire most of the faculty of the Economics Department, accusing them of “sowing the seeds of discontent among the students.”\textsuperscript{2341} In the meantime, the students had successfully boycotted classes, forcing five classes to cancel. On January 17, the ongoing Mohawk Indian occupation of a 612-acre tract of land in upstate New York neared its apex.\textsuperscript{2342} According to a Liberation News Service article, on January 22, the “entire” Los Angeles Police Department was training for possible “labor strikes, food riots, student protests, and other demonstrations that they say might occur during the current recession.”\textsuperscript{2343} A bombing occurred in New York City on January 24, by the Puerto Rican Liberation group FALN, and four were killed.\textsuperscript{2344} In San Jose, on January 27, the New World Liberation Front bombed the “Golden Pacific Center,” which housed several corporations including Pacific Telephone, General Motors, and Acceptance Corp.\textsuperscript{2345} On February 1, there were marches held in both San Francisco and Berkeley to “feed the world’s hungry.”\textsuperscript{2346} In San Francisco, a demonstration on February 5 was held in support of the “Menominee” Indians, who had ended their month-long occupation of a “vacant abbey” in Gresham, Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{2347} On February 6, in San Francisco, the New World Liberation Front bombed television station KRON-TV, channel 5; it was the fourth bombing of the week by the NWLF.\textsuperscript{2348} Between February 15 and 16 in Los Angeles, the first West Coast regional conference was held by “the Revolutionary
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According to figures released on February 18 by the “National Bomb Data Center,” there were 1,474 bombing incidents in the United States (including its Puerto Rican territory) from January through September 1974 with 18 persons killed and 150 injured. In the San Francisco Bay Area, bombings averaged “one every 16 days” during the period of February 1974 and February 1975, with not a single arrest. Of these 27 bombings, the New World Liberation Front claimed responsibility for 14, Americans for Justice claimed five, while the Weather Underground claimed four. While virtually nothing was known of the NWLF, the Weather Underground had been around since 1969 as an outgrowth of the Students for a Democratic Society. The Americans for Justice, “apparently a San Jose based group,” concerned itself over fair “utility rates,” and utilities were all its bombing targets. Protests on both February 20 and 25 at Stanford University concerned tenure cutbacks, increased tuition, and proposed elimination of “four popular student-initiated programs” and proposed changes in “qualifications for freshman financial aid.”

In Berkeley, on February 22, 300 demonstrators marched down Telegraph Avenue in hippie “costumes and gaiety, kazoo and balloons” in support of “tenants’ rights.”

From February 22 through March 1, there was a United Farm Workers Union “boycott campaign” march of 20,000 people that went from the San Francisco Bay to Modesto, California. On February 24 through 26, in Shiprock, New Mexico, thirty Navajo Indians occupied an electronics plant in protest of “better working conditions and health care on the Navajo reservation.”

The Hard Times Conference was held at Laney College in Oakland from February 28 to March 1 about the economic crisis in the U.S., and the continuing support of the Lon Nol government in Cambodia. On March 10, the Chicano Liberation Front took credit for three bombings and one failed bombing. The first issue of the Osawatomie magazine appeared on March 17, put out by the Weather Underground as a complement to their bombing actions. Since the publication of their Sing a Battle Song book in July of 1974, the Weather Underground had begun to make
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connections with the aboveground movement to better fight the revolution. On March 20, 1975, in Watsonville, California, a “band of armed Indians and their supporters” occupied an “ancient Indian burial ground” all day in a standoff with “riot equipped” deputies. From March 20-21, Pacific Gas and Electric Company transmission towers were bombed four times in various locations by the New World Liberation Front demanding that the electric company “cut in half the utility rates for those forced to live on fixed incomes, and change the rate scale so that the large industrial users of energy are charged more per unit that individual consumers.” On March 27, 1975, in Berkeley, a new revolutionary group called the “Red Guerrilla Family” bombed the “Great Western Savings and Loan Association” building on Shattuck Avenue. The target of the blast was the FBI offices on the 11th floor, which were “awash in two inches of water.” In San Jose, the New World Liberation Front “blew up a Pacific Gas and Electric Company substation,” knocking out electrical power to 34,000 homes. In a new communiqué, the NWLF demanded “free utilities to any and all unemployed.” On April 4, in San Francisco, The Red Guerrilla Family bombed the Standard Oil building in response to President Ford’s visit to the area to give a speech on the “nation’s economic problems,” as the United States jobless rate hit its highest level in 34 years. In March of 1975, nearly eight million people were out of work, the most since 1941, when the Great Depression ended. However, on April 11, another article appeared in the Berkeley Barb concerning the “dissolving of the radical challenge to the establishment” that had started a decade ago. According to the news story, the upcoming April 15 elections showed no “possible gains through electoral efforts,” unlike the peak of radical success in 1971. On the other hand, the federal government was “quietly training and financing” up towards

2368 “PG&E Bombed Again,” Berkeley Barb, April 4-10, 1975, 2.
2373 “U.S. Jobless Rate Hits Highest Level in 34 Years,” San Francisco Chronicle, April 5, 1975, A1.
2374 “Nothing to Fill Political Vacuum,” Berkeley Barb, April 11-17, 1975, 10.
2375 Ibid.
1,000 SWAT units throughout United States for a possible revolutionary uprising. At Concord, Massachusetts, on April 19, a “battle of the bicentennial was fought” involving two separate crowds, those supporting President Gerald Ford as he spoke, and those across the “Old North Bridge” who came to boo and hoped to “spark a new revolution.” The battles of Concord (and Lexington) were the first “military engagements” of the American Revolutionary War fought on this day in 1775, and thus the opening first commemorations for the Bicentennial celebrations. In San Jose, on April 29, fifty San Jose State University students occupied a dean’s office to protest the purging of radical professors, while in Waltham, Massachusetts, students occupied an office and classroom building at Brandeis University in protest of “proposed cuts in the university budget.” On May 1, in Berkeley, around 1,500 people attended a May Day celebration with speeches calling for a “working class revolution,” as the New World Liberation Front bombed the Sacramento Department of corrections. On May 4-5, there was a two-day building occupation protesting the proposed cuts to the Black and Chicano Studies Research Centers at the University of Santa Barbara. On May 9, the New World Liberation Front again bombed Pacific Gas and Electric, this time in Berkeley; their demands included cutting in half the rate for those forced to live on fixed incomes and that PG&E provide free utilities for all unemployed. On May 13, the largest protest rally at Stanford University in three years concerned the university’s plan to “eliminate preferential treatment for minority recipients of scholarships,” the “military industrial complex and big business running the university.” In San Francisco on May 13, there was an anti-nuclear demonstration organized by “Women to Women Building the Earth for the Children’s Sake.” In Sacramento, a demonstration was held in support of the ongoing court trial of Symbionese Liberation Army members Russell Little and Joseph Remiro. On May 17, demonstrations were held in several major cities to “show support

for the NAACP’s fight to keep Boston’s public schools integrated. On May 18, in Berkeley, 150 rallied in remembrance of the one-year anniversary of the Symbionese Liberation Army “massacre,” and to support the integration of the underground and aboveground revolutionary groups within the Movement. Also on this day, San Quentin Prison was bombed by the New World Liberation Front. In Sacramento, on May 21, 4,000 people demonstrated against nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons. In Berkeley, on June 1, a protest rally was led by Angela Davis to “free political prisoners.” On June 16, the Weather Underground bombed the “Banco de Ponce,” a Puerto Rican bank, in “solidarity” with the ongoing Puerto Rican cement workers’ strike. On June 26, there was a shootout at Pine Ridge reservation between the FBI and the American Indian Movement that resulted in the deaths of two agents and one AIM member. On June 27, Greenpeace, an environmental (peace and anti-nuclear) group originally from Vancouver, British Columbia, confronted Soviet whalers near the Mendocino Ridge about 40 miles west of California. On July 21, the offices of the U.S. Treasury Department’s “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms” were bombed by the “Red Guerrilla Family.” In San Rafael, on July 28, there was a protest rally in support of the “San Quentin Six” now on trial in Marin County. On August 22, the “Warriors of the Rainbow” accepted responsibility for the “burning of the Military Induction Center in Fresno on July 24, 1975,” while a new group called the “Emiliano Zapata Unit” wrote that it would begin to “engage in political kidnapping, political assassinations, and bank expropriations.” It wrote, that the “peoples’ struggle has now reached the point where we must in some cases depart from our non-injury policy.” On September 4, the Weather Underground bombed “Kennecott Corporation” headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah, to mark the second anniversary of the Pinochet coup
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From September 4 through 7 in Louisville, Kentucky, nearly 1,000 National Guardsmen and “hundreds of city and county police” arrested around 500 anti-busing demonstrators creating violence. On September 5, in Sacramento, California, there was an attempted assassination of President Gerald Ford by Lynette “Squeaky” Fromme, a member of the Charles Manson family. In Boston, on September 7, anti-busing violence exploded between 3,000 demonstrators and 600 National Guardsmen and hundreds of police. On September 8, in Sacramento, 300 “environmental activists” protested the building of the “New Melones Dam” on the Stanislaus River. Also on this day, the FBI announced that during the first seven months of 1975, 31 persons died and 206 were injured from bombings (up from 90 injuries for the same period in 1974). On September 11, the Weather Underground bombed the ITT Corporation in New York City for its role in the Pinochet coup in Chile two years earlier. Meanwhile, authorities began to investigate a new group that first surfaced in July, called the “International People’s Court of Retribution,” which threatened to begin “maiming and murdering humans if the killing of whales wasn’t immediately stopped.” On this day, twenty-seven Bay Area executives were “marked for death.” On September 12, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about a new “aboveground” revolutionary group called “Prairie Fire Organizing Committee” (PFOC) to support the “underground” Weather Underground Organization (WUO). On September 18, in San Francisco, after 19 months of search, police captured Patty Hearst and three other fugitive Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) members. On September 22, in San Francisco, President Gerald Ford was fired on from the crowd lining a street outside the St. Francis Hotel. It was the second concrete assassination attempt on the President in 17 days. Police said that
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Sara Jane Moore, who worked for several left-wing radical groups (including the Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization) was “taking aim for a second shot” when someone in the crowd hit her arm, giving police a chance at grabbing her gun.\footnote{Ibid.} On September 27, in Berkeley, there was a rally held at Ho Chi Minh Park in support of the Symbionese Liberation Army, and all “our guerrilla forces.”\footnote{“SLA Supporters,” \textit{Berkeley Barb}, October 3-9, 1975, 3.} On September 28, in Oakland, the Weather Underground bombed Anaconda Corporation for its role in the Pinochet coup in Chile two years earlier.\footnote{Dohrn, 	extit{Sing a Battle Song}, 148.} In Oakland, on October 31, the “Zapata Unit” bombed a Safeway store, “the largest supermarket chain in the United States.”\footnote{“Zapata Unit’ Claims Bombing,” \textit{Berkeley Barb}, November 7-13, 1975, 4.} According to a communique, the action occurred because “it has been one of the most blatant violators of the peoples’ right to decent working and living conditions.”\footnote{Ibid.} On November 25, according to an FBI report, during the first six months of 1975 there were 1,012 “bombing incidents” (828 actual bombings; 184 times the bomb did not explode) in the USA, of which 267 occurred in the state of California.\footnote{“State Leads Nation in Bomb Incidents,” \textit{San Francisco Chronicle}, November 26, 1975, A2.} In contrast, there had been 918 “bombing incidents” in the first six months of 1974. The explosions caused “25 deaths and 188 injuries nationwide.”\footnote{Ibid.} On December 3, 1975 in San Francisco, the “New World Liberation Front” bombed an old abandoned “radio communication center for the Municipal Railway” up on the Twin Peaks part of the city.\footnote{Ibid.} According to “Supervising Captain” Jeremiah Taylor, the bombing was tied to NWLF demands for “two-health clinics” for the poor.\footnote{“Bombing Probe at Twin Peaks Site,” \textit{San Francisco Chronicle}, December 9, 1975, A16.} On December 5, Ralph Nader’s “Raiders” pushed new California state laws to protect the public and the environment from the release of “sulfur dioxide gas” (SO2).\footnote{Ibid.} On December 12, the \textit{Berkeley Barb} reprinted the first part of Abbie Hoffman’s “Prairie Fire distributing conference” taped speech (held in Boston), on “renewing” the revolution for the 1976 Bicentennial year.\footnote{“Renewing a Revolution,” \textit{Berkeley Barb}, December 12-18, 1975, 7.} Hoffman, who was still a fugitive, gave his thoughts on the “worldwide events of the past year,” the meaning of communism, and what constituted a “real American Revolution.”\footnote{Ibid.} He said that the Bicentennial would be the “beginning of the fire that will spread out from this coming
together, that will reignite the torch of revolution,” but that there were “two tasks before
us.” 2429 The first one was to build a mass movement along the principles outlined in the
Weather Underground’s *Prairie Fire* book. 2430 The other was to build a clandestine
organization “committed to continuous and victorious revolution.” 2431 Finally, Hoffman
said that the present danger involved the media broadcasters who were promoting patriotic
propaganda for the Bicentennial, and not the present real revolution. 2432 On December 19,
Hoffman added that everyone is “brainwashed by the media.” 2433 Most people still believe
“everything they read in the papers.” 2434 Commenting on how the establishment calls
radicals who bomb “terrorists,” Hoffman said, “A terrorist is a freedom fighter too poor to
afford a jet bomber” (unlike the U.S. government, which has killed millions). 2435

In hippie counter-cultural news, on January 10, a third *High Times Magazine* issue
(Winter 1975) appeared following the incredibly successful first two issues that had made
it perhaps the most successful counter-culture publication ever. 2436 On January 17, Bob
Dylan released his fifteenth studio album called “Blood on the Tracks,” considered one of
his best ever. 2437 The single “Tangled Up in Blue” mentions the “revolution in the air.” 2438
On January 24, in Berkeley, the “Housing Committee Chairperson Abe Copperman”
discussed a new proposal on limiting communes. 2439 On January 31, an article appeared in
the *Berkeley Barb* about reggae music, the “newest musical phenomenon to bounce into
Berkeley.” 2440 The story called Reggae “outlaw” and “revolutionary” music” from the
slums of Jamaica, which is why it immediately fit in well with the counter-culture in the
U.S. 2441 Both hippies and political revolutionaries liked it. Hippies liked reggae for its
spiritual side, often including the Rastafarian religion it espoused, while the politicos (both
black and white) liked it for its lyrical themes concerning, “poverty, Black pride, social
issues, resistance to government and racial oppression, and repatriation to Africa.” 2442
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February 1, while Patty Hearst was still missing, FBI agent Charles Bates said, “We have the phenomenon of communal living” which made it easier to hide fugitives. Supporters of Timothy Leary organized an event called an “Irish wake” (also called “Wake-Up”) on February 8, with rock music, poetry reading, a film festival, and an auction of Leary’s old manuscripts. Many counter-cultural leaders took part with Paul Krassner and Wavy Gravy alternating as master of ceremonies. In March a new church started up in New York City called “The Church of the Psychodelic Eucharist,” using LSD. On March 19, the film version of The Who’s 1969 rock opera album called “Tommy” opened in the U.S. Also in March, Wavy Gravy of the “Hog Farm” commune in Berkeley started a new religion called “First Church of Fun.” The motto of the church was “Stop the killing, feed the people.” On March 27, in San Francisco, Maharishi Mahesh Yogi brought together 8,000 “Transcendental Meditators” to the civic Auditorium, proclaiming San Francisco as the “first city of the Age of Enlightenment.” On April 12-13 at the Cow Palace, in San Francisco, thousands of young people saw psychedelic space music legends Pink Floyd play. On the other hand, an article in the Berkeley Barb, on May 16, mentioned the rise of punk music. Though most people in 1975 in the U.S. had not heard of punk music as of yet (that would wait until late 1976 or early 1977), it could be seen as a start of something new in the sense that it rejected the counter-culture’s “most celebrated predecessors.”

In the Clash song “1977” the lyrics stated, “No Elvis, Beatles or the Rolling Stones.” In fact, many punks called the year 1976 (musically and culturally) as the “Year Zero” when the “punk rock revolution began” in earnest in Great Britain, and to a much lesser extent in the United States. Already in the Dictators’ 1975 song “The Master Race,” hippies and the main part of the counterculture were ridiculed in its lyrics,
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“Hippies are squares with long hair and they don’t wear no underwear.” The rise of punk was one of the signs that the Sixties era was ending as the punk philosophy is based not on hope that one can change the world, but on nihilism, as summed up by the 1977 Sex Pistols’ slogan “No Future.” Back to 1975, on May 20, a hippie occult group called the “Religion of Ten/The Eternal Now” moved up from Los Angeles to open an “Age of Aquarius” type nightclub and to expand their “family of gods” to 4,000 members in San Francisco. On May 23, in Berkeley, Dave Dillinger held a book-signing party for his latest work entitled More Power Than We Know: The People’s Movement Toward Democracy. He stated that he was “very encouraged by where the Movement is now.” From May 24-26, the fourth annual “Albion People’s Fair,” a hippie type “celebration of life on Earth” event consisted of “100 crafts booths, lots of food and music.” On May 25, in San Diego, 20,000 people showed up for the “first birthday” of the nude beach named “Black’s Beach.” Many came from Ocean Beach, the home for hippies only about 12 miles away, known as the “Haight-Ashbury of San Diego.” In San Francisco, on May 30, the largest free concert held in years (and perhaps ever) in Golden Gate Park was headlined by the Jefferson Starship (formerly the Jefferson Airplane), one of the original hippie bands. About 25,000 people came to the free event, which was co-produced by the counter-cultural “People’s Ballroom” group. In Berkeley, on June 13, there was a benefit concert for the “reconstruction in Vietnam,” raising money to buy “medicines, chemical products, and medical apparatus” urgently needed for dealing with the “effect of chemical defoliants on pregnant women and their newborn babies,” dumped on them by the U.S. during the war. On June 20, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about how the “back-to-the-land movement” commune movement was still going strong. From July 1-7, the fourth annual hippie Rainbow gathering was held in Arkansas by the White and Buffalo rivers, near Mountain Home, in
the Ozark National Forest. On July 3, the “Haight-Ashbury Research Project” released their study on what happened to the “Flower Children” who took part in the 1967 “Summer of Love.” The inquiry consisted of tracking 250 individuals, “Hippies,” over the past eight years. It found that the “project’s subjects” fell into three categories as far as how they lived today: around 40% had reentered society (gone back to school or work), nearly 30% had stayed as “full-time” hippies (living in the streets), and a little over 30% had stayed as “part-time” hippies (living communally and working only “intermittently” or taking welfare). On July 4, in Washington, D.C., the sixth Annual Yippie “Smoke-In” was held in front of the White House to demand the legalization of marijuana. The Yippies also sponsored “Insurrection City,” a four-day conference involving workshops on “the Bicentennial, conspiracy, phone phreaking, and the media.” Also on this day, the “Ant Farm,” a group of “environmental artists,” staged an event called “Media Burn” in San Francisco. It stated that “mass media monopolies control people by their control of information” by “continually rewriting, suppressing, omitting, ‘the news,’ not to mention the daily barrage of advertisements.” On July 15-16, the Rolling Stones played at the San Francisco Cow Palace, the band’s first tour since 1972. An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb on July 18 about the “Oregon Country Renaissance Fair” outside of Eugene. Started in November of 1969, it had become the biggest annual hippie gathering in the Northwest, attracting tens of thousands to the three or more day event. On July 26, 1975, the “One World Family Natural Foods Restaurant and Teleport Lounge” closed after more than four years in Berkeley. In the meantime, Allen Michael, their leader, began a “cross-country tour to promote the Gala World Celebration of 1976,” which according to Michael was, “the ending of the dying world order of capitalism and the true rebirth of communalism.” An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb on August 22 about the rise of country-rock within the counter-culture over the years, first led by Bob
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Dylan and the Byrds in the late 1960s. Since then, many country-rock bands had emerged including the Flying Burrito Brothers, Pure Prairie League, the Eagles, Marshall Tucker Band, Emmy Lou Harris, and many others. One reason for the popularity of country-rock tied to the back-to-the-land movement and its yearning for nature, freedom, and simplicity. Another article appeared in the Berkeley Barb on August 29 about the continued building of the futuristic town called “Arcosanti” by a “back-to-the-land” group called “Arcology Circle,” begun in 1970; they hoped to create an intentional community numbering 100,000 people. On September 6, George Carlin and Mimi Farina headlined the Berkeley Community Theater benefit concert for the “Bread and Roses.” In San Francisco, on September 27-28, a “Biocentennial Unity Fair” was held at Golden Gate Park sponsored by the “alternative Communities of the Bay Area.” There were “community and organization” booths and a sound stage with 38 bands, including the legendary counter-culture band Jefferson Starship (formerly Jefferson Airplane) playing. On October 10, the Illuminatus: The Eye of the Pyramid by Robert Anton Wilson was published, about conspiracies, numerology, the counter-culture, and secret societies. On December 19, an article in the Berkeley Barb appeared about the continued increase in heroin use and deaths from the drug. The news story said that 77 people had died in Alameda County of heroin use during the first six months of this year, and 83 had died in San Francisco. It said that even back-to-the-land “mellow” hippie counties, such as Mendocino in Northern California, were experiencing an epidemic, with the use of heroin reportedly doubling that summer. Some in the counter-culture suspected that the heroin problem was part of a government plot “to pacify the masses of young people” (Allen Ginsberg accused the CIA of “trafficking in heroin”).
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III.8. Summary of 1976:

Anti-War Movement Alive but Ignored By Media, Back to Patriotism with the Bicentennial Celebrations, and Jimmy Carter Fools the Movement

According to Sixties myth, with the war in Indochina over, so was the counter-culture that opposed it. Yet a Berkeley Barb survey, taken on January 2, found the counter-culture still “flourishing,” and predicted it to be “still alive and healthy” during 1976. Nevertheless, the Movement was compared to the Loch Ness Monster in the article, which said that it was “not always clearly perceived” as the mass media began to downplay it, or ignore it, more and more. As a result, the year 1976 indeed became a turning point as the Sixties era counter-culture coincided with the new emerging realities of the later 1970s, or the Seventies era. On the anti-war front, Vietnam War-related affairs were still very much in the news, as were the efforts not to allow another war to engulf the U.S., as in Angola. On January 14, the remains of five U.S. soldiers killed during the Vietnam War arrived at Travis Air Force Base, near Fairfield, California. On January 19, in Washington, D.C., over 200 persons gathered in “subfreezing weather” for an anti-war rally held concerning the increasing involvement of the U.S. in Angola. In the last several months, American government had continued “covert aid to the FNLA-UNITA,” and the CIA had armed mercenaries from Zaire to launch attacks. One speech directed at the Ford Administration started with, “The people who brought you peace in Vietnam will prevent you from bringing war in Angola.” On January 23, the military draft “went out of business,” as Selective Service Director Bryon V. Pepitone announced the “canceling of the 1976 lottery drawing.” Those born during the first months of 1957 had had to register for the draft until President Ford “temporarily suspended registration” in April of 1975, and the Pepitone announcement terminated the process completely. On January 31, in San Francisco, more than 1,000 people participated in a peace march.
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calling for the “conversion of military resources to peaceful purposes.”

The march was part of the “Continental Walk for Peace and Social Justice” that had arrived in the Bay Area the day before. Many signs held with sayings such as, “Non-violent Peace Revolution, No More War, Make Peace, etc.”

Also on this day, there were reports of how the civil war in Angola was escalating, with both the Soviet and the United States taking a greater role: “1,000 white soldiers of fortune . . . an undisclosed number of them Vietnam veterans” were making their way from the United States to Angola.

On February 1, in Northeast Thailand, the United States “handed over” one of its three remaining air bases to the Thai government, as part of a U.S. withdrawal of its combat forces due to be completed by March 20.

U.S. State Department officials acknowledged, on February 2, that former President Nixon promised North Vietnam $3.25 billion in aid to rebuild their country, but only after the January 27, 1973 Peace agreement signing.

According to White House press secretary Ron Nessen, “The whole issue became moot because Hanoi violated the peace agreement by starting the war up again and failing to give full accounting of Americans killed and missing in action in North Vietnam.”

In San Francisco, on February 3, 800 people at attended an anti-Angola war rally held outside on the Pacific Union Club’s sidewalk.

An article in the Berkeley Barb, on February 6, spoke about the “Continental Walk for Disarmament and Social Justice,” and how the anti-war movement was finally organizing to address the major unfinished business of the 1960’s – the escalating likelihood of nuclear war, brought on by U.S. militarism and the international arms race.

On March 5, in Palo Alto, the “Red Guerrilla Family” bombed the “Deer Creek laboratory of the Hewlett-Packard plant” for being part of the “war industry” and U.S. intervention in Angola.

From April 14-16, in Washington, D.C., an “Anti-Nuclear proliferation” vigil was held in front of the Pentagon. Lead by long-time activist and Catholic priest, Phillip Berrigan, the event culminated with “the pouring of human blood on the columns of the Pentagon” on Good Friday.

In the meantime, Daniel Berrigan (brother of Phillip) spoke to several hundred people at the UC-
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Berkeley campus about “The Violent Bicentennial and the Non-Violent Millennium.”

In San Francisco, on April 15, “Tax Day,” several protest groups held demonstrations against the continued spending of vast amounts of money on weapons by the U.S. government. The largest and the “most imaginative” was the “anti B-1 bomber protest at the Federal building.”

Sponsored by the “Stop the B-1 Bomber/ Peace Conversion Campaign and the War Resisters League West,” balloons were released “with IRS 1040 forms folded into airplanes attached,” to symbolize “how we see our tax dollars floating away from us by the financing of new weapon systems” like the B-1 bomber.

An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb, on April 23, about the amnesty issue concerning Vietnam era veterans with “Less Than Satisfactory Discharges (LTHDs),” draft resisters, and those who had failed to register for the draft. The “Real Amnesty” question, called one of the last major pieces of “domestic unfinished business left over from the Vietnam War,” involved over one million men.

In San Francisco, on April 30, a one-year anniversary celebration was held for the “liberation and victory of the Vietnamese” during the Vietnam War.

On May 12, an American civilian contractor (and his family) left behind in South Vietnam during last year’s American evacuation of Saigon was allowed to leave the country to Thailand. According to the Red Cross, there were still about 40 American believed to be in South Vietnam trying to leave.

In Washington, D.C., on May 16, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (the main architect of Nixon’s war in Indochina) told Barbara Walters in an interview that no matter who won the Presidential election this year in November, he would most likely step down on January 20, 1977.

On June 25, two Vietnam era war resisters were paroled, while one was denied parole for another 18 months.

An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb, on July 16, about the ongoing “15-month old class action suit” involving up to 1,500 of the 2,700 children evacuated from Vietnam during “Operation Babylift” in April of 1975.

From October 16-18, in Washington, D.C., the “Continental Walk for Disarmament and Social Justice” arrived to
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conduct a “three-day series of rallies and celebrations” at the Lincoln Memorial.\footnote{Continental Walk Ready to Jog D.C.,” Berkeley Barb, October 1-7, 1976, 2.} An estimated 4,000 to 5,000 marchers had participated on the cross-country march since December 1975.\footnote{Ibid.} In Berkeley, on October 25, a new coalition of Bay Area activists called the “UC Weapons Lab Conversion Project” wrote to the University Regents asking for “public participation in negotiating the new federal agreements” concerning “atomic research currently underway at the University’s Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos Laboratories.”\footnote{“Contract Challenged: UC’s Bomb Labs Face Countdown,” Berkeley Barb, November 25-December 2, 1976, 4.} The coalition was made up of anti-war organizations, students, college and university professors, environmentalists and trade union members.\footnote{Ibid.}

In other protest actions, on January 12, the underground revolutionary group the New World Liberation Front issued a communiqué, demanding that San Francisco Board of Supervisors “immediately upgrade medical care at the county’s jail,” in San Bruno.\footnote{“Jail Health Care: Cruel and Unusual Despite Improvements,” Berkeley Barb, January 16-22, 1976, 3.} On January 12, in Madison, Wisconsin, the initial hearing for David Fine, one of four who bombed Sterling Hall on August 24, 1970, began with over 75 supporters and acquaintances who “jammed the court-room.”\footnote{“Not Guilty Plea Planned in Bomb Case,” San Francisco Chronicle, January 13, 1976, A4.} On January 13, the revolutionary Zapata Unit released a statement to the media how they were sending $25 or $50 to Berkeley homeowners for damaging their windows after bombing the Bank of America a few days before.\footnote{“Zapata Unit’s Money Giveaway,” Berkeley Barb, January 23-29, 1976, 4.} On the same day, they bombed a Safeway store in Novato, California.\footnote{“Radical Group Says It Bombed Novato Safeway,” San Francisco Chronicle, January 16, 1976, A5.} In San Francisco, on January 14, two people were hurt in the bombing of the Iranian Consulate claimed by the Red Guerrilla Family.\footnote{“Editorial: Systematic State Terror on a Global Scale Makes Armed Resistance Inevitable—But Some Serious Mistakes Have Been Made,” Berkeley Barb, January 16-22, 1976, 7.} The bombing protested SAVAK, the “secret police, domestic security and intelligence service” known to have tortured and murdered thousands, started by Iran’s Mohammad Reza Shah and the CIA.\footnote{“Bombing in S.F. – 2 Hurt,” San Francisco Chronicle, January 15, 1976, A1.} On January 15, the pre-trial of Patty Hearst began. Many were fascinated with the case, which tried to answer how, or if, “a young woman from one of America’s wealthiest families was transformed by her own kidnappers into a gun-wielding revolutionary dedicated to provoking a violent
While on January 15, the revolutionary and FBI informant Sara Moore was sentenced by the U.S. District Court to life imprisonment for attempting to shoot and kill President Ford in September. On January 16, the radical group “New Dawn” made it clear that they fully support the Zapata Unit’s further escalation of the struggle, based on a “new tactic” of “more than just symbolic bombings.” Also on this day, in Union City, California, a large bomb powerful “enough to cause death to many persons and widespread destruction,” found beneath a police car in the Union City police station parking lot. Moreover, the Weather Underground Organization (WUO) wrote an article analyzing the armed struggle, stating, “The problem for revolutionaries is that brave actions and courageous uncompromising stands do not change conditions unless they build lasting organization and are accountable to and involve the people.” In other words, armed actions are not enough to change things if cut off from the support of the people; the task is also to “organize the working class to seize power.” In Boston, on January 21, school desegregation violence continued in at least two places. In a communique, on January 23, the New World Liberation Front (NWLF) denied bombing the La Guardia in New York the previous month (December 29, 1975). On January 24, Dennis Banks, co-founder and leader of the American Indian Movement (AIM), was captured in El Cerrito, California. On January 26, San Francisco District Attorney Joseph Freitas Jr. asked the Board of Supervisors for money “to form a special legal team to combat terrorists.” According to Freitas, “terrorist spokesmen have declared the bicentennial year 1976 will be the beginning of violent revolt.” On January 27, the official start of the Patty Hearst trial began with Judge Carter saying, “This is the most fully covered case in the history this country that I know of.” Also on this day, in Santa Clara, California, a Safeway store was bombed, the sixth in the past three months (of those, four had been claimed by the
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“Emiliano Zapata Unit”). Two days later the Zapata Unit claimed responsibility, stating that the action was taken “in a spirit of solidarity with the Chicano community which last week lost another brother [Danny Trevino, 26, shot dead by police] to terrorist San Jose pigs.” From January 30 through February 1, the “National Hard Times Conference” held in Chicago, Illinois, was the “largest gathering of the independent left since the late Sixties.” Organized by the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, “with Weather Underground Organization (WUO) support and leadership,” it was called in response to the impact of the economic crisis on “poor and working people characterized by rising unemployment, skyrocketing prices and cut-to-the bone slashes in community services,” while the Pentagon budget was over $100 billion and corporate profits were at “an all-time high.” On February 1, an article appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on the continuation of the “Whale war” between those counter-cultural types living in Mendocino County California and the “killer ships of Russia and Japan.” On February 2, the “New World Liberation Front” planted several bombs (only one went off) in three counties around the Bay Area, after declaring war against “scum lords.” Also on this day, in Los Angeles, the trial of Symbionese Liberation Army members Bill and Emily Harris began, as the trial of other SLA members Joe Remiro and Russell Little continued. On February 6, it was announced that the New World Liberation Front would start an “official publication” called The Urban Guerrilla. In contrast to the Weather Underground Organization’s Osawatomie, it would openly endorse “armed struggle,” and invite “everybody to join in, even if you’re only armed with a wrench.” On February 17, the trial of the “San Quentin Six” continued, entering into its “defense side of the case.” On February 24, the “war for Pine Ridge” Indian reservation continued as the body of American Indian Movement activist Anna Mae Aquash was found on the side of the road. Since the Wounded Knee Incident in 1973, at least 70 people, mostly, AIM members were found murdered. Two separate bombings by two different revolutionary groups
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occurred on March 5, one in San Francisco and the other in Palo Alto, California.

Also on this day, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb concerning the ongoing trial of Patty Hearst and her role in the Symbionese Liberation Army bank robbery in 1974. According to Paul Krassner, the message of the trial was clear; he wrote, “Destroy the seeds of rebellion in your children or we will have it done for you” with “psychosurgery, electrodes, aversion therapy.”

Another article on this day concerned with the rise of the “Rebel Teamsters,” an under told story of the Sixties era of members of the student movement joining the ranks of the working class to put their theories into practice. On March 19, there was a communique from the four members of the Symbionese Liberation Army still on the loose. The fugitives of SLA called the whole Patty Hearst trial “a huge media forum for counter-revolutionary propaganda” which would have “a subtle effect of undermining the validity of all revolutionaries in many people’s eyes.”

In New York City, on March 20, the first conference of the “United Action Front-76” was held to “organize for protest actions at the Democratic National Convention in July.” A Yipster Times article, on April 1, mentioned that the media in recent years had gone all out to mislead the public, saying that there had been a “war of information.” The mass media filled with FBI-planted “phony stories” had begun an all-out campaign to shape opinion and set trends and ignore all else.

Continuing this theme, an April 2 article in the Berkeley Barb stated that there had been an increase in “mass media misinformation” and manipulation concerning the counter-culture and its leaders. In San Francisco, on April 3, over two thousand people demonstrated in support of American Indian Movement leader Dennis Banks’s efforts to avoid extradition to South Dakota. Also on this day, in Santa Cruz, California, over 100 “enthusiastic” people from 24 Northern California cities formed the “Congress for the Continuation of the American Revolution.” The aim of the new group consisted of bringing together “liberals and leftists from all walks of life to build a
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revolution.”

In Oakland, on April 5, the pre-trial of SLA member Wendy Yoshimura ended with Yoshimura being released on $25,000 bail bond. On April 13, in Sacramento, Sandra Good and Susan Murphy, long-time Manson family members, were sentenced to 15 years in prison for “conspiracy and threatening businessmen and government officials.” On April 14, in San Francisco, the Red Guerrilla Family bombed the Mutual Benefit Life building. The bomb exploded on the 17th floor of the 32-story building. In Wagner, South Dakota, a “growing policy rift within the AIM ranks” resulted in the April 21 shooting of two American Indian Movement leaders by other AIM members.

In an article in the Berkeley Barb, on April 23, Scott Camil, the former “Gainesville 7” and “Vietnam Veterans Against The War” leader, stated that “Movement people are still being hassled.” On April 24-25, in Kansas City, the Yippies held a “planning conference” for their July 4th “Smoke-In” and for the Democratic and Republican Presidential National Conventions. The Yippies complained about the media black-out they had experienced in recent years, stating that the mainstream press had “programmed a role for protestors at last. . . . For no one to show up at the Conventions at all now, after Chicago and Miami, will be projected by the press as the final death of radical activities.”

On May 1, in San Francisco, the Yippies announced that “1976 is the Year of the Guerrilla,” and that future historians would remember this year as when “the second American revolution escalated to the point where the fact of guerrilla warfare in the United States could no longer be denied.” Meanwhile, many new political folksingers (such as Holly Near and Bev Grant) had emerged to sing “songs of insurrection.”

In San Francisco, on May 4, the Trans-Bay bus terminal was bombed injuring one and hurting or nearly killing close to a dozen other passengers. Unlike most bombings by radical groups, there were no telephone warnings ahead of time. On May 7, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about the how the U.S. with its capitalist system could not solve its unemployment problem; nonetheless, the tight labor market (and the ending of the Vietnam

---

2563 Ibid.
2570 Ibid.
War and the military draft) helped fuel the increasing attitude among the younger generation that “it’s every man for himself,” reflecting the “me generation’s” concern with personal issues of existence and survival (reflected culturally in the rise of disco music).2574 In a sign of changing times, on May 14, the students at the University of California in Berkeley, known for its radical activism, nearly voted in their first Republican student body president in 14 years.2575 Ray Van Buskirk’s popularity among many students resulted from economic hard times; “At a time when students are concerned about making ends meet and finding jobs,” he promised to give students “more for their money and bring employers to the campus.”2576 In Springfield, Illinois, on May 16, 8,000 people demonstrated in support of the “Equal Rights Amendment.”2577 Also on this day, in Murphys, California, a Pacific Gas and Electric Company powerhouse was bombed, killing a 26-year old man, who police suspect was the perpetrator.2578 On May 17, in San Francisco, the “Bay View Federal Savings and Loan Association” yielded to the demands of the “New World Liberation Front” by agreeing to “renovate four dilapidated slum dwellings” owned by them.2579 Because it had submitted to revolutionary demands, the NWLF removed the loan association from its “bombing list.”2580 On May 19, an article appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on the continuing violence in Boston over the desegregation “forced busing” issue.2581 Interestingly, busing created divisions within the Sixties movement. The issue of busing not only further split the civil rights movement minorities from the working class, it also created a split within the political left, especially the New Communist movement.2582 Perhaps some of the inherent hypothesis in the Sixties movement began to be seen in its dialectic contradiction. In Berkeley, on May 21, 500 students and “onlookers” demonstrated for the “better treatment of Chicano students.”2583 It was the largest demonstration at the University of Berkeley in more than a year.2584 In Sacramento, on May 25, hundreds protested in support of an environmentally “strong
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coastal protection bill.”2585 From May 27 to June 11, in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, U.S. and Canadian environmentalists gathered (amid bomb threats from radicals) for a United Nations “Habitat Forum and conference,” to discuss population and standard of living reductions in order to save the planet from ecological disaster.2586 2587 Many Sixties era notable figures (such as Robert Anton Wilson) opposed the direction of environmental movement’s new restrictive and limiting ideology pushed by some of the richest and most influential people, preferring to still adhere to their expansive philosophies.2588 By 1976, it began to become clear that big, powerful interests within the establishment were using the environmental movement to implement general policies and specific laws to control eventually all human activity, since everything is part of the environment and everything affects it.2589 Those in the environmental movement perhaps did not realize that their Sixties ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, and equality had begun to lessen in significance and turn into their opposites. According to the “National Bomb Data Center,” on May 28, more than 2,000 “terrorist” bombings were expected to occur by the end of 1976 in the United States.2590 Moreover, the U.S. Army admitted that revolutionary groups stole 6,900 weapons (nearly half of them fully automatic) and 1.1 million rounds of ammunition from American Army bases between 1971 and 1974.2591 On May 29, the Nuclear Regulatory commission ordered a “nationwide security alert” for all 58 U.S. nuclear power plants because of an alleged possibility of attack by “some extremist group.”2592 FBI director Clarence Kelley and “other law enforcement officials” told of how they expect a “surge of terrorist activists during the Bicentennial year.”2593 An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb, on June 4, about the “demise of the women’s movement.”2594 According to the radical “Redstockings” (the one-time vanguard for the feminists), the new vanguard, the lesbian faction, had destroyed the women’s movement by
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not dealing with “women’s oppression by men,” but instead ignoring it and running from dealing with men altogether.\textsuperscript{2595} An article appeared in the \textit{Berkeley Barb} on June 11 about how the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, had finally quieted down after years of violence since the newly elected President Al Trimble had taken over.\textsuperscript{2596} On June 18, an article appeared in the \textit{Berkeley Barb} about “one of the most dramatic and exciting of any U.S. (revolutionary) guerrilla organization(s) today,” called the “George Jackson Brigade” from Seattle.\textsuperscript{2597} On June 22, four members of the revolutionary “Emiliano Zapata Unit” were sentenced to ten years each and $10,000 fines for carrying out several bombing throughout the Bay Area in the previous few years; allegedly they had plans for a “commando-style raid at the Republican convention next month in Kansas City.”\textsuperscript{2598} On June 25, the 15-month-long trial of the San Quentin Six (the longest trial in California history) ended and was sent to the jury.\textsuperscript{2599} \textit{San Francisco Chronicle} editor Jim Brewer stated, “The lack of coverage was due to how “the political winds have shifted.”\textsuperscript{2600} On July 1, in San Francisco, a revolutionary group, the “New World Liberation Front (NWLF),” bombed the home of the South African consul in retaliation for “the massacre of more than 1,000 poor people in South Africa” by the government.\textsuperscript{2601} On July 2, the bombing in three U.S. cities occurred in protest of the upcoming Bicentennial celebrations.\textsuperscript{2602} Also on this day, American Indian Movement (AIM) leader Vernon Bellecourt said that there was a “mass hypnosis” taking place on television concerning America’s Bicentennial.\textsuperscript{2603} He continued to say that America was “trying to brainwash us with patriotic slogans.”\textsuperscript{2604} On July 4, the U.S. Bicentennial celebrations culminated with the 200th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. During 1976, the whole country was seemingly immersed in Bicentennial fever, an “old-fashioned Fourth of July” patriotic mood.\textsuperscript{2605} All across the country, landmarks were painted with patriotic colors and designs. Buildings, fire hydrants, locomotives . . . nothing escaped the artist’s paintbrush. It renewed a sense of pride, patriotism, healing of past wounds and belonging to their country. George Idelson, committee chair for the Federation of Citizens
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Association, wrote about the Bicentennial: “In the Winter of 1976, America was still hurting from the wounds of the Viet Nam War. Officially it was over. The boys had come home. Not to ticker tape, but to tortured second-guessing. Those who had avoided the war fared little better. In truth, we were still at war . . . with ourselves. But the chill of Winter yielded to the winds of March and the warm promise of Spring. July 4, 1976 in the Nation’s Capital was a clear, sunny day. But this was to be the day of days, the moment to inhale the joy of being an American . . . something remarkable happened. We were family again.”

Meanwhile, not everyone was willing to submit to “patriotic lore.” Protests held in many cities throughout the U.S. included: 50,000 people in Philadelphia (led by the Puerto Rican Socialist Party demanding Puerto Rican independence), thousands in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, and hundreds elsewhere. While the establishment envisioned the Bicentennial celebration as a showcase of American achievements, not everyone agreed with the genial, patriotic consensus of the bicentennial’s national sponsors. Many Movement groups, such as women’s groups, Native Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, farmworkers, and young radicals opposed efforts to instill artificial homogeneity. A new left-inspired organization, the People’s Bicentennial Commission (PBC), “combined hostility to corporations into pleas for a second revolution.”

Many revolutionaries (both political and cultural) hoped that the culmination of the Sixties was at hand, fulfilling the progression from protest to radicalism to revolution to overthrow of the U.S. government and its institutions, in order to usher in a new social order, or a New Age. The PBC itself said on April 28, 1975, “Sure . . . Saigon’s about to fall. The anti-war movement is going domestic.” However, the battle for the Bicentennial ended with the winners clearly being the establishment with its huge media propaganda campaign. Those who pushed the American patriotic Bicentennial

---

celebrations saw the outcome as a peaceful ending to the upheavals of the previous decade; the system had weathered the storm and the Seventies were here at last. Nevertheless, although mass bombings and violence did not happen, some bombings did occur, including a First National Bank blown up in Revers, Massachusetts. On July 9, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about the “new wave of conservatism currently on the rise.” Part of the new conservatism was the political talk of “fiscal responsibility,” which included a “reluctance to spend public money for human services.” According to the news story, the climate of “fiscal panic” stemmed from the “trumped up energy crisis, and by the New York City fiscal crisis,” which were meant to “show the public that there is no longer enough to go around.” Also on this day, Paul Krassner, promoting his new book Sixties Going On Seventies,” said that “the pendulum does seem to be swinging,” but sneered at the current “spirit of Bicentennial forgiveness.” From July 12-15, in New York City, the Democratic National Convention nominated Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia for president and Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota for vice president. As 1976 was still a year “bogged down in its post-Nixon, post-Watergate (post-Vietnam) funk.” Carter made an effort to run for president on the image of a “people’s president,” and not as an “imperial” one. Talking of change, “idealism of the student,” quoting Bob Dylan, wearing sweaters instead of suits, Carter was the hip choice for president. His hipness, however, was one of a new era, one of working within the system. At the same time, the media censored the thousands of hippie freaky types attending the Democratic National convention week protests, which included a huge Yippie-sponsored smoke-in where many chanted “Fuck Ronald Reagan!” Also censored by the mainstream media was the July 12 Yippie-sponsored “march to abolish the police state,” to
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“Stop 1984 in 1976.” Nonetheless, overall, the convention protests were much smaller and mellower than those of the previous conventions in 1968 and 1972. On August 10, four members of the Symbionese Liberation Army members, now in prison, announced “the end of the SLA” in a 39-page statement. They wrote that they were not demoralized because “the number of underground revolutionary groups has grown and many of these groups are operating in a way that will insure their continued survival.”

In Kansas City, Missouri, from August 16 through 19, the Republican Party National Convention took place nominating incumbent Gerald Ford for president, but only after narrowly defeating a strong challenge from former California governor Ronald Reagan.

Outside the convention hall, various protest groups demonstrated for various causes. Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) marchers chanted, “Two, four, six, eight, ratify in every state.” Outside of the Ford headquarters, 150 young Yippies protested against imperialism and South African apartheid, and for the legalization of marijuana. Nonetheless, unlike 1968 and 1972, the Yippies, frustrated and powerless, found themselves mostly laughed at or ignored, not supported by the thousands that had protested in the recent past. The Yippies, “far too few and badly disorganized” (never more than two- or three-hundred strong), were said to have been “a shadow of their former selves,” speaking for another era and “locked into a lost frame of reference.”

In Miami, Florida, on August 27, Mitchell Werbell’s “drug and gun-running trial” began, which was in some ways a continuation of the “post-Watergate” investigations of the Nixon Administration. On August 29, in Oakland, 500 people protested against “police crimes.” They demanded “reopening investigations into the deaths of Barlow Benavidez and Tyrone Guyton,” both killed by Oakland police recently. In another article in the Berkeley Barb, on September 3, key counter-culture figure Allen Ginsberg stated his regret about and rejection of his confrontational politics during the Vietnam War era, saying he
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now believed in “compromise.” The “New Communist Movement” began to disintegrate after Mao Zedong died on September 9, and the Chinese party abandoned its earlier advocacy of “anti-imperialism and social revolution.” In San Francisco, a third anniversary protest was held on September 10 concerning the overthrow of Salvador Allende by the Chilean military junta with CIA help. On October 1, an article appeared in The Yipster Times about how the revolutionary “guerilla underground” had finally emerged in force outside the West Coast and the New York “metropolitan East,” spreading now to New England. On October 6, in San Francisco, 24 separate groups sponsored a demonstration outside the Palace of Fine Arts during the “Great Debate” held there between presidential contenders Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford. An estimated 3,000 people attended the demonstration. On October 8, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about the previous month’s California Supreme court ruling in favor of Alan Bakke in his “reverse discrimination” law suit. This reverse discrimination court case was yet another indication that the Sixties era was coming to an end as “affirmative action” policies intended to promote “equal opportunity” for minority groups (to compensate for past discrimination, persecution or exploitation by the ruling class of a culture) began to be legally challenged. On October 8, still another article appeared in the Berkeley Barb dealing with the end of the Sixties era, this time concerning “lowered expectations.” The news story related how many (even within the Movement) had turned away (or were now against) “hedonism” and “optimism of the “psychedelic 1960’s.” In the Berkeley Barb book review section, on October 22, a critique was published of the 1975 book called The Crisis of Democracy written by the Trilateral Commission. John S. James wrote that the book should have been called The Shadow Government Speaks, as those who really ruled the U.S. “disclose the future they want to see.” According to the elite, the Sixties era created problems for them, stemming from the “independent voice or power base” of
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the “youth culture,” minorities, labor, and the media.\textsuperscript{2648} The remedy prescribed by the elite called for a “pushing back” against this movement towards more democracy, the lowering of expectations, and the creating of a “trans-national ideology suitable for a world run by multinational corporations.”\textsuperscript{2649} The Trilateral Commission, which authored the book, consisted of many of the most powerful people at the time, including Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale, the current Democratic Party candidates for president and vice president. According to an article in an Italian magazine called \textit{Europa}, Carter, far from being a political outsider, was selected as an “ideal politician to build on” to advance Trilateral Commission goals in as early as 1970.\textsuperscript{2650} The ten-year anniversary of the founding of the Black Panther Party in Oakland, California, on October 25, was still another event that marked an interval that made the later 1960s seem like a long time ago to many.\textsuperscript{2651} On November 2, in Oakland, two-hundred people demonstrated to protest the “two-party capitalist electoral polities” on election day.\textsuperscript{2652} Speakers at the event criticized the electoral process as a “sham which only serves to shore up the capitalist system and stave off revolutionary change.”\textsuperscript{2653} On November 25, an article appeared in the \textit{Berkeley Barb} about how the language of the “Sixties counterculture” had been co-opted by politicians and big business. The new story gave examples on how there was “‘revolutionary’ bread, ‘natural’ cosmetics, even apartments for ‘alternative’ lifestyles.”\textsuperscript{2654} Moreover, even oil companies talked about “preserving the environment,” and Jimmy Carter was saying “right on” in his speeches.\textsuperscript{2655} On December 10, in Oakland’s Alameda County Superior Court, it was announced that three separate trials for political revolutionaries would begin soon. The cases involved Eldridge Cleaver (Black Panthers), Wendy Yoshimura (Symbionese Liberation Army), and Bill and Emily Harris (Symbionese Liberation Army).\textsuperscript{2656} On December 14, 1976 in San Francisco, an unsuccessful attempt to bomb Supervisor Dianne Feinstein’s Lyon Street home occurred as the “potentially lethal bomb” misfired.\textsuperscript{2657} The New World Liberation Front claimed responsibility in a communiqué and warned all
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supervisors that they had “48 hours to respond to just demands” to help with the horrible conditions in local jails or “suffer further attack.”

In the hippie counter-cultural news, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb on January 2 about how money had co-opted the rock music scene last year. “We have witnessed,” said Barb writer Michael Snyder, “the total absorption of rock music (once-trumpet of the activist and the alternative lifestyle) into the main stream of American Liquid Fascism.” On January 25, an article in the San Francisco Chronicle appeared about how hitchhiking, common in Northern California, had become unsafe for young women. On January 30, a “switchboard” for hippies was established for those who wanted to find old friends and lovers who they met over the years in communes, music festivals, hitch hiking, in the streets, etc. On February 6, in still another article in the Berkeley Barb, Jerry Rubin talked about his new soon-to-be-published autobiographical book called Growing (Up) At Thirty Seven. In this article, he revealed that after the end of the mass anti-war movement in 1973, he joined the New Age, “new consciousness movement,” and turned inward. On February 6, a new book from Theodore Roszak was published entitled Unfinished Animal: The Aquarian Frontier and the Evolution of Consciousness. In his latest book, he wrote about how human evolution had taken a huge leap forward and could be on the threshold of a “shift of consciousness fully as epoch-making as the appearance of speech or of the tool-making talents in our cultural repertory.” He wrote that the “Age of Aquarius,” as sung about in the hippie musical “Hair,” was but the beginning of a New Age of “harmony and understanding, sympathy and trust abounding.” On February 18, in Berkeley, Steve Gaskin, his wife, and several of his hippie tribal family were in town to give a lecture. A poem was published in the Berkeley Barb on February 27 called “Saturday Nite Disco,” about the rise of the new self-absorbed, bourgeois, decadent, disco culture. Critics of disco condemned it for its apathy toward government policies and its escapism, and for it lack of wanting to change
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the world. Disco fashions (in of themselves) marked the end of the Sixties era, as discothèque-goers often wore expensive and extravagant fashions for nights out at their local disco. However, as the great popularity of disco began to rise and commercialize, especially around the summer of 1975, by the end of the summer of 1976 it had squeezed out much of the spotlight on the Sixties movements. According to a March 12 Yipster Times article, Jan Wenner, the co-founder and publisher of Rolling Stone magazine, made a secret deal with record company executives, in 1970 that “secured for his magazine a $100,000 loan in return for cutting off favorable coverage of U.S. leftist groups harmful to the company’s hip capitalist plans.” In San Francisco, on March 20, the second “New Age Bio-Centennial Unity Fair” was held at McLaren Park in the name of “celebration of unity.” On April 1-2, the “Helter Skelter” made-for-TV film shown throughout the U.S. It was about the Charles Manson family murders of 1969, based on the book written by prosecutor Vincent Bugliosi. On April 9, protest singer Phil Ochs hanged himself in Far Rockaway, New York, because he was depressed that the Sixties movement was over.

April 10-11, in Berkeley, Tuscarora Iroquois medicine man Wallace “Mad Bear” Anderson, who predicted that “the Day of Purification will be 30 days of chaos – pretty soon,” cancelled his speaking engagement on “The Emergence of the Fourth World.”

The event, sponsored by Doug Boyd and his Menninger Foundation, was but a continuing trend within the counter-culture of dreaming about a magical transformation of the world, or its end, as more young people lost hope that the revolution would come soon.

On April 16, another article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about how rock music “as a medium has passed.” The story said that “in the Sixties rock was the medium, the most complex, all-inclusive, incisive expression of the acid induced flaming optimism we all shared.” Now rock music was described as “bankrupt, just like our acid dreams and optimism.” On April 21, LSD guru Timothy Leary was released from prison by
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California Governor Jerry Brown after serving more than three years in prison. From May 7 through 9 in Davis, California, around 15,000 people participated in the seventh annual Whole Earth Festival on the campus of UC Davis. One of the largest counter-cultural events of its kind, the festival’s emphasis was on “spirituality, healing, and positive social change.” On May 12, Anita Hoffman, wife of Yippie fugitive Abbie Hoffman, edited a book of letters called, To America with Love: Letters from the Underground. In New York City on May 15, 8000 pot-smoking hippie freaks attended the Yippie-sponsored “Sixth Annual New York City Smoke-In.” On May 28, a documentary film about the Vietnam War and the Weather Underground called Underground was released nation-wide today.” The movie had been filmed a year before on May 1, 1975 in a “safe-house,” five years after they went underground to help start a revolution in the United States. An article appeared on May 31 in the San Francisco Chronicle about the reemergence of the “old-fashioned teenager” at the middle school/junior high school level. Vice Principal Dean Taylor from the Intermediate School in Millbrae said, “Boys are showing up on campus in letterman’s jackets. Two years ago, they’d have been ashamed to put it on.” Also on this day, in New York City, a “Nude-In” was held near the World Trade Center as a “warm-up to Democratic Convention protests and a preliminary to the massive stripdown across the country, expected on National Nude Beach Day, August 8.” On June 1, an article appeared in the Yipster Times about how “the Haight-Ashbury of 1976 is not like the Haight of 1967.” According to the news story, the “afflu-hip (what we once called ‘weekend hippies,’) was kicking out “poor freaks” still living there to charge new tenants “three times” the amount. In Berkeley, 500 people came out, on June 6, in support of Wavy Gravy’s “Nobody for President in 1976” campaign rally. A bizarre myth-building article appeared, on June 11, in the Berkeley Barb concerning young people born in the 1950s.
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Entitled, “Born in the ‘50’s? What’s Tim To You?,” the news story implied that young people born in the 1950s did not remember, or belong to, the heyday of the Sixties era. As the Sixties era was beginning to fade out from mainstream view in the second half of the 1970s, outlandish statements began to be made to define when the Sixties took place and who was part of that era. This was of course nonsense; those born in the 1950s, especially in the early 1950s, were already attending university by as early as 1967/68.

From July 1-7, 1976, the fifth annual Rainbow Gathering was held in the state of Montana by “Cave Mountain,” near Choteau, in Lewis and Clark National Forest. It was the largest Rainbow Gathering since the first one in 1972, with an estimated 16,000 hippies from all over the country meeting at this “gathering of the tribes.” On July 6, an article appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle about the reemergence of fifties hairstyles for men. Inspired by the hit TV show “Happy Days,” both the “greaser” and the “flattop” styles became “in” fashions. The slow rise of 1950s nostalgia (as evident especially in mid-1970s film, television, and music) also symbolized the ending of the Sixties era. On July 9, in Berkeley, the “People’s History of Telegraph Avenue” mural was painted completed by approximately 30 artists in over 10 weeks, commemorating the fight for Peoples Park in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In San Francisco, on July 25, 2,500 people gathered in the Golden Gate Park to celebrate the Hare Krishna-sponsored tenth annual “Bay Area Festival of the Jagannatha Cart.” An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb, on July 30, about the experience of returning to Kent State University (on May 4) exactly six years after the shooting that left four dead and nine wounded. The authors, two former Kent students, found that the situation had completely changed at the university, “Six years ago, everybody bitched about the establishment. Now, everybody wants to join it and join it real badly,” as most students were now majoring in “business administration.” An article appeared in the Berkeley Barb on August 6 saying that the San Francisco Mime Troupe continued, after 17 years, performing free theatre shows of “political satire” in various parks in the San Francisco Bay Area and around California. Also on this day, former
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LSD guru Timothy Leary, recently released from three years in prison, announced his first speaking tour in seven years, this time on “intelligence in outer space” and “space migration.”

On August 20, an article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about there being thousands of beatnik, hippie, New Ager, occultist seekers and “multi-dimensional channelers of cosmic messages,” living in and around the Bay Area who believe that they were the “signs of the coming age of enlightenment.”

On the other hand, in San Francisco on August 22, the first “punk rock” band called the Ramones played from their debut record on their first West Coast tour. According to Rolling Stone magazine, the Ramones’ first record (April 23, 1976) began the punk rock era, and was considered a historic turning point in music and young people’s means of expressing their rebellious attitude. Rock critic Robert Christgau’s said, “It was also a subculture that scornfully rejected the political idealism and Californian flower-power silliness of hippie myth.”

While hippies and punk rockers shared an anti-establishment mentality (as Patti Smith pointed out), the punk scene adopted a “nihilistic attitude,” summed up by the Sex Pistols’ slogan “No Future.” Punk, like disco but for different reasons, signaled the end of the Sixties era. On August 23, New York magazine published novelist Tom Wolfe’s article called “The ‘Me’ Decade and the Third Great Awakening,” coining the term “me decade” to describe the last years of the 1970s. The term described “a general new attitude of Americans towards atomized individualism and away from communitarianism in clear contrast with the 1960s,” and some saw the rise of the “unapologetic hedonism” of the disco culture as a perfect fit. Indeed, times had changed; on September 4, the “Pop Top 20 Countdown” included five disco hits in the top seven most popular songs. Exploding especially during the late summer of 1976, disco music and its cultural fashions and attitudes began to take hold of a much larger portion of the Sixties generation. As far as the media were concerned, hippies, freaks, radical protesters, and revolutionaries were now beginning to be considered passé. For men for example, long natural hair, love beads, tie-dye t-shirts and jeans had given way to shorter styled hair, gold chains, polyester shirts and
leisure suits. Making it became the trend during the emerging disco era versus dropping-out as in the Sixties era, marking its end. But still, on September 5, in New York City, Yippie Aron Kay hit politician Daniel Patrick Moynihan in the face with a pie. Also, on September 6 in San Diego, the Yippies sponsored a Smoke-In to legalize marijuana at Balboa Park with “free music, pot, and speakers.” However, punk too was breaking out. On September 20-21 in London, England, a “watershed” event called “100 Club Punk Special” marked the beginning of “punk arising from the underground and into the mainstream music scene.” Once again, what set punk apart from the Sixties era counterculture philosophically (although they too were of the same age and part of the Sixties generation) was the belief of many early punk bands in the need for “general anarchy” and “nihilism” (the belief in the “abject lack of meaning and value to life”) versus the idealism of changing the world and finding higher truth. In a Berkeley Barb book review on September 24, it was pointed out that the newly released best-seller entitled What Really Happened to the Class of ’65? was becoming part of a growing trend towards looking back nostalgically on the “sixties” in the later seventies. The book was later adapted into a brief television series of the same name, which aired from December 1977 to July 1978. However the counter-culture still existed and never completely died out. On October 1, Paul Krassner wrote about the continuing popularity of eastern cult groups, such as Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh’s, within the hippie movement. Krassner wrote about many youth having been turned off to what was happening in the world to pursue enlightenment by following one of many gurus from India. A fairly large part of the remaining hippie movement had by this time either retreated to rural communes or spiritual monasteries. But the Yippies also persisted; on October 2, in Madison, Wisconsin, 6,000 “weed-heads” marched and demanded “freedom for marijuana and longtime Smoke-In
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organizer Ben Masel,” who had been arrested for spitting on Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson. On October 5, in San Francisco, over 1,000 people attended the counter-cultural “Nobody for President national campaign tour” featuring Wavy Gravy, Paul Krassner, and Grateful Dead song-writer Robert Hunter’s new band. Also in October, the Grammy Award-winning duo Cheech and Chong released their latest hippie underground comedy album called “Sleeping Beauty.” Finally, on November 5, in San Francisco, the counter-culture theatre groups called “Trenchmouth” were evicted from their communal converted warehouse. On November 25, in San Francisco, The Band gave a “farewell concert appearance” known as “The Last Waltz” at the Winterland Ballroom, called the “most awesome assemblage of rock’s nobility since the Woodstock mud-bath.” An article in The Aquarian on December 1 said, “Unemployment has replaced Vietnam as the major issue in the minds of millions of Americans.” Moreover, the commercialization of the Sixties era was part of what defined the new Seventies era, as on December 17, an article in the Berkeley Barb appeared about what had happened to the “hippie VW bus.” Lastly, on December 31, 1976, a negative and nostalgic article appeared in the Berkeley Barb about how Timothy Leary really had been a government “fink” while in prison (which was doubtful, as nobody ever went to prison because of him), and how great thinkers were ten or more years back during the beginning of the Movement, reminiscing over a bygone era.

IV. Final Conclusions

The rationale of most historians for ending the Sixties era in 1969 is based on their inability to integrate the unfavorable aspects of the counter-cultural movement into their overly positive dialogue about that era. After considerable analysis I came to the conclusion that the most predominant negative attributes associated with events considered
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by them as marking the end of the Sixties (i.e., Altamont rock festival) were viewed as consisting of fragmentation, despair, and violence (and to a lesser extent drug abuse). On the other hand, the Woodstock rock festival (the so-called peak of the counter-culture) was overly idealized and said to have consisted of the opposite true attributes of the Sixties era such as unity, hope, and non-violence. To determine when the lack of unity, hope and non-violence began to creep into the Sixties counter-culture, my investigation led me to the conclusion (after reviewing the whole 1960s decade) that they had always been part of the movement, although continually increasing with each passing year. This growing negativity on the part of the Movement could in part be explained by the sense of frustration with the slow rate of real change, and government repression against them; paradoxically, I found that the positive realities also continued to endure throughout the Sixties era. Lastly, I turned to the 1970s decade in order to find out if the Sixties Movement had indeed continued to exist after 1969, and the answer is yes. The Movement continued not only up until the complete end of the Indochina War (meaning the fall of Saigon and the Mayaguez incident in 1975), but even beyond that. Neglected in history books is how after the war, the Movement kept going in the form of preventing another Vietnam-like war in Angola, agitating for the conversion of military resources to peaceful purposes, fighting for decent working and living conditions (fair utility rates and health clinics for the poor), opposing nuclear energy, and so forth. Finally, to a large part, it was the establishment’s own media that killed the Sixties era as it began to downplay, ignore, and no longer consider hippies or political activism as fashionable during the postwar era.

In closing, to state that the Sixties era ended at Altamont (or any other event) on or before December of 1969 is simply preposterous. As the chronology of events of the 1970s shows, nothing really changed the following year after the numerical 1960s decade ended. The same type of events and beliefs held by the countercultural movement during the late 1960s persisted. The Vietnam War, and the protests against it, extended well into the next decade. The “hippie” lifestyle, and with it the appetite for rock festivals, rock music, sexual liberation, experimentation with psychedelic drugs, freedom to explore one’s potential, freedom to create one’s self, freedom of personal expression, freedom from scheduling, freedom from rigidly defined roles and hierarchical statuses increased unabated. The clamor for equality, justice, liberation for women, and various racial and ethnic groups, such as African Americans, American Indians, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans, intensified. Other social movements such as those favoring alternative medicine, anti-nuclear action, environmental action, gay rights, and organic foods surged.
The claim that the Sixties ended at Altamont is in large extent based on several misunderstandings, or myths, such as:

- The 1960s were a time of hope, unity, and peace for the counterculture (that is why violence and chaos signified the end of the Sixties).
- During the 1960s the political establishment and the majority culture were accepting towards hippies, student radicals, and minority struggles (violence such as that at Altamont turned them against the Movement).
- The philosophical basis for the Movement from the beginning was solely of some variation of Mahatma Gandhi’s belief in non-violent civil disobedience.
- Woodstock was the opposite of Altamont (the fiction of duality).

The first myth, that the 1960s were a time of hope, unity, and peace for the counterculture, is far from the truth. Altamont was not the first time violence occurred in connection with the Movement. It was also not the first time division and a loss of optimism arose. Concerning the hippie movement, even during the so-called “Summer of Love” there were riots, rapes, and murders. In Sixties mythology, the summer of 1967 is when the hippie movement was at its supposed highest and most pure (the First Human Be-In in January 1967 was when most people first even heard of them). However, deleted from this first myth of peaceful coexistence are incidents such as the one on July 9 when “peace and love” hippies physically attacked tourists who came to observe them in Haight-Ashbury, and when the police came the hippies fought with the officers. To be clear, this was not a unique occurrence in the Haight (where the hippie movement began). In fact, there had already been similar incidents in this still budding bohemian enclave on January 14, March 26, April 2, April 10, April 23, and June 22. Rape, according to the hippies themselves, was “as common as bullshit on Haight Street.” As stated before, the Diggers’ own Communication Company on April 16, 1967 printed the following: “Pretty little sixteen-year-old middle-class chick comes to the Haight to see what it’s all about & gets picked up by a seventeen-year-old street dealer who spends all day shooting her full of speed again & again, then feeds here 3000 mikes (micrograms of LSD, 12 times the standard dose) & raffles off her temporarily unemployed body for the
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biggest Haight Street gang bang since the night before last.”\textsuperscript{2734} Finally, on August 3, and again on the 6th, well-known Haight-Ashbury LSD drug dealers John Kent Clark and Superspade were found murdered, with more hippies killed in the following weeks.\textsuperscript{2735}

The situation with violence at hippie communes and rock festivals around the country was no different, either. In October of 1967, Groovy 21 and Linda 18 were found murdered at a Lower East Side New York City “hippie drug party.”\textsuperscript{2736} According to \textit{Time} magazine, “Groovy tried to defend the girl and was smashed with one of the boiler-wall bricks, his face crushed. Linda was raped four times and bashed with a brick.”\textsuperscript{2737} Lastly, there were rock festivals with large-scale violence even before Altamont, these would include the Newport ‘69 Festival on June 20-22, 1969; the Denver Pop Festival on June 27-28, 1969; the Newport Jazz Festival (with rock bands included) on July 3-6, 1969.\textsuperscript{2738}

The following was a description of what happened at the Denver Pop Festival. “First came a barrage of rocks, then came bottles and beer cans. Those who had crashed the fence successfully at the south end of the stadium and were now inside climbed to the top of the grandstand and hurled objects down on the police below. Political slogans were heard amid the shouting, and ALM members who had been passing out leaflets before the disturbance began became part of the unruly crowd. One police officer was knocked to the ground by a large wine bottle, and the police decided that the situation was now serious enough to use tear gas. The canisters were shot into the crowd, only to be thrown back at the police by brazen members of the throng.”\textsuperscript{2741}

The second myth that during the 1960s the political establishment and the majority culture were accepting towards hippies, student radicals, and minority struggles is also not true. Violence such as that at Altamont did not turn average people away from the Movement; it only reinforced their already negative views about those involved. The common person believed hippies to be decadent, self-destructive, unhealthy, immoral, and as a California state assemblyman stated, “potentially the greatest threat to our nation’s traditional social structure.”\textsuperscript{2742} In fact, on March 23, 1967, the City of San Francisco
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officially declared hippies “unwelcome.” As far as the Vietnam War, many ordinary folks supported U.S. involvement, giving credence to the “domino theory,” a belief that if one country fell to communism, then the bordering countries would also fall, thus justifying the war. As a result, student anti-war activists were viewed as unpatriotic, communists, traitors, faggots, and agitators. Some blue-collar workers, or “hard hats,” even physically assaulted anti-war demonstrators. The most famous “hard hat riot” occurred in New York City when 200 construction workers broke through police lines and injured 73 by beating the “longest haired youths first.” What they considered the most despicable was how “radicals would wave the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese battle flags, while burning and urinating on the American flag.” Their favorite slogans after watching the riots at the Pentagon in October 1967, the university take-over at Columbia in April and May of 1968, and the violent clash at the Chicago Democratic National Convention in August of 1968 (to mention just of few) became, “All the way, USA,” and “America, love it or leave it.” To Middle America, the revered Woodstock itself was not a triumph. Instead, seeing half a million kids smoking dope, swimming naked, and listening to loud rock music was an “outrage and an affront to American values of decency and duty.”

The third myth that the philosophical basis for the Movement from the beginning was solely some variation of Mahatma Gandhi’s belief in non-violent civil disobedience was never completely true even from the beginning. It is beyond question that Martin Luther King emulated Gandhi’s example during the African American civil rights struggles from 1955 to his death in 1968. It is also valid that today King is the most famous leader of that era, and even back then, had the most national exposure for delivering his famous “I Have a Dream” speech in 1963, and winning the 1964 Nobel Peace prize. Nonetheless, many have argued that in the black community, it was not King but Malcolm
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X, and others like Robert F. Williams and Ernest “Chilly Willy” Thomas, who supported an alternative to the pacifist strategies of the national civil rights organizations, that had the most influence over the black community.\footnote{Hill, The Deacons for Defense, 2.} In his book about the Deacons for Defense, Lance Hill wrote that disenchantment with passive resistance was common among blacks even during the early years of the Movement. They had refused to participate in non-violent protests because “they believed that passive resistance to white violence simply reproduced the same degrading rituals of domination and submission that suffused the master/slave relationship.”\footnote{Ibid., 2.} Moreover, they saw it as difficult to live Martin Luther King’s message of non-violence when the Ku Klux Klan was raping black women, burning down black houses, beating black people to death, and bombing black churches, causing the deaths of black children. As time went on the ideology of non-violence fell further and further out of favor. After 1965, pacifism was virtually scorned by the newer and more radical black power movement. Robert F. Williams was perhaps the first to create an armed self-defense unit in the black community. In 1957, Williams transformed his local NAACP branch, in Monroe, North Carolina, into an armed self-defense unit, made up of former WWII and Korean war veterans.\footnote{Williams, Negroes with Guns, xix.} He declared that it was time to “meet violence with violence.”\footnote{Ibid., xxiv.} He stated that black citizens unable to receive legal support must defend themselves because “the federal government will not stop lynching, and since the so-called courts lynch our people legally.”\footnote{Ibid.} Another armed self-defense organization formed in Jonesboro, Louisiana, in 1964, to protect civil rights activists from the KKK.\footnote{Hill, The Deacons for Defense, 2.} Led by Ernest Thomas, by the end of 1966, the Deacons had grown to twenty-one chapters, mostly in the states of Louisiana and Mississippi.\footnote{Ibid.} The Deacons “guarded marches, patrolled the black community, to ward off night riders, engaged in shoot-outs with Klansmen, and even defied local police in armed confrontations.”\footnote{Ibid.} The rise of white supremacist violence, in response to desegregation, made armed self-defense a must for most black organizing efforts, especially in the South.\footnote{Ibid., 5.} As the years passed, even Martin Luther King began to understand the limits of non-violence to “awaken a sense of moral shame in white southern
racists."²⁷⁶⁰ King gave up on Gandhi’s theory of “redemptive suffering,” the idea that if one suffers enough violence through non-violent resistance, it could eventually change the hearts and minds of the perpetrators.²⁷⁶¹ Moreover, King wrote, “I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today – my government.”²⁷⁶² On October 15, 1966, a new group emerged, in Oakland, California, called the Black Panther Party of Self Defense.²⁷⁶³ It borrowed many of the same self-defense principles and becomes the new vanguard of the Movement, not of civil rights, but of African American liberation. They were inspired by what Malcolm X stated before his death: “The time has come to fight back in self-defense whenever and wherever the black man is being unjustly and unlawfully attacked.”²⁷⁶⁴ The Black Panther Party started “armed citizens’ patrols to evaluate behavior of police officers.”²⁷⁶⁵ Their confrontational, militant, and violent tactics included carrying weapons openly and making threats against police officers.²⁷⁶⁶ Their chants included, “The Revolution has come, it’s time to pick up the gun, off the pigs!”²⁷⁶⁷

With the rise of armed black liberation radical groups, the mostly white anti-war student movement too began to emulate the increasing rhetoric of armed struggle. As all aspects of the larger Sixties movements followed the lead of the African American civil rights movement, since the early days, their steady rise in the belief in using violence affected both student activists and hippies. The 1960s politicos moved away from merely protesting to fighting back and finally to “bringing the war home.”²⁷⁶⁸ This often translated into the acts of demonstrating, street fighting, and bombing. The Sixties myth that non-violent protests suddenly turned violent at the end of the 1960s decade, signaling the end of the Sixties era, is not true. There always was a violent element to the Sixties. An illustration of this would be the bombing spree, from August to November 1969, by Sam Melville, Jane Alpert, and several others who bombed several corporate offices and military installations (including the Whitehall Army Induction Center) in and around New
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York City. Relating this to the civil rights movement, according to Hill, “The myth posits that racial inequality was dismantled by a non-violent movement. In this narrative Martin Luther King Jr. serves as the moral metaphor of the age while black militants-advocates of racial pride and coercive force-are dismissed as ineffective rebels who alienated whites with Black Power rhetoric and violence.” Hippies too moved increasingly away from the flowers and beads of 1967 to images of armed survivalists in the country by 1969, as portrayed by the “Déjà Vu” album cover of Woodstock artists Crosby Stills Nash and Young (released on March 11, 1970). Hippies who remained in the cities often toughened their demeanors, using the example of the battle over People’s Park in Berkeley on May 15, 1969, when 110 people were shot and wounded (one protester was killed). On the other hand, some original hippies, like the Diggers, were never as benign and transcendental as the so-called flower children. In fact, Emmett Grogan, the leader of the Diggers, talked of the “revolution of violence” to come as early as the spring of 1967. Other examples of hippies being willing to fight back include the Sunset Strip curfew “hippie riots” of late 1966, the 1967 Christmas Eve bombing of the San Francisco Golden Gate park station, and a 1968 dynamiting by a hippie named Tom Archer to “spread a message of universal love” in San Francisco. No matter, by the end of 1967, a new type of hippie arose, calling themselves the Yippies. They were a cross between the flower-type hippies and the new political white revolutionaries engaging in radical politics.

The fourth myth that Woodstock was the opposite of Altamont is a fiction of duality that did not exist. Woodstock and Altamont being polar opposites was a mass media-generated parable. “Woodstock is peace and love, the triumph of Woodstock
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Nation (the peak of the Sixties). Altamont is guns, drugs and the end of the world (the end of the Sixties). But in reality they were . . . the same fuck-ups, the same cast of characters."  

Woodstock was no more peace and love than Altamont was. The two events were not much different, except that Woodstock was better planned and luckier. Woodstock could have just as easily turned into as big a disaster as Altamont (in fact, it was a sort of disaster zone with traffic jams, lack of food, water, medicine, electricity, and sewage problems). 2782  “In one sense, Woodstock had been a success for what didn’t happen – more than 400,000 young people had congregated and it did not lead to mass rioting or destruction.”  

However, Woodstock did have its share of other problems. To begin, it only became free once it was overrun by “unruly” ticketless gatecrashers, “but its commercial origins are but a footnote in its mythology.” 2784  Many who were actually at Woodstock describe their experience as not all peace, love, and fun (just as Altamont was not all conflict, hate, and misery). A former assistant Attorney General of the State of New York said, “Instead of the widespread notion of joy and an outpouring of goodness, the people I met told tragic stories of lack of consideration, nonexistent sanitation . . . fear and pain.” 2785  Many of the countercultural musicians performing at Woodstock also agreed. Barry Melton of Country Joe and the Fish said, “When they tell me it was great, I know they saw the movie and they weren’t at the gig.” 2786  Jerry Garcia of the Grateful Dead remarked, “Woodstock was a bummer. It was terrible to play at . . . .” 2787  Janis Joplin stated soon after Woodstock, “I can’t relate to a quarter of a million people.” 2788  Trouble simmered throughout the festival, but major catastrophes were miraculously averted. Because of the heavy rains and winds, the stage came close to collapsing. 2789  Faulty grounding shocked musicians when they touched their instruments. 2790  With the crowd growing restless, performers were persuaded to play impromptu sets to avert riots. 2791
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Everywhere there were thousands of people suffering from the ill effects of drugs.\footnote{Keith Phipps, “Albert Maysles: Altamont revisited,” A.V. Club (October 18, 2000), \url{http://www.avclub.com/article/albert-maysles-13682}. Accessed October 1, 2011.} When gangs of Black Panthers and Hells Angels arrived on motorcycles and acted tough, they came close to confrontations.\footnote{Ibid.} Moreover, Abbie Hoffman, veteran of the 1968 Chicago Convention riots, gatecrashed the festival with his fellow Yippie activists intent on “liberating Woodstock from the hippie capitalists.”\footnote{Ibid.} On the third day of the “peace” festival, Hoffman walked on stage during The Who’s set and tried to make a political speech, only to get hit on the head by Pete Townshend’s guitar.\footnote{Makower, \textit{Woodstock}, 256.} “I think this is a pile of shit while John Sinclair rots in prison,” Hoffman shouted. “Fuck off my stage,” screamed The Who guitarist, “the next person that walks across the stage is going to get killed. You can laugh but I mean it.”\footnote{Sharon O’Brien. “Remembering Woodstock: A Profile of the Woodstock Music & Art Fair,” About Relationships, \url{http://seniorliving.about.com/od/entertainmentrecreation/p/1969-woodstock.htm}. Accessed October 1, 2011.} In the meantime, the militant group, the Motherfuckers, torched a hamburger van, also protesting hippie capitalism.\footnote{Ibid.} Later, someone pulled a gun on Woodstock promoter Artie Kornfeld in the backstage area. “I was chatting to David Crosby and Stephen Stills when this crazy revolutionary dude suddenly appears and sticks a gun to my forehead,” asserted Kornfeld, who reported that the man said, “I’m going to blow you away, you fuckin’ hippie capitalist pig!”\footnote{Ibid.} A roadie jumped on the person and saved Kornfeld’s life.\footnote{Ibid.} In the end, thousands at Woodstock sustained injuries (mostly cuts from stepping on barbed wire and glass while barefoot), and three people died, only one fewer than later at Altamont.\footnote{Sharon O’Brien. “Remembering Woodstock: A Profile of the Woodstock Music & Art Fair,” About Relationships, \url{http://seniorliving.about.com/od/entertainmentrecreation/p/1969-woodstock.htm}. Accessed October 1, 2011.} One person died of a heroin overdose; another was run over accidentally by a tractor; a third festival-goer died of a ruptured appendix. Nonetheless, with most of the negativity at the Woodstock festival deliberately brushed aside, it seemed that only negativity could describe Altamont.
On the other hand, a question rarely asked is, was Altamont really so completely bad and evil? The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported, in several articles, the next day (December 7, 1969) about a “rock-happy crowd” and being together.²⁸⁰² While it mentioned incidents involving the Hells Angels and the crowd, the focus was on flowers thrown into the air and the people grooving to the music.²⁸⁰³ The *Berkeley Barb* also mentioned violence, and the killing of Meredith Hunter; however it also stated that “the majority of people enjoyed themselves and that the bummers were relatively few considering the large number of people in attendance.”²⁸⁰⁴ In addition, it wrote that Altamont “wasn’t a complete downer. The good vibes far outnumbered the bad.”²⁸⁰⁵ It is interesting to note the contrast between these reports and the later telling of the story, before the myth making reduced Altamont to a complete generational disenchantment. Instead, the perspective in December of 1969 was much more nonchalant, as typified by the *Berkeley Barb* article a few days later, “too bad, it might have been a beautiful high . . . maybe next time.”²⁸⁰⁶

Interestingly, movies were made of both events and were released in 1970. While the *Woodstock* film created an incredibly positive image of the summer festival, the *Gimme Shelter* Altamont film (about the Rolling Stones 1969 U.S. tour) ironically left viewers with a prophecy of doom. As the *Woodstock* movie conjured up childlike idealism, *Gimme Shelter* distorted the complete understanding of what happened at Altamont. The pessimistic exaggerations were not accidental. According to the *New York Times*, *Rolling Stone* magazine, and *Variety*, the Maysles brothers and Charlotte Zwerin (who directed the film) applied techniques that fictionalized the Altamont event.²⁸⁰⁷ By using “direct cinema” methods, they shaped the reporting of events.²⁸⁰⁸ The previously mentioned magazines, in fact, criticized the three for exploiting the murder to their economic advantage.²⁸⁰⁹ In the *Gimme Shelter* film, the filmmakers “construct a narrative to lead inexorably to the murder,” by not adhering precisely to the chronology of events of the festival.²⁸¹⁰ Examples include the Flying Burrito Brothers playing before the Jefferson Airplane in the
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film, when in reality they played after them. However, in order to show the mounting tension and violence, the movie “situates the Jefferson Airplane’s set, in which singer Marty Balin was knocked out by an Angel when he jumped into the crowd to stop a fight, after the Burritos.” Furthermore, the movie makes it appear that the Rolling Stones opened their set with the foretelling “Sympathy for the Devil,” which again is not accurate; that was the third song played. Finally, the movie makes it appear that Altamont concluded with Meredith Hunter’s stabbing at the end of “Under My Thumb,” which it did not. The movie ends with complete despair, and an end to the Sixties. In reality, the Rolling Stones went on to play eight more songs, and as many claim, gave one of their greatest performances ever. Nearly an hour later, at the end of the concert performance, the live audio produced of the Altamont festival reveals a thrilled, enthusiastic audience laughing, shouting, completely enjoying themselves, seemingly experiencing good vibes. Mick Jagger finishes the show by saying goodbye to the crowd: “We’re going to kiss you good bye, and we leave you to kiss each other good bye, and we will see you again, alright, kiss each other good bye, sleep at night.” This surely does not fit the image of how all was death, hate, and panic. After the film’s original release, its distortions ultimately made Altamont even more notorious then the murder itself. When this myth was fabricated, it secured the festival’s bad reputation as marking the end of the Sixties.

To end, it would seem peculiar to consider the Woodstock and Altamont rock festivals as opposing bookends. The events took place less than four months apart. How could an event be considered the height of an era, with the other considered the era’s end, in such a short time interval? Many of the same people were involved in both events. The answer lies in myth making. The chaos and murder at Altamont were ultimately overstated, and made unique, while Woodstock had all its flaws and blemishes whitewashed. The whole Sixties era can be fit into this understanding. The early 1970s are not something to be labeled as not belonging to the Sixties era because of increased violent radical behavior. And the 1960s should not to be cleansed and idealized as some kind of peaceful time. Curiously, the image of the Sixties (portrayed in films today) usually involves youth that
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were more typical of the 1970s than the 1960s. By the time the masses of youth started to defy society by taking drugs, listen to hard rock on free form radio, and wear their hair long, it already was 1970. In fact, during the first several years of the 1970s, the Movement actually continued to grow and find strength, although it eventually was coopted, depoliticized, and mass-marketed to youth by the establishment. By 1973, the typical American college student more closely approximated this profile (of the Sixties counterculture), and it is clear that the inspiration for this model was the countercultural that started the 1960s. Nothing ended at Altamont in December of 1969, not the war in Vietnam, not the protests against imperialism, not the back-to-the-land hippie communal movement, not black liberation, not women’s liberation, not the concern for the environment, nothing that had emerged from the second half of the 1960s counterculture – key players also agreed. Ralph “Sonny” Barger, leader of the Hells Angels, wrote, “All that shit about Altamont being the end of an era was a bunch of intellectual crap. The death of Aquarius, Bullshit, it was the end of nothing.” Mick Jagger of the Rolling Stones said, “It’s all so wonderfully convenient (that Altamont was the end of an era) things aren’t quite as simple as that.”

V. Statement of Purpose

The writing of this doctoral dissertation has been long in coming, an ongoing project of mine (of setting the record straight) that extends back to the late summer and fall of 1976. Back then, I was a hippie radical who was actively part of the back-to-the-land movement and the Yippies. However, during the 1970s the media increasingly ignored us and endlessly proclaimed that the “Sixties were over.” We were told that it was now time to conform back to the system. It was strange, depressing, and maddening to witness how the revolution could now be depicted as being passé. After being declared no longer current or in fashion, most people (but not I) began to slowly conform, as the stigma of being out-of-date was too great. But the power of the media and government propaganda had little real success in convincing youth to change course (though they tried continually since the mid-1960s) until after President Nixon resigned and the Vietnam War had completely ended, both of which occurred in the middle of the 1970s decade. Thus, in my
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disseration, I also end the Sixties in the middle 1970s, more specifically, during the second half of 1976. Why? Because that was precisely when the establishment’s new paradigm finally took hold. The new promoted beliefs and values that were characterized by such things as patriotism and nostalgia swept the nation (fueled by the fifteen-month-long Bicentennial celebrations), Jimmy Carter (a wolf in sheep’s clothing who claimed to be an outsider and reformer, yet institutionalized and bamboozled a large part of the protest movement with his year-long presidential campaign and November election victory), and disco (a cultural manifestation of the “me generation,” which combined with the ongoing economic recession and energy crisis, caused many to turn towards self-absorption). Paradoxically, even the new form of protest in the mid-1970s called punk signified the end of the Sixties with its philosophy of nihilism and its ridicule of Sixties era music and positive ideals. Nonetheless, even then the Sixties did not end for all of us. There were many like myself who understood the contradiction involved in the corporate media (the same people we were trying to overthrow) telling us that the Sixties had ended. Yes the Vietnam War and the military draft had ended, but American imperialism had not. We kept going, protesting American involvement in Angola, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala and the return of draft registration. There were also continuing movements: anti-nuclear power and in favor of weapons freeze, anti-apartheid, environmental, civil rights for minorities and women, legalization of marijuana, and many other areas of protest. Thus, in this other sense, the Sixties era can be seen as extending, at least, into the middle of the 1980s if not much further. But no, starting in the latter part of 1976, the media went all-out to portray us as being “Sixties hanger-on-ers,” relics from another time, and it worked. The Baby Boomers’ generational unity concerning “the Movement” or “the Revolution” was lost. During the late 1970s, I personally experienced brainwashed young people screaming out from their car windows “cut your hair” because “the Sixties are over” when noticing me. Yes, I witnessed the process of elite-sponsored reality myth-making; their social engineering quickly became a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Finally, the impetus for writing this dissertation came not only from being part of the Sixties era, but from being the younger part of the Baby Boom generation, which came of age mostly in the 1970s decade. If the Sixties era had truly ended in 1969, then my immediate age group and I would not (or would barely) have taken part in the Movement actively. As a result I am, in effect, indirectly reestablishing the younger part of the Baby Boom’s rightful place in Sixties-era history with this dissertation. Yet, as someone who was alive during the 1960s and 1970s, and with an agenda, I found that it was both an
advantage and a disadvantage when it came to formulating and framing my thesis. The challenge was to not prejudice the facts that I was uncovering in my research, but to remain impartial. I believe I succeeded, as my research led me to overwhelmingly highlight the negative (in opposition to myself) in order to prove my propositions about why the Sixties area did not end in 1969. On the other hand, remembering the years that I researched was admittingly helpful, as I did not have to learn all the basic historical details of the time (and their intricate connections to each other) since I had been aware of most of the events during the 1960s and 1970s as they unfolded. Although I was only a kid during the 1960s decade, those memories shaped a large part of my life, and as far as the 1970s decade is concerned (as I stated before), I was already a hippie and politically active. To provide a sense of my memories, the following is a brief sketch on how this time period affected me. The first real historical event that I remember was the Berlin crisis in August of 1961, especially how building contractors constructed my family’s nuclear fallout shelter next to our house in October of that year. One year later, in October 1962, thinking I was going to die, I was dismayed that humanity had almost launched a nuclear war during the Cuban missile crisis; it was then that I began to not like the way the world was being run. The assassination of John F. Kennedy in November of 1963 was a real heartbreaker that made me cry, and reinforced my distrust of those in power. Three days later I watched, on live TV, Jack Ruby kill Lee Harvey Oswald (the so-called lone assassin of JFK). On a happier note, in February of 1964, I watched the first two Beatles concerts in America, which were also shown live on TV; they were only rock shows but somehow I (and many of my generation) felt excited about this new music form and thought that somehow it could help change the world positively. In March of 1965, I heard that the first combat troops had arrived in Vietnam, and in August, the Watts section of Los Angeles exploded in a riot, causing fear in our white neighborhood. The “First Human Be-In” was on the nightly news in January 1967, which I saw, and with it I witnessed the rise of the hippie movement. By July I had met hippies in person for the first time and they intrigued me. The following year, I was fascinated with the photo of SDS leader Mark Rudd on the cover of Life magazine, after the Columbia University riots in May of 1968; I kept staring at his image, perhaps picking up premonitions of how I would turn out in a few years. Also that year I was greatly saddened and angered by the June assassination of Robert Kennedy, which led me by August of 1968 to utter my first beliefs on the need for a revolution (this occurred precisely on August 28 while I was watching the Chicago Democratic Presidential National Convention riots on TV). After I finished cutting grass, in May of 1970, I listened
in shock to a special report on the radio on how four students had been shoot dead at Kent State University by the National Guard; one was a 19-year-old girl who lived fairly close to me. Finally, on September 8, 1971, I joined the ranks of the hippie radicals, making a commitment this day to actively support the various causes that would make the world a better place to live. Why on that day? Without getting into details on what happened, I will simply say it was just the time that I reached the age of decision – on who I was and what I was going to do in life. Young people must always figure themselves out during adolescence, but perhaps this process was even more intense during the height of the Vietnam War. The lines regarding which side of the revolution they would be on were sharply drawn for teenagers at the time. For me, the writing of this dissertation is but one more step on the path of continuing the struggle for truth and justice. The importance of recognizing that the Sixties did not end in 1969 has to do with the fact that the struggle for social justice is ongoing and not a brief youthful fad that is tied to a decade. The Sixties era was not just the 1960s decade; it included at least a large portion of the 1970s decade. While movements do generally rise and fall, or begin and end, in a broader sense they never do end, as members of the coming generations continue the efforts of their predecessors to shine light onto the darkened injustices that humanity has created. The need to uphold a higher vision for humanity since WWII has continued to be paramount, as the age of weapons of mass distruction has only intensified. If Homo sapiens wants to continue to exist on this planet earth, we who heed the call must continue the struggle not only to ensure that it does so, but to guide it towards its glorious potential.
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