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Between the mid-1960s and early-1970s, the genres of folk and rock music were often culturally subversive forces that, at times, supported such countercultural mores as illegal drug use, obscenity, and a hedonistic sexuality which offended some governmental agencies and law enforcement authorities in the United States. Although the countercultural subversion frequently attributed to such music was neither the same as nor necessarily inclusive with revolutionary, leftist political ideologies and movements, such music commonly provided the soundtrack and inspiration for various counter-hegemonic political groups as the antiwar movement, the Youth International Party, the Black Panther Party, and the Weather Underground (all of which challenged government authorities which they condemned as imperialist, racist, and oppressive). Consequently, a variety of officials, including FBI agents, the U.S. Military, and local law enforcement officers, including municipal narcotics and vice squads, instituted various forms of repression or harassment against certain musical performers, promoters, or concertgoers. Frequently working as independent actors or bureaus, these political officials and law enforcement agents imposed varying degrees of repression or harassment upon musicians, depending on the degree to which they felt threatened. Targeted by such acts, musicians sometimes witnessed a deleterious effect on their emotional state, careers, and even the general direction of the music industry. Others, however, seemed little affected
by police harassment or political repression, suggesting that the thought of dealing with law enforcement authorities did not completely deter all musicians from writing, recording, or performing whatever they wished.
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Introduction:

Between the mid-1960s and early-1970s, the genres of folk and rock music were often culturally subversive forces that, at times, supported such countercultural mores as illegal drug use, obscenity, and a hedonistic sexuality which upset some governmental agencies and law enforcement authorities enough to elicit policing. Although the countercultural subversion frequently attributed to such music was neither the same as nor necessarily inclusive with revolutionary, leftist political ideologies and movements, such music commonly provided the soundtrack and inspiration for various counter-hegemonic political groups as the antiwar movement, the Youth International Party, the Black Panther Party, and the Weather Underground (all of which challenged government authorities which they condemned as imperialist, racist, and oppressive). Consequently, a variety of officials, including FBI agents, the U.S. Military, and local law enforcement officers, including municipal narcotics and vice squads, instituted various forms of repression or harassment against certain musical performers, promoters, and concertgoers. Frequently working as independent actors or bureaus, these political officials and law enforcement agents imposed varying degrees of repression or harassment upon musicians, depending on the degree to which they felt threatened. Targeted by such acts, musicians sometimes witnessed a deleterious effect on their emotional state, careers, and even the general direction of the music industry. Others, however, seemed very little affected by the more frequent police harassment or the less common repression, suggesting that the thought of dealing with law enforcement authorities did not completely deter all musicians from writing, recording, performing, or promoting whatever they wished.
I. This Study’s Relation with Published Literature:

The title of this dissertation, “Must Be the Season of the Witch,” refers to lyrical imagery in the British Folk Rock singer Donovan Leitch’s 1966 song “Season of the Witch.” For Donovan, as the blogger Virginia Cannon has recently argued, “Season of the Witch” was an auditory prognostication, as the song’s release predated by several months the singer’s arrest in Britain for marijuana possession. Even though Donovan was arrested in London (by authorities unconnected to those in the U.S.), many countercultural participants (such as drug users) or political activists in the U.S. could have interpreted the song’s line, “you’ve got to pick up every stitch,” as a metaphor for law enforcement officials seeking to find a reason (i.e., stitch as a metaphor for drug possession or other illicit activity) to arrest such subjects. Likely sharing this interpretation of the song’s lyrics, the authors Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain have used the term “Season of the Witch” as a chapter title in their study, Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond. This monograph explores the efforts of the CIA and law enforcement officers to repress the psychedelic movement for both political and cultural reasons at a time when such agencies viewed both revolutionary politics and the psychedelic counterculture as dangerous. This study shares more with Acid Dreams than title alone; it similarly examines the targeting of such countercultural luminaries as Dr. Timothy Leary for both political and cultural reasons.

1 Donovan, “Season of the Witch,” Sunshine Superman, Sony Music/Epic (B00138CRN6), compact disc.
3 Donovan, “Season of the Witch.”
4 Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1992), 223-258.
It also makes arguments similar to some of those of Lee and Shlain, who, in one passage, write: “the harassment of rock musicians was part of a crusade against the emerging counterculture and the alternative lifestyles associated with radical politics in the late 1960s.” However, this dissertation also realizes that the subversive or “alternative” lifestyles of the counterculture were often very different from ideas of political revolution, leftist politics, or antiwar movements.

Moreover, by situating its central focus and primary analysis on all aspects of folk and rock music (instead of just rock’s connection to LSD, the main subject of Lee and Shlain’s study), this dissertation extends the discussion that the cultural reasons for the harassment or repression extended towards some rock and folk musicians included more than just an attack on the psychedelic counterculture or a crackdown on drug use. It also demonstrates how the FBI and other law enforcement agencies sought to destroy the antiwar movement and the anti-imperialist demands of leftist revolutionaries like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, along with organizations which the historian Jeffrey Ogbar terms as “radical ethnic nationalists.” Organizing around their conceptions of ethnicity and race in American society, these groups demanded the overthrow of racism, imperialism, and capitalism.

Such political revolutionaries, dissenters, and countercultural participants (not all of whom necessarily derided political officials) decried what they conceived to be a unanimous oppressive state. Unseen within that framework, however, was the state’s actual division into numerous branches of federal governmental authorities, from FBI

---

5 Ibid., 226.
7 Ibid.
agents to Presidents, and localized civic officials from city councils to vice squad officers. These political, police, and governmental divisions ensured that there was no monolithic government or system. Instead, these agencies and officials had their own personal or bureaucratic beliefs and politics that were sometimes in concert and other times in conflict with one another. Said politicians and law enforcement officials also held differing views about the degree to which countercultural acts and politically radical or revolutionary ideologies were dangerous. As scholars like David Cunningham have shown, due to internal division and disagreements, the FBI did not always work in agreement with itself, other governmental branches, or law enforcement agencies; likewise, vice squads often acted independently. The individual police officers who joked backstage with Jim Morrison at Doors concerts were not the same authorities as the FBI informers or agents who engaged in his surveillance.

Much of the literature surrounding the government’s repression of the antiwar movement and revolutionary organizations like the Black Panther Party has focused on the FBI’s counterintelligence program (COINTELPRO). This scholarship ranges from David Garrow’s analysis of the FBI’s surveillance of Martin Luther King, Jr. to Ward Churchill and Jim Vanderwall’s examination of the Bureau’s violent repression of the Black Panther Party and American Indian Movement. James Kirkpatrick Davis’s

---

8 Such points about the FBI’s internal divisions, occasional reluctance to work with other government or police organizations, and disagreement about what constituted “danger” are argued by Cunningham. See David Cunningham, *There’s Something Happening Here: The New Left, the Klan, and FBI Counterintelligence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 7-12.

9 David J. Garrow, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Norton, 1981). Ward Churchill and Jim Vanderwall, *Agents of Repression: The FBI’s Secret War against the Black Panthers and the American Indian Movement* (Boston: South End Press, 1988). Although academics over the last several years have found much of Ward Churchill’s work to be scholarly questionable and even fraudulent, *Agents of Repression* maintains appropriate citations for Churchill and Vanderwall’s findings. Moreover, Churchill and Vanderwall’s arguments in that monograph hold up upon examination of their second book on the subject: *The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI’s Secret War Against Domestic Dissent*
Assault on the Left: The FBI and the Sixties Antiwar Movement, specifically chronicles the Bureau’s interest in the peace movement during the Johnson and Nixon administrations. In Davis’s words, “The FBI launched the COINTELPRO-NEW LEFT operation primarily to stem the tide of extreme anti-Vietnam War protest across the nation.”

Studying the FBI COINTELPRO-NEW LEFT files, Davis explains the government’s interest, surveillance, wiretapping, and repression of such groups as the Students for a Democratic Society, the various organizations involved outside the National Democratic Convention protests of 1968, the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the Weather Underground. Davis finds that the FBI’s actions against the antiwar movement intensified towards the very end of the sixties (circa 1968 to early 1969), a period when the movement became more violent. In other words, the FBI’s repressive programs escalated in reaction to the degree of perceived threat. Although the FBI epitomized racism through such policies as the exclusive hiring of white agents, and thus disliked Martin Luther King, Jr.’s contributions to the civil rights movement enough to engage in surveillance and the mailing of disruptive letters, the FBI never reacted to King through the utilization of violence as it did with the Black Panthers. The FBI harassed King, but took violent action against the Panthers.


Ibid., 63-106, 209.

Ibid., 107.

Garrow, The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr., passim. Davis, Assault on the Left, passim. Churchill and Vanderwall, Agents of Repression, passim.

Garrow, The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr., passim. Churchill and Vanderwall, Agents of Repression, passim.
A reading of this literature confirms that the FBI engaged in both harassment (i.e., the mailing of upsetting letters to activists’ associates and family members) and more severe forms of direct repression (e.g., the forceful shutting down of organizations). Moreover, as the scholar David Cunningham has contended, the FBI engaged in both “intelligence” operations such as taking photographs for purpose of future identification and “counterintelligence” acts designed “to actively restrict a target’s ability to carry out planned actions (prevention) or to encourage acts of wrongdoing (facilitation)” in order to allow law enforcement authorities legal grounds for arresting such subjects or suppressing such organizations.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, FBI activities varied in their severity. Although harassment was in itself albeit a lesser form of repression, the level of repressive action taken resulted from the agency or individual’s estimation of a perceived threat. For example, an FBI agent would not have cared all that much about stopping individual performers such as Country Joe McDonald from singing about marijuana, because the Bureau did not view McDonald as a major threat.\textsuperscript{16} Nonetheless, the FBI did engage in some (although very little) surveillance of McDonald, demonstrating that the singer was the recipient of some “intelligence” but no “counterintelligence” activity. This differed from the FBI and Michigan law enforcement officials’ targeting of John Sinclair. His arrest and imprisonment on marijuana possession charges was a stratagem intended to derail the music critic and band manager’s revolutionary endeavors with his organization, the White Panther Party. Such activity constituted repression.

\textsuperscript{15} Cunningham, \textit{There’s Something Happening Here}, 6.
\textsuperscript{16} McDonald was arrested by the Worcester, Massachusetts Police Department on misdemeanor obscenity charges. Resulting in nothing more than a few court appearances and monetary fines, however, such arrests constituted a form of harassment – not serious repression.
My study ventures into grounds uncharted by Garrow, Churchill and Vanderwall, Davis, and Cunningham by examining how some rock and folk musicians directly or inadvertently supported political radicals and revolutionaries, consequently leading these musicians to the attention of law enforcement officials, including the FBI. I argue that while there was no “COINTELPRO-ROCK” OR “COINTELPRO-FOLK,” the FBI, in addition to other federal agencies and local officials nonetheless exerted harassing or repressive acts for political and cultural purposes (many of which varied by degree and meaning). Most studies on the FBI’s federal acts of repression have concentrated solely on the doings of the Bureau. I extend the analysis by examining the FBI alongside other federal agencies and local law enforcement officials, many of whom worked alone, as for instance, the vice squad officials assigned to a concert. This is especially important, because while some musicians were harassed by such varied law enforcement entities as narcotics officials or FBI agents, they were often unable to define their antagonist. As David Cunningham has argued not about musicians, but instead about political activists, especially those of the New Left:

Speaking with many of CONTELPRO’s targets, I found that one seeming constant was a general awareness of covert disruptive activity by the police and FBI at the time, combined with an inability to penetrate the secret world of the intelligence community in order to fully understand the shape of repressive efforts. As Stephen Stills sang in the opening lyrics of the 1967 Buffalo Springfield song “For What It’s Worth”: There’s something happenin’ here; what is ain’t exactly clear.17 Cunningham’s allusion to Buffalo Springfield’s lyrics connotes how many political actors who were subjected to FBI or police activities were not always certain as to what degree the authorities were responding or why. Consequently, while different persons, including musicians, received the attention of authorities, what they perceived as happening was

17 Cunningham, There’s Something Happening Here, xiii-xiv.
often just as significant as what the law enforcement agencies were actually doing. Harassment and repression occurred on a multiplicity of levels; sometimes musicians believed that incidents of mere surveillance or harassment such as arrests on misdemeanor drug or obscenity charges were connected to more sinister police machinations (even when they were not).

Realizing that countercultural behaviors like smoking marijuana and leftist revolutionary politics (such as the politics of the Weather Underground) were not always intertwined, but also looking at how both the countercultural acts and political beliefs of some musicians concerned government authorities or law enforcement officials enough to incite either surveillance, harassment, or occasionally harsher repression, this study both synthesizes and extends the scholarly literature on both music and the repression common during the era which historians (like Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin) have labeled the “Long Sixties.”\(^{18}\) Besides situating its analysis within the era’s historiography, this study complements two published books on the harassment and repression of rock between the mid-1960s and early 1970s. My emphasis on these years follows the periodization established by the writers Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave, who, in their examination of parental, religious, and political attacks on rock music, circa 1953-1986, situate “Part II” of their book within the framework of 1963-1973.\(^{19}\) Although Martin

---

\(^{18}\) In a timeline, “Critical Events During the Long Sixties,” situated within the appendix of their interpretive survey of the era’s political movements and protest, the historians Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin date the era’s inception as the 1946 French-Vietnamese battles which in forthcoming years transitioned into the Vietnam conflict, and Jackie Robinson’s 1947 integration of Major League Baseball, a key event in civil rights movement history. They see the “Long Sixties” as concluding with President Richard Nixon’s 1974 resignation and the official ending of the Vietnam War in 1975. Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, “Critical Events During the Long Sixties,” in America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 311-317.

\(^{19}\) Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave, Anti-Rock: The Opposition to Rock 'n' Roll (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1988),
and Segrave’s monograph addressed some of the same events discussed in this study, their book’s ultimate purpose was to argue:

Rock-bashing has remained constant since the mid-1950s both in content and style. This book is about the history of opposition to rock and roll from its beginnings up to the mid-80s, written from a pro-rock point of view. We have not attempted to define the term in any rigid way, preferring to consider it ‘music of the young,’ for rock-bashing ultimately represents an age-old problem: the generation gap.20

Martin and Segrave’s overall interest was the demonstration that harassment and repression resulted from a “generation gap” inherent with its own prejudices regarding lyrical content, auditory volume, and sexual insinuations. Their approach largely (but not completely) obscures the parallels which existed between rock’s history and the narratives of countercultural practitioners or political revolutionaries who outside the music industry also suffered acts of harassment or repression during the Vietnam War era.21 In contrast, this study places deeper emphasis on the political reasons behind the condemnation of such music, thus connecting the story of rock and folk’s harassment and repression to the historical discourse regarding the often more concerted attacks on political organizations like the Black Panther Party and the antiwar movement.

In this regard, my study’s periodization and interest cover some of the same incidents, events, persons, and themes described in the journalist Peter Doggett’s There’s A Riot Going On: Revolutionaries, Rock Stars, and the Rise and Fall of the ‘60s.22 That study’s encyclopedic narrative of the connections between music and revolutionary

20 Ibid., vii.
21 The writer Eric Nuzum’s Parental Advisory: Music Censorship in America (New York: Perennial, 2001) cursorily addresses some of the deeper connections between the repression of musicians and the politics that generated such acts. However, that book’s encyclopedic scope of several decades and journalistic approach makes it more of a listing of incidents than a source of strong analysis of why such repression occurred.
22 Peter Doggett, There’s A Riot Going On: Revolutionaries, Rock Stars and the Rise and Fall of the ‘60s (New York: Canongate, 2007).
politicos, circa 1965-1973, however, is far more journalistic and less documented than mine. Furthermore, its chronological organization focuses more on describing what happened than on providing a deeper analysis of these incidents’ relationship to the meaning of repressive acts committed by civic and law enforcement authorities. Also, much of my analysis, by emphasizing the ongoing counter-hegemonic implications of rock and folk music, and by examining bands such as the Doors who warranted FBI and law enforcement officials’ attention despite being generally isolated or non-interactive with political organizations, digresses from Doggett’s belief that perhaps some of rock and folk’s “revolutionaries” were doing no more than playing a part and that the music industry completely co-opted and thus depoliticized the era’s rock and folk music.\textsuperscript{23}

Whereas the authors mentioned above have examined the entire genres of rock and folk, others like the historians John Weiner and Jeff A. Hale, and the sundry biographers of Phil Ochs and Joan Baez have written about how the political affiliations of particular musicians prompted state surveillance, harassment, and repression. For example, Weiner has already traced the FBI and Nixon Administration’s efforts against John Lennon because of his affiliations with noted sixties radicals such as Jerry Rubin who hoped to prevent Richard Nixon’s 1972 reelection.\textsuperscript{24} Hale has examined the state’s interest in the MC5 and their first manager, White Panther Party founder and leader John

\textsuperscript{23} For example, Doggett writes that in the early 1970s, a time when various political organizations succumbed to political repression, “[R]ock’s radical superstars continued to spout incendiary rhetoric for a few more months, and then turned about face. Suddenly there was no more talk about revolution; no more anthems designed for the barricades” (Ibid., 5). Later, Doggett contends, “Over and over again musicians believed that they were striking blows for liberation (sexual, political, conceptual, and the revolution. Over and over again, their every move had already been softened and contained by the contaminating presence of the same industry that they were using to announce their dissent – the music business” (Ibid., 10). I would suggest that Doggett’s position obscures the continuation of some of rock’s more subversive manifestations, such as the Grateful Dead’s ongoing association with illegal drugs.

Sinclair, because of Sinclair’s advocacy of marijuana and the radical political activities of the White Panthers (including an alleged conspiracy to bomb the Ann Arbor, MI. building inhabited by the CIA),\(^5\) Markus Jager has analyzed how the folksinger Joan Baez’s advocacy of draft resistance and relationship with the antiwar movement resulted in arrests and brief incarcerations as well as an incident in which the CIA had ostensibly influenced an interpreter to mistranslate Baez’s antiwar statements issued during a Japanese concert tour.\(^6\) Marc Eliot and Michael Schumacher have delineated the FBI’s surveillance on Phil Ochs, and calculated its effects.\(^7\)

While such authors have focused on analyzing their respective subjects as individual entities, my study views all of these musicians within a collective interpretive framework which synthesizes all of this individually-focused scholarship and biography into a broader narrative about the music industry as a whole and its intersection with the tumultuous political landscape of its era. Besides addressing how politics generated acts of surveillance, harassment, or repression towards those musicians who sometimes had connection to political groups like draft resisters or the Black Panther Party, this study also discusses how bands like the Grateful Dead and the Doors incited the ire of law enforcement officials through their promotion of such counterculture mores as psychedelic drugs, overt sexuality, and profanity. Examining these themes, this study builds upon the narration and analysis of incidents such as the drug-related arrests


covered in Dennis McNally’s *A Long Strange Trip: The Inside History of the Grateful Dead* and various biographers’ notations of the arrests, trials, and FBI surveillance inspired by the numerous profane acts and statements of Jim Morrison.28

Memorialists, biographers, and historians are still writing profusely about incidents of FBI, red squad, and vice squad repression during the “Long Sixties.”29 Trevor Griffey’s essay in the Spring/Summer 2012 issue of *Left History* implores historians to conduct additional readings of red squad and FBI files.30 In August 2012, the journalist Seth Rosenfeld published a detailed account on “the FBI’s War on Student Radicals” in Berkeley, California.31 Both the memoir by guitarist Jimi Hendrix’s brother, Leon, and the oral history on the ESP-Disk record label respectively referenced in Chapters Three and Four of this study are of very recent publication.32 As additional interviews, oral histories and memoirs are written, archives are opened, and Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests are leading to the opening of heretofore sealed FBI and police files, further details and scholarship will result.33

---


29 The term, the “Long Sixties,” is taken from Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, “Critical Events During the Long Sixties,” 311-317.


33 The FBI can deny FOIA requests for all files on living subjects, unless such subjects provide written permission for said researchers to access those files. For this reason, this author has been unable to access any probable files that might exist regarding Joan Baez’s activity with the antiwar and draft resistance movements. However, this author has accessed files for Baez’s contemporaries in the draft resistance movement, such as the deceased Professor Howard Zinn.
II. Chapter Summaries:

This dissertation’s four chapters explore a range of aspects regarding this era of folk and rock music’s generation of surveillance, harassment or repression from political or law enforcement authorities. Chapter One argues that before and throughout the mid-1960s to early-1970s the genres of folk and rock music were rooted in counter-hegemonic traditions that often disrupted the interests of parental, civic or law enforcement authorities on various levels across the geographical and cultural gradations of the nation. Such genres were more than a forum for entertainment; in fact, one’s role as a folk or rock listener or concertgoer sometimes undermined more popular, hegemonic mores of the era. This music commented on and provided support for many progressive, civil rights, and antiwar movements resistant to the demands of a claimed repressive American state, which though constituted of the agendas of diverse bureaus, agencies, and political parties and ideologies, was associated by such musicians or political actors with a variety of political or cultural sins as diverse as marijuana laws and the Vietnam War. Consequently, though far from exclusively subversive or leftist in nature, folk and rock were important elements to participants in both the New Left and the counterculture (neither of which were in themselves monolithic forces). The performance of this music in public space also demonstrated tensions related to volume, an increasing use of psychedelic drugs and marijuana, and changing standards regarding sexuality and appropriate behavior in public. The rhetoric of this music often challenged the authority of law enforcement officials, including the FBI, the CIA, and the vice squads of police departments across the nation. While much of the violence and resistance vocalized by

---

musicians was nothing but metaphorical, law enforcement authorities frequently sought to police certain musicians in a manner sometimes similar to yet usually not as severe as their repression of political activists, radicals, or revolutionaries.

Chapter Two contends that folk and rock music were important tools for many political activists and revolutionaries during the 1960s and early 1970s. From such famous counterculture luminaries as Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, to the revolutionary Black Panther Party, to the bomb-wielding Weather Underground, the sounds and rhetoric of rock and folk provided inspirational support, a means of expression, and an interpretative lens through which these activists and others, at times, galvanized their beliefs. Yet, folk and rock also permeated throughout the larger political opposition to the Vietnam War, including the sentiments of many civilian draft resisters and enlisted soldiers. At times, music supplemented political action and rhetoric, even serving as what the historian Melvin Small has referred to as a “drawing card” that may have brought some audience members to political rallies that they otherwise may have avoided.\textsuperscript{35} Such expression consequently brought legal troubles and arrests, as well concerted acts of repression against some musicians like Joan Baez.

Chapter Three explores how political and law enforcement officials as diverse as J. Edgar Hoover and anonymous vice squad officers denounced rock and folk musicians for both being supportive of political causes like the antiwar movement which challenged the positions of governmental authority, and advocating such behavior as illegal drug use, seen as synonymous with the counterculture. Although many musicians, particularly on a local level, were placed under surveillance, denounced, or even arrested for either drug

possession or an expression of alleged profanity or obscenity, those with blatant ties to radical political organizations, such as John Lennon, Phil Ochs, and Joan Baez, evoked a much greater proportion of concern. Police also directed harassing or repressive efforts against rock audiences via club closures, festival cancellations, surveillance and photography, and arrests at concerts. Such repressive measures were intended to dissuade some potential concertgoers from attending these events. In sum, the various efforts against rock by law enforcement officials (many of whom did not act in concert with each other) affected more than just musicians, radio broadcasters, and concert promoters; they also confirmed how such different institutions as vice squads, the FBI, the FCC, and the U.S. Military, tried to stop the subversive expressions of rock and folk from reaching the music’s youthful audience. While many of these authorities (despite their bureaucratic differences) sought to curb what they interpreted as the disruptive countercultural or disturbing political implications of folk and rock, representatives of the U.S. State Department and some police departments realized the importance of appropriating the performance of rock in order to promote their own hegemonic interests. Although musicians were not assassinated, as was the Black Panther leader Fred Hampton, and bands such as the Doors, unlike many radical or antiwar organizations, never experienced the same level of repression as did such political actors as draft resistance groups and the Weather Underground, numerous performers saw their lives and careers affected by court dates and the disruptive emotional and economic effects that such harassment generated. The repressive acts of law enforcement officials helped to destroy both the underground press and its association with radical political organizations ranging from the Students for a Democratic Society to the Black Panther
Party; they also presented some emotional and economic distress on both individual musicians and the music industry at large.

Chapter Four analyzes how between the mid-1960s and early-1970s different persons within the music industry reacted in divergent ways to the threat imposed by law enforcement authorities. Almost no musicians went to jail for long periods of time; instead, they were subjected mostly to monetary fines. Nonetheless, arrests and trials contributed to noted emotional hardship for Phil Ochs and Jim Morrison. As these singers exhibited signs of paranoia and a general concern with the presence of law enforcement officials, others, like the folksinger Joan Baez and the rock manager and critic John Sinclair seemed galvanized by their political and legal struggles. In terms of economic effects, festival promoters were denied permits; clubs were shut down by city councils and police departments; and even some of the most profitable bands like the Doors suffered a loss of lucrative bookings as promoters feared that working with such controversial artists would generate untoward police attention. Arrests and government surveillance of certain groups also exacerbated tensions among band members, particularly in their interaction with their record labels, and radio stations, most of whom had owners wanting to avoid government interference with their businesses. Yet, as these bands, record labels, and radio stations made certain decisions in order to distance themselves from the possibility of invoking government repression, some groups like the Grateful Dead chose to utilize their oppositional relationship with law enforcement authorities for marketing and promotional purposes.

Such are the arguments of this dissertation as evidenced by an examination of secondary historical literature, activist and musician memoirs, underground newspapers,
several years of *Rolling Stone* magazine, FBI and police files, websites, documentary films, musical recordings, archival manuscripts, and other sources. These sources both synthesize and enhance the historical literature associated with the following topics: rock history, the Sixties counterculture, the antiwar movement, revolutionary nationalist organizations, and the struggles encountered by cultural subversives and political dissidents living in what they viewed as an oppressive society run by an imperialist, bellicose government that both detested drug use and leftist revolutionary politics (even though such activities were themselves not always intertwined). These struggles between this wide range of often isolated government and law enforcement officials and this diversity of countercultural and leftist movements were not a narrative of monolithic institutions always acting in concert with or reaction against one another. Nonetheless, they did witness the instances of surveillance, harassment, and repression against musicians, that while usually less severe than the efforts taken against many political revolutionaries, nonetheless had some degree of emotional and economic effect on the livelihood of such musicians. Furthermore, such acts of harassment or repression demonstrated how despite the nuances of this historical era’s cultural and political tensions, these incidents and the manner in which they were interpreted confirmed the centrality of music’s positioning within the dialogue between law enforcement institutions and their antagonists.
Chapter One: An Examination of Folk and Rock Music as Subversive and/or Counter-Hegemonic Forms during the 1960 and Early 1970s:

This chapter examines how during the “Long Sixties,” the genres of rock and folk music were not just consumer products or art forms, but also politically or culturally subversive forces associated with progressive and radical activist politics.¹ Rock’s ascent paralleled the rise of the civil rights movement, antiwar movement, and youth counterculture. Concurrently, on both the national and local level, it concerned parents and state officials who oftentimes resisted these progressive movements. Despite the generational criticisms and government hearings of the 1950s, rock and roll, which transitioned into the rock music of the 1960s, persisted as the preferred music of the American youth, many of whom were active in the social movements of their time.

By the late 1960s, when the nation was divided by various political issues, including the Vietnam War, it was no surprise that as the historians Kenneth J. Bindas and Craig Houston have discovered, “[a]lmost sixty percent of Americans in their twenties, the primary target for rock, considered themselves doves.”² Yet, while some of the most ardent supporters of various political officials or law enforcement agents would also have appreciated rock as entertainment, the music clearly expressed counter-hegemonic and countercultural motifs.³ One example of this, examined by the author Mike Marquese,

---
¹ The term, the “LongSixties,” has appeared in studies such as Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin’s *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. Isserman and Kazin use it to define the period from the late 1940s, when the earliest events associated with the Vietnam War (1946) and modern civil rights era (1947) occurred, to the mid-1970s, when President Richard M. Nixon resigned from office (1974) and the Vietnam War officially ended (1975). See Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, “Critical Events During the Long Sixties,” in *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, second edition. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 311-317.
³ In this study, the term, counter-hegemonic, is used to define acts or attitudes promoting discord, subversion, or opposition to perceived authority figures, government officials, U.S. military brass, or law
was the November 1968 Columbia Records advertising slogan: “But the Man Can’t Bust our Music,” which implied that while rock’s listeners could be arrested, the music’s sonic anti-authoritarianism would persist.\(^4\) Marquese suggests that Columbia Records’ decision to stop publishing such ads in countercultural publications possibly resulted from a condemnatory Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) memo, suggesting the extent to which some government officials feared the political connotations of the music.\(^5\)

Many actions against rock resulted most likely from what officials believed that rock-and by extension-the counterculture represented. While not all members of the rock counterculture shared the same beliefs, some stereotypical attributes included distrust for authority, disgust for the Vietnam War, and distaste for short-haired conformity associated with an ostensibly staid middle-class society. Scholars Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle point out that by “the 1970s, the ‘counterculture’ – a term popularized in 1968 by Theodore Roszak—was well on its way to becoming a term referring to all 1960s-era political, social, or cultural dissent, encompassing any action from smoking pot at a rock concert to offing a cop.”\(^6\) Although some rock listeners may have been apolitical or even supportive of the American government and status quo (including the Vietnam War), it is important to remember that the rock counterculture arose for the same reasons that the historian Charles DeBenedetti has ascribed to the founding of the highly political activists of the New Left. DeBenedetti writes: “the New Left arose from the confluence of economic affluence, political powerlessness, and

---

\(^4\) Mike Marquese, *Wicked Messenger: Bob Dylan and the 60s* *Chimes of Freedom*, revised and expanded ed. (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005), 274.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, “Historicizing the American Counterculture of the 1960s and 70s,” in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ‘70s*, eds. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 5.
cultural anxiety and alienation that characterized the experience and feelings of a significant minority of the country’s middle-class youth." 7 Interestingly, as the scholar Jim Curtis has found, the majority of rock’s most famous musicians in the late 1960s themselves came from these same middle-class backgrounds, which they had rejected. This included Jim Morrison of the Doors and Grace Slick of the Jefferson Airplane, two subjects frequently addressed throughout this study. 8

While differences did exist between the various political movements, the New Left, and the counterculture, many authorities antagonized by both the New Left and the counterculture frequently conflated these groups and movements as a unified threat. As the historian Jeff Hale has argued, more scholarship is needed to address what constituted “a widening ‘perception-reality gap’ at both ends of the political spectrum.” 9 Much of the literature surrounding the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover demonstrates a deep concern with the counterculture and New Left that resulted in a repression that many activists, musicians, and later scholars believed was unwarranted. 10 In his study of Hoover, a very public enemy of the counterculture, the historian Richard Gid Powers explains that the FBI Director clearly believed that one of the major crises of 1960s America was “the preaching of civil disobedience. . . . He rejected, of course, any defense of civil

---

10 As one example of this, folksinger Pete Seeger contends that the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) was unwarranted in its questioning whether he was a communist. Seeger argues that his actions were American and patriotic, but admits that he did at times perform for communists, alongside those from a myriad of political backgrounds. See “A Question of Patriotism,” in Pete Seeger, The Incompleat (sic) Folksinger, ed. Jo Metcalf Schwartz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 462-486. One academic monograph that criticizes the FBI’s actions against the New Left is James Kirkpatrick Davis, The FBI and the Sixties Anti-War Movement (Westport, CT: Praeger Trade, 1997).
disobedience; whatever its goals, to him it was willful defiance of the law, the ultimate attack against society.”

Yet, besides detesting the civil disobedience frequently practiced by the New Left through the various events of the civil rights and antiwar movements, Hoover also spoke out against such youthful activities as sexual promiscuity and drug experimentation. As Powers describes, in July 1968, Hoover suggested that local FBI offices should clandestinely inform parents and college administrators about the countercultural preferences of antiwar students as a means of generating the imposition of parental and university discipline on those youth whose actions Hoover viewed as dangerous to American society. Two such “depravities” noted by Hoover included “the use of narcotic and free sex.” While Hoover did not mention rock, hedonistic associations between “sex, drugs, and rock and roll” proliferated throughout both mainstream society and the counterculture. Powers interprets Hoover’s criticism of these “immoral behaviors” as an effort to act like a “foster parent” in order to correct what he viewed as the misdirection of American youth.

Although Hoover also distrusted numerous politicians and figures within the American state itself, the Cold War state which blanketed the events of the long sixties, did not always appreciate or support the ideas of individual expression epitomized by the New Left, the counterculture, or rock music itself. The historian Lizabeth Cohen argues that in a political climate that claimed to be more egalitarian and free than the Soviet Union’s, true democracy never occurred as racial and economic restrictions soon came to

---

12 It is important to remember that in terms of repression, Hoover’s public criticism of drugs and sex was not on the same level of neutralization as some of the acts taken against political groups like the Black Panther Party.
13 Powers, Secrecy and Power, 432.
14 Ibid., 462.
dominate America’s topography. For example, African Americans were excluded from the developing suburbs symbolic of the nation’s supposed well-being.\textsuperscript{15} Simultaneously, public spaces, such as the land surrounding shopping centers became commercialized, increasing the difficulty that those with anti-corporate values would encounter when attempting to congregate in certain areas.\textsuperscript{16} This would explain the reasoning behind the state’s efforts against rock performances in public space, a point examined later in this chapter. Ultimately, many political authorities and agencies valued capitalism more than individual freedom.\textsuperscript{17} Desiring to squash opposition to capitalist interests, federal institutions like the FBI and local authorities such as the red squads of local police departments intended to preserve the dominant culture’s social, political and economic order. In the words of scholar Frank Donner, the era’s police forces were the “protectors of privilege.”\textsuperscript{18} For these reasons, particularly since the co-optation and corporatization of folk and rock music were far less secure than they would be in the 1970s, these genres were often controversial during this time period.\textsuperscript{19} Of course, however, a connection between music and progressive or counter-hegemonic movements had dated back several decades.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 274.
\textsuperscript{17} Historian Jeffrey Ogbar argues that “the American Cold War dichotomy of ‘democracy’ versus ‘communism’ . . . was, of course, a false dichotomy that assumed the United States was pro-democracy when it was actually pro-capitalism.” Jeffrey O.G. Ogbar, \textit{Black Power: Radical Politics and African American Identity} (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 171.
\textsuperscript{19} A good source for understanding how executives and employees of corporate record labels increasingly co-opted and commercialized this music, particularly rock and folk-rock, is Fred Goodman, \textit{The Mansion on the Hill: Dylan, Young, Geffen, Springsteen, and the Head-on Collision of Rock and Commerce} (New York: Times Books, 1997).
I. Music as a Counter-Hegemonic Force between the 1930s and 1960s:

Decades before rock served as the soundtrack behind the political upheaval of the 1960s and 1970s, folk music developed within a historical tradition of opposition to the dominant culture, and in particular, the economic elite. Before World War I, Joe Hill performed for and advanced the politics of the radical labor organization, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). During the 1930s and 1940s, musicians like Woody Guthrie and Pete Seeger had close connections with labor unions and the Communist Party, performing frequently at events hosted by such groups.\(^\text{20}\) The close relationship between communism and folk music continued into the early 1950s, when the popular folk group, the Weavers, with a high volume of record sales, was blacklisted for its alleged communist affiliation.\(^\text{21}\) The FBI examined Guthrie’s ties to communism.\(^\text{22}\) Pete Seeger was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).\(^\text{23}\)

As labor unions sought to distance themselves from all accusations of being communists in the late 1940s, they ended their close relationship with musicians like Guthrie and Seeger. Nonetheless, as Seeger would point out, the radicalism behind “the singers and

---


\(^{22}\) Various documents from Federal Bureau of Investigation File on Woodrow W. Guthrie, Woody Guthrie Archive, New York, NY.

\(^{23}\) Seeger addressed his battle with HUAC in “A Question of Patriotism,” in Pete Seeger, *The Incompleat (sic.) Folksinger*, ed. Jo Metcalf Schwartz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 462-486. He has contended that while he performed in front of all groups of people (including communists), he was never a communist. See ibid.
songs carried on” into the 1950s, as Seeger and his compatriots performed wherever the blacklist had not obstructed their appearance.24

The early 1960s birthed what many musicians and scholars have referred to as the folk revival, particularly among college students, many of whom supported the growing civil rights movement. This led to the ascending renown of the Newport, Rhode Island Folk Festival, and what Seeger describes as a period “when the guitar became the favorite instrument on many a college campus: books and LPs of ‘folk songs’ gathered on every shelf.”25 Most musicians and critics, including Seeger, realized that this acoustic-based music was not always radical or revolutionary. Several folksingers, including Phil Ochs and Bob Dylan refused to appear on the ABC television program Hootenanny, contending that the network’s refusal to allow Seeger to perform constituted both censorship and the creation of a television program devoid of political worth.26 Yet, despite the labor unions’ disassociation with folk music in the late 1940s, the blacklisting of Seeger in the 1950s, and large corporations (as personified by the ABC television network) attempt to bowdlerize the music in the 1960s, strong connections persisted between folk musicians, acoustic-based performers of a genre which according to Seeger “was invented by nineteenth-century scholars to describe the music of the peasantry” - and therefore the oppressed and marginalized, as well as the era’s political activists.27

Many of these folk musicians sought to undermine the demands and values of the dominant, capitalist elite on behalf of individual autonomy and democracy. Such actions

25 Ibid., 11.
and beliefs paralleled those of the New Left as defined by the historian Charles DeBenedetti (and discussed earlier in this chapter).\textsuperscript{28} Frequently, many of these activists listened to records by the likes of Bob Dylan, Joan Baez, and Phil Ochs, artists whose material like Seeger’s, was often perceived to have demonstrated the close relationship between folk music and politics. As the historian Grace Hale would later argue, “the seeds he [Seeger] had planted during the Cold War had grown into trees.”\textsuperscript{29}

While folk music presented a challenge to the era’s dominant political and economic values, the scholar George Lipsitz has argued that the early development of rock and roll music was rooted in a similar demand for individual choice and autonomy in a society dominated by capitalism.\textsuperscript{30} Unlike folk music, rock and roll was stereotypically pleasure-oriented, something that could at times be ironically problematic to a Cold War America rooted in a capitalist achievement and consumption resulting from hard work. While the capitalist system promoted both leisure and pleasure, some capitalists feared that too much of either would paradoxically indicate a workless society susceptible to either a communist takeover or the non-productive, and sometimes criminal, activity associated with juvenile delinquency. Such concerns prompted societal fear regarding consumer products that could lead to a juvenile delinquency detrimental to American values. This led to parental and governmental concern regarding certain trends in teenage consumption. Writer David Hajdu argues that the efforts taken against the comic book industry by church groups, civic organizations, and governmental legislatures in the late

\textsuperscript{28} DeBenedetti with Charles Chatfield, \textit{An American Ordeal}, 76.
1940s and early 1950s were similar to the attacks against rock and roll music in the mid-1950s. In Hajdu’s words, “Elvis Presley and Chuck Berry added the soundtrack to a scene created in comic books”\textsuperscript{31} Mainstream society believed that the violent, graphic depictions of criminal activity, bondage, and horror in these comic books were just as harmful as the sexual metaphors of rock and roll lyrics, including those by African Americans, like Berry. Both cultural forms manifested themselves in what Hajdu defines as “a raucous and cynical one [sensibility], inured to violence and absorbed with sex, skeptical of authority, and frozen in young adulthood.”\textsuperscript{32} Similarly, in relation to rock and roll, Lipsitz argues, “the good time in rock-and-roll songs elevates the world of play over the world of work, and it carves away a limited sphere of autonomy in an increasingly regimented world.”\textsuperscript{33} Consequently, many officials viewed 1950s rock and roll music as a subversive force that countered mainstream capitalist values. If buying a home, as Lizabeth Cohen contends, was essential to the wellbeing of a capitalist system, then the act of consuming a rock and roll record (which Cohen does not examine) could have a subversive effect. Though purchasing a record was an act of consumption in itself, that purchase could undermine the mores of the dominant capitalist society, if it encouraged destruction such as the riots following the spring 1955 release of\textit{Blackboard Jungle} (addressed below). Instead of advancing the idea that capitalism led to tranquility by ensuring a controlled space, rock reminded its listeners that racist, classist, and sexual tensions existed—thus demonstrating the flaws of the capitalist system. Furthermore, the inability of many black rock and roll originators to achieve full respect from a capitalist

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Lipsitz, “Ain’t Nobody Home but Us Chickens,” 328.
country rooted in economic hierarchy, suggested that not everyone was supposed to have true equality. Otherwise, racism would not have been so entrenched; and various politicians would not have so vehemently denounced a musical genre originating from African-American musical traditions and rhythms.

As rock and roll records were increasingly marketed to American youth in the 1950s, cultural tensions erupted between the music’s youthful consumers and their critics, namely parents and government authorities. Historian Shane J. Maddock, among others, has demonstrated that when white parents in the 1950s expressed concern about the content of rock records, many of which popularized African-American rhythms found problematic by some white racists, mainstream publications and government officials listened.  

Despite the generational criticisms and government hearings of the 1950s, rock and roll, which transitioned into the rock music of the 1960s, persisted as the preferred music of America’s youth. Some but not all of rock’s listeners were active in the social movements of their time. Nevertheless, parental concerns continued about the “sexuality” and “primacy” of rock.

One example of how parental and governmental authorities feared the impact of rock and roll music on American youth appeared in their reaction to incidents of unruly crowd behavior and property destruction during concerts and dances. These included events connected to showings of Blackboard Jungle in the spring of 1955. Describing this phenomenon in which teenage audiences became excited by the film soundtrack’s inclusion of Bill Haley and the Comets’ song “Rock Around the Clock,” the political scientist James Miller writes: “From Los Angeles to London, self-styled hoods reacted

---

with glee. They danced, they sang, they slashed seats.”35 A U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency investigation followed, as did strong denunciations from educators and Time magazine, who, according to Miller, “deplored the aid and comfort the film was giving to Communist critics of America and its way of life.”36 Such fears resulted from the destruction of property (such as movie theaters) during these incidents. Despite governmental, educational, and parental dismay, the song quickly reached number one on the Billboard (the industry’s trade journal) charts, demonstrating that what authorities viewed as a dangerous message was in fact profitable and popular among teenage consumers. Similar instances of unruly crowd behavior broke out at concerts, a trend which the authors Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave have defined as being instigated and exacerbated by police presence.37 Such law enforcement officials, like many politicians and parental authorities, denounced rock and roll for its arousal of sexuality, physicality, and violence.

II. Folk Music’s Connection with the Civil Rights Movement:

Whereas 1950s rock and roll was politically contentious in the context of Cold War era class, race, and sexuality, folk music, including songs like “We Shall Overcome,” provided essential inspiration to the civil rights movement of the early 1960s. During this time many authorities (particularly Southern police officers and FBI agents) feared the progressive advances in democracy and human rights demanded by the civil rights movement. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, whom writers like Anthony

36 Ibid.
Summers have viewed as a traditional advocate of the Southern concept of white supremacy, expressed his aversion to both the 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom and the movement’s use of civil disobedience.\(^{38}\) Hoover’s belief was just one instance of the FBI’s effort to suppress the movement. Bureau agents neither protected civil rights workers (white or black), nor prevented the racist violence which Southern whites like the Ku Klux Klan imposed on black activists like Robert F. Williams, a man who asserted his Constitutional right to armed self-defense only to find himself forced to leave the country due to a fear of arrest.\(^{39}\) In addition, the FBI worked to discredit the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. both publically and within the confines of his marriage.\(^{40}\) Though such repression and fear of arrest may have dissuaded some potential civil rights activists, the movement pressed on to end legal segregation and ensure that black people throughout the U.S. gained voting rights.

For the civil rights movement, folk music served as a means of inspiration. Citing the experience of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) field secretary Phyllis Martin, author Mike Marquese argues that folk music was even more important to the civil rights movement than to the labor movements with which it was associated in previous decades:

But in the Southern United States in the early sixties, song came into its own. It was no longer an intermission in the serious politics; it was a motivator, an explainer, and as much a binding force as ideology or program. Above all, it was a weapon in the ceaseless battle against white


\(^{40}\) The first major scholarly monograph regarding the FBI’s efforts to discredit King was David J. Garrow, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Norton, 1981). Also see Summers, *Official and Confidential*, 349-365.
terror that had to be waged town by town throughout the South. ‘The fear down here is tremendous,’ SNCC field secretary Phyllis Martin explained. ‘I didn’t know whether I’d be shot at or stoned or what. But when the singing started, I forgot all that.’

Martin’s words and Marquese’s interpretation of them suggest that for some activists, music could complement the movement’s efforts at retaining solidarity amidst violent adversity. Often performers and activists appeared alongside one another at concerts, such as the annual Newport (Rhode Island) Folk Festival. Filmmaker Murray Lerner’s documentary *Festival* reveals that the Newport festivals were not only home to performances by the likes of Bob Dylan, and Peter, Paul, and Mary, but also space in which activists like Fannie Lou Hamer could generate the movement’s growth by appearing onstage alongside the entertainers. This was important since in other public spaces, particularly in the South, Hamer, as an instrumental member of both SNCC and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, was attacked and even imprisoned.

Furthermore, some noted folk performers, including Bob Dylan, Joan Baez, Pete Seeger, and Phil Ochs participated even more directly by writing songs that directly addressed the movement, valorized its heroism, and provided psychological catharsis by remembering its martyrs. For example, at a February 1962 benefit concert for the activist group the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), Bob Dylan introduced the song “The Death of Emmett Till” as a means of eulogizing the murdered subject, and inspiring those in the audience to continue fighting for the advancement of equal rights for Southern blacks.

---

41 Marquese, *Wicked Messenger*, 47.
43 Marquese, *Wicked Messenger*, 52. As Marquese and others have pointed out, Dylan’s girlfriend at the time, Suze Rotolo, was an active member of CORE.
As Marquese argues, despite Dylan’s appearance at the 1963 March on Washington and his work with CORE, “Dylan was never an activist. He absorbed his politics, like much else, by osmosis. His contribution to the movement was limited to a small number of personal appearances, a few donations—and the songs. These, however, were an inestimable gift.”

Other musicians participated more directly—as both performers and activists. Joan Baez publically declared in 1962 that her Southern concerts would occur only in fully integrated facilities, a controversial move in many deep Southern states where local police forces were averse to changes on behalf of civil rights, particularly those changes supported by white people (e.g., “Northern liberals”) who did not even live in the South. She also appeared at the 1963 March on Washington, and marched several times in 1965-1966 with Martin Luther King, Jr. Pete Seeger, whose arguably greatest contribution to the movement came from his popularization of “We Shall Overcome,” one of the most common songs of solidarity at civil rights marches, performed at numerous SNCC rallies in Mississippi. Phil Ochs was just as active. Like Dylan, Ochs sang about murdered African Americans like Medgar Evers, the subject of “Too Many Martyrs.” In 1964 he toured some of Mississippi’s most dangerous areas as a member of the Mississippi Caravan of Music, which sought to organize black voters’ drives. Biographer Michael

---

44 Ibid., 91. Marquese suggests that the crowds at the August 28, 1963 March on Washington paid less attention to the folk singers like Odetta and Bob Dylan than they gave to the Hollywood stars Charlton Heston and Marlon Brando (Ibid., 10). He also asserts that black celebrities differed in their acceptance of Dylan’s presence and efficacy; the black comedian Dick Gregory feared that the white folk singers might overshadow the black leaders whom he believed should be in the vanguard. Yet, the African American calypso singer Harry Belafonte praised the appearance of both Joan Baez and Dylan, who at this time were perhaps the genre’s most newsworthy performers (Ibid., 15). Regardless of which attendees cared for Dylan’s presence, the publicity surrounding his appearance arguably inspired at least some of the crowd to maintain its stance on civil rights.


Schumacher documents Ochs’s realization of danger, which could easily have included a violent death at the hands of the Ku Klux Klan or racist Mississippi law enforcement officials. Nevertheless, Ochs persisted to address the racial inequality and racial violence in Mississippi by addressing his experiences in “Here’s to the State of Mississippi.” Ironically, as Schumacher argues, Ochs’s stance against racists associated with the police departments and courts of Mississippi was so vitriolic that some blacks took offense to the song, claiming that it depicted a place that was far too violent for African Americans to ever gain the democratic inclusion for which they were fighting. Once Southern blacks had ensured their legal right to vote by the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Ochs’s fight against the denial of democracy extended to his activism against the Vietnam War. This would include his participation at the protests outside the August 1968 Democratic National Committee Convention in Chicago.

III. Concerns of Federal and Local Authorities Resulting from Illegal or Subversive Activity within the Rock Scene:

A. Beatlemania and Crowd Behavior:

Nicholas Knowles Bromell, a professor of English who has examined the phenomenon of sixties rock, both as a firsthand participant and a scholar, compares the youth of the 1960s to the young people of the 1840s. The latter group had been described by Ralph Waldo Emerson as temporarily turning away from capitalism in favor of a utopian religious experience. Yet, Bromell also notes that rock music during the 1960s had a far wider range of reception than 1840s literature did. Like religion, rock was often associated with a fervor that contributed at times to unruly, hedonistic expressions

48 Ibid., 85-86.
49 Ibid., 87-88.
of desire. This experience was akin to what scholars like Bromell have labeled as “Beatlemania,” a phenomenon in which crowd fanaticism in public space generated the presence of police officers beholden to quell the excited crowds and prevent the occurrence of dangerous activity or property damage. Beatlemania arrived during a time when the nation was undergoing what the historian Lizabeth Cohen describes as “the struggle to define what kind of political behavior was permissible in the new, privately owned public place of the shopping center.” As public space became more corporate, business and civic authorities often debated what type of behavior was acceptable. Anyone acting wild could be construed as dangerous to the privileged owners of property.

While American and British teenagers flocked together in fandom, some politicians and Christian ministers affected by the Cold War feared that such teenagers would do more than purchase innocuous objects of teenage consumption. Instead, rock’s audience would create a public disturbance over a musical messiah that countered the rationalism and traditional Christian values of a hardworking, capitalist, Cold War society. For fans, such activity included following their favorite musicians to various airports and hotels, possibly blocking traffic or disrupting commercial activity, and dancing fervently with evocative gestures defiant of sexual conservatism. As the historian Jon Wiener notes, many parents and religious conservatives became so upset by John Lennon’s 1966 suggestion that the Beatles were “more popular than Jesus,” that politicians in areas like Memphis, Tennessee declared publicly that “The Beatles are not

---

51 Ibid., 63.
52 Cohen, _A Consumers’ Republic_, 274.
Such occurrences led to dangers like the Ku Klux Klan picketing the Beatles’ 1966 appearance in Memphis. With a violent reaction that paralleled the recent efforts of some Southern whites to repress the civil rights movement, many Southern radio stations sponsored public burnings of Beatles records. Such events reflected the dominant Southern society’s fear of how groups like the Beatles had a strong influence on the behavior of their fan base, and demonstrated the dangerous methods (e.g. the fact that mass burnings could lead to the spread of deadly fires) that rock’s foes would use to dismantle the music’s metaphoric gods.

The evangelical Reverend David A. Noebel published some of the most vehement expressions regarding such fears about the Beatles, “Beatlemania,” and rock music in general. As Noebel argued, “the Beatle rebellion at the very least parallels the Communist rebellion against God, Christ and morality.” Fans succumbing to “Beatlemania” and even “the Beatles [themselves] could be susceptible to the enemies of our Republic [the United States], since atheism and anti-Christian tendencies are compatible with the philosophy of Communism but contrary to the original American dream of one nation under God.” Consequently, within the perimeters of Cold War security, Noebel believed that the Beatles’ performances were particularly dangerous occurrences that might brainwash otherwise innocent American Christians into not bestowing attention upon the God whose trust supported the capitalist nation’s currency, thus undermining the nation’s economic and religious stability. Such behavior also

---

54 Ibid., 13.
55 Ibid., 14-15.
57 Ibid., 100.
58 Ibid., 109.
defied the paradoxical containment that accompanied the nation’s supposed emphasis on the individual’s advancement due to hard work and Christian beliefs. Noebel quoted a “Dr. Bernard Saibel, child guidance expert for the Washington State division of community services” as stating, “The externals are terrifying. Normally recognizable girls behaved as if possessed by some demonic urge, defying in emotional ecstasy the restraints which authorities try to place on them.”\textsuperscript{59} Quite possibly, Saibel viewed this “emotional ecstasy” as sexually dangerous to unwed teenagers. Since then, journalistic and scholarly articles have argued that “for the girls who participated in Beatlemania, sex was an obvious part of excitement.”\textsuperscript{60}

Not every parental, religious, or governmental authority would have accepted Noebel’s analogy of Beatlemania and a “Communist conspiracy.” Yet, many adults (including rock’s commercial promoters) were concerned that overzealous fans were reacting without self-control in the presence of their performing heroes. In one instance, \textit{Rolling Stone} published an account of a 1968 Doors concert in Long Island, New York, where 200 excited concertgoers destroyed wooden chairs and even “rushed the stage forcing the Doors to flee.”\textsuperscript{61} Such dangers heightened tensions between rock’s younger audience and the Long Island police sworn to protect private property and preserve law and order. Compounding these tensions between fan devotion and police dedication was the growing belief among many of rock’s fans that the music’s public performances were

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 108-109.
\textsuperscript{61} “Doors Concert Starts Riot in Long Island,” \textit{Rolling Stone}, 14 September 1968, 4. Despite this article title’s mention of Long Island, biographer Stephen Davis has affirmed that the concert took place at the Singer Bowl in Queens, New York. Even though the audience was unruly throughout the concert, Jim Morrison’s rude remarks about an audience member triggered the destruction that ended the show. See Stephen Davis, \textit{Jim Morrison: Life, Death Legend} (New York: Gotham Books, 2004), 272-274.
such an essential part of their cultural development that such concerts should be free of admission charge. This led to outbreaks of property destruction at such events as the 1969 Denver Pop Festival and a 1970 Mountain concert at a New York City skating rink, where people’s desire to see the musicians surpassed their willingness to submit to the capitalist ritual of paying for admission to the performance. The recalcitrance of those who demanded access to their idols without offering sacrificial payment also figured prominently in disrupting the 1970 Isle of Wight rock festival. Tensions and threats of violence existed between gatecrashers and the promoters who emphasized the expenses of paying performers, hiring security, and renting venues. The disagreement about who should accept these expenses would become a recurring theme in the rock documentary, Message to Love. Such problems provided additional fodder which the likes of Noebel and police officers could use in their crusade against rock. They also demonstrated the police officers’ fears of losing control over rock’s volatile performances and crowds.

**B. Loud Disturbance in Public Space.**

If the police existed, for among other reasons, to preserve law and order for property owners and capitalistic interests, then rock provided an electrified threat to those whose unwillingness to listen led them to ask for the police to curb rock’s volume. This demonstrated one of the rifts in the era of Cold War consumption in which the “Long Sixties” occurred. While some advocates of capitalism might have defended the individual’s right to attend rock concerts as an extension of one’s freedom in the American republic, the historian Lizabeth Cohen writes that others believed that “the
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state would continue to play a role regulating the consumer marketplace, and . . . the good
citizen would continue to be defined as one who consumed responsibly with the public
interest in mind.”

Consequently, because the amplification of rock and the behavior or
appearance of rock audience concerned property owners, the sounds and audiences
leaving clubs, theaters, and outdoor performances prompted tensions between rock and
the state. Such concern extended even to private band practices. Keyboardist Ray
Manzarek of the Doors would remember how some of his group’s earliest rehearsals in
San Monica, California were disrupted by police officers asking the band to quiet down
at the request of their elderly neighbors.

Similarly, a July 1968 performance in Ann Arbor, Michigan by the MC5 saw the
arrival of two police officers who had come to shut down the concert that neither had a
permit nor followed a city noise ordinance. Yet, the concert continued per the advice of a
third officer in the crowd. Soon, trouble arose when Tyner led the crowd in a chorus of
“kick out the jams, motherfucker,” a phrase that alerted neighbors who were dismayed
enough about the profanity to call in the police. These complaints led to the band’s
arrest for “disturbing the peace” and “for disorder.” Despite this repression, the city of
Ann Arbor soon granted the band a permit to perform outdoors in Gallup Park following
articles written in the University of Michigan’s newspaper that defended the band’s right
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64 Cohen, A Consumers’ Republic, 101.
65 Besides the amplified guitars, rock bands performed with loud drum kits. As the music theorist Walter
Everett has written about the differences between rock music and more traditional genres, particularly
classical, “…probably the most important reason for the noise complaint was rock’s new emphasis on the
68 Ibid.
to performance.\textsuperscript{69} This decision indicated the Ann Arbor authorities’ growing concern with student uprising. Considering that such articles appeared in the weeks following the May 1968 student occupation of Columbia University, the city begrudgingly conceded to the students’ interests as a means of appeasement.

At times, such concerns about noise ordinances and arrests resulted in difficulty finding venues for rock performances where police officers would not be present. For example, in 1968, the San Francisco, California, concert promoters, the Family Dog, most famous for boosting the careers of such psychedelic luminaries as the Grateful Dead and Big Brother and the Holding Company with Janis Joplin, lost their license to hold rock dances and concerts due to what \textit{Rolling Stone} referred to as the preferred lifestyle of “[t]he police and a hotel full of aged pensioners (who say late-night rock and roll has robbed them of sleep).”\textsuperscript{70} Frequently, these complaints regarding noise resulted from the local community’s concern with both volume and genre. When a 1971 Byrds concert at the Lenox Arts Center in rural Massachusetts resulted in noise complaints, so the police chief William Obanhein (who will be discussed later in this chapter in regards to Arlo Guthrie’s “Alice’s Restaurant”) threatened to unplug the performers. Interestingly, \textit{Rolling Stone} interpreted this incident as part of a “the summer-long feud between the Lenox Arts Center and Tanglewood Music Shed, which are two miles apart.”\textsuperscript{71} The latter performance space featured symphony orchestras; its audience of classical music aficionados, suggested \textit{Rolling Stone}, was dismayed over the volume at the Lenox Arts Center. \textit{Rolling Stone}’s brief description culminated with the observation that “[r]ock partisans pointed out that on the same night, Tanglewood fired six cannons at the climax

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
of the 1812 Overture.” Because no noted police action resulted from the cannons, Rolling Stone contended that this incident served as another example of how one local community viewed rock as a public nuisance. Due to its presentation of classical music, a genre not associated with the possible destruction of surrounding property, Rolling Stone thus articulated that Tanglewood did not face the same complaints as did the Lenox Arts Center, which was attracting police attention because of its favoritism of rock.

Concerns regarding the dangerous effects of rock’s electrified loudness extended beyond just the police and tired neighbors. Even Rolling Stone realized that many scientific researchers feared that hearing loss could result from both attending and performing at concerts. Consumer advocate Ralph Nader asked legislatures and agencies on both the federal and local level to regulate the performance of rock music over a certain decibel decreed as a “public nuisance.” Nader also wanted local laws passed to ensure that musicians and workers wore ear protection lest they lose their own hearing. This was just a very miniscule portion of the more extensive debate of whether rock, due to its volume alone, was too loud for society’s wellbeing. Moreover, it compounded a similar argument against the drug usage and unbridled sex that accompanied the rock scene.
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73 Concerns with the effect of rock’s volume on bourgeois and wealthy citizens continued after the 1960s, even to this very day. For example, William M. Kunstler, the lawyer who defended in court such “enemies” of the state as the comedian Lenny Bruce, the political activist Abbie Hoffman, and members of the White Panther Party accused of bombing a Michigan CIA office, write that when the 1980s political activists of Rock Against Racism held concerts in New York City’s Central Park, enough wealthy residents complained about the loud volume for the city to implement an ordinance allowing only certain sound companies to provide sound at park events. Despite Kunstler’s challenge on behalf of Rock Against Racism, which did not want to use a city- chosen sound company for its concerts, the Supreme Court ruled that cities could control the volume of music since limiting the number of decibels did not violate the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution. See William M. Kunstler with Sheila Isenberg, My Life as a Radical Lawyer (New York: Birch Lane Press, 1994), 367-368.
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C. Fears of Rock’s Association with Unbridled Sex and Drug Abuse.

During the 1950s, rock and roll, the musical antecedent to sixties rock, had concerned amongst others, parents and vice squads fearful of the music’s sexual connotations. Such discourse emanated even from within the music industry trade magazine, Variety. A 1955 article from the publication warned industry executives: “Don’t invite the Governmental and religious lightening that is sure to strike.” Of direct relation to this warning were the sexual undertones of “‘rock and roll,’ about ‘hug,’ and ‘squeeze,’ and kindred euphemisms . . . attempting a total breakdown of reticences (sic.) about sex. In the past such material was common enough but restricted to special places and out-and-out barrelhouses.” As predicted by this internal industry warning, the thematic correlation between rock and roll and sexual activity among its youthful audience generated both complaints and repression on national, regional, and local levels. For one example of the latter, in 1956 city officials in San Antonio, Texas ensured the removal of rock-and-roll records from all jukeboxes stationed on city property. Their actions demonstrated their racist fears that such songs promoted acts of sexual miscegenation. Similar complaints resulted in record burnings and public hearings scattered across the country.

78 Ibid., 102.
80 For more examples and analysis of complaints that rock and roll and sex were interconnected, see Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave, Anti-Rock: The Opposition to Rock ‘n’ Roll (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1988, 5, 15-26.
The most vociferous criticism of rock and roll’s connection to sex often emanated from the clergy. Authors Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave have noted that while religious and civic groups were initially concerned with lyrics only, after 1955 they became increasingly vocal about the sexualized movements of rock and roll performances. To cite one example, an employee [possibly the editor] of the La Crosse Register, the “official newspaper of the Diocese of La Crosse,” Wisconsin, wrote FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover about a May 14, 1956 Elvis Presley concert. “[C]onvinced that juvenile crimes of lust and perversion will follow his [Presley’s] show here in La Crosse,” the author stated, “I do not write idly to the FBI.” Especially appalling to the letter’s author was “that Presley’s actions and motions were such as to rouse the sexual passions of teenaged youth. One eye-witness described his actions as ‘sexual self-gratification on the stage,’ – another as ‘a strip tease with clothes on.’” After the show, teenage concertgoers crowded around Presley’s backstage area and hotel room – “and there were two high school girls . . . whose abdomen and thigh had Presley’s autograph.” This letter writer’s account demonstrated the belief that the FBI (or other law enforcement agencies) needed to curb Presley’s sexual, and thus, in the letter writer’s opinion-criminal, image. Although no evidence has been found suggesting that the FBI took any action against Presley in 1956 (aside from holding onto this letter and its enclosures), the letter’s existence confirmed how some religious authorities, including
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this employee of a Diocesan newspaper, demanded the government’s suppression of rock-and-roll sexuality.\(^87\)

The equation that concerned authorities made between rock and roll and an uncontrolled form of sexuality (sometimes connected to miscegenation) persisted throughout the 1960s. As the years passed, what would become defined as the Sexual Revolution developed not just in cities like New York or San Francisco, locations for some of the better-known rock clubs, but also in Middle American communities, such as the college town of Lawrence, Kansas.\(^88\) The historian Beth Bailey’s study delineating the rise of the Sexual Revolution in Lawrence addresses the introduction and growing popularity of the birth control pill. While the pill increased the number of unmarried women engaging in sexual activity, its growing presence paralleled the development of an American youth culture adhering to much different values than those of the country’s elders. In 1960, the birth control pill was introduced. One year later, approximately one million women were taking it. As of 1963, doctors were prescribing it only to married women. Yet, by 1969 an estimated 8.5 million women were regular users.\(^89\) The story of the birth control pill’s popularity, and the efforts of concerned parents, doctors, and officials to restrict it, demonstrated that the repression of sexuality loosened during the sixties. Simultaneously, the youth culture’s effort to express its sexuality complemented rock’s battle for autonomous expression.

Rock critic Dave Marsh has delineated how rumors of alleged “dirty lyrics” in the frat-rock classic “Louie Louie,” as recorded by the Kingsmen in 1963, elicited both

\(^{87}\) The FBI’s decision to do nothing else regarding Elvis Presley should be noted in contrast to their more detailed efforts to destroy revolutionary political organizations like the Black Panther Party and the Weather Underground in the late 1960s.


\(^{89}\) Ibid., 1, 7, 105.
national outrage and an FBI investigation. In the winter of 1964, an FBI office in Indiana received a letter from a woman who had purchased the somewhat indecipherable record before receiving a copy of the supposed “dirty lyrics.”90 In Marsh’s words, “Instead of investigating the story, the Bureau took the tale at face value and set about investigating the music, with the object of making it criminal.”91 Henceforth, FBI agents in six cities helped to collect and study regional variations of the song’s printed lyrics in an effort to gauge whether such material violated laws regarding the illicit “Interstate Transportation of Obscene Material.”92 Although the FBI ultimately decided that the song was “unintelligible at any speed,” and thus unworthy of further examination or prosecution, the debate regarding music and unbridled sexuality persisted.93 The FBI’s attention to investigating the song’s potential obscenity coincided with the years of upheaval generated by the Sexual Revolution. Bailey’s research of the birth control pill phenomenon demonstrates that the FBI’s investigation occurred at a time when an increasing number of women were interested in obtaining the pill, thus suggesting that sexuality was becoming more publicized.

After the FBI’s examination of “Louie Louie,” the phenomenon of “Beatlemania” examined earlier in this chapter dismayed many parents and police officials hired to work security at concerts. Yet, of even more particular offense to some of the more strait-laced members of the dominant American society was the counterculture’s public demonstration of “free love” and nudity at concerts such as the July 1969 Woodstock

90 Dave Marsh, Louie, Louie: The History and Mythology of the World’s Most Famous Rock ‘n’ Roll Song; Including the Full Details of Its Torture and Persecution at the Hands of the Kingsmen, J. Edgar Hoover’s F.B.I., and a Cast of Millions; and Introducing, for the First Time Anywhere, the Actual Dirty Lyrics (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 122-123.
91 Ibid., 123.
92 Ibid., 117.
93 Ibid., 116.
festival. Footage of such activity was well documented throughout the filmmaker Michael Wadleigh’s popular documentary of that event. Concertgoers swam, cavorted, and danced nakedly, in addition to using illegal substances such as marijuana and LSD. Such behavior characterized a hedonism that flouted local standards of decency seen as the bedrock of a hard-working capitalist order, coinciding with the growing use of the birth control pill. Clearly, to the dismay of many parental and state authorities, extramarital sexuality had become much more widespread and noticeable. As the pill’s usage grew, the ostensibly “dirty” lyrics of “Louie Louie” had been surpassed by the filming of “free love” and nudity. Alongside this growing expression of public sexuality and changing sexual mores was the rock culture’s advocacy of marijuana and LSD.

Although some musicians like Joan Baez decried the counterculture’s appreciation for drugs like LSD and marijuana, many rock musicians and audiences profusely used and advocated illegal substances. Walking onstage for a May 1970 concert in Berkeley, California, Jimi Hendrix casually told his audience: “actually give us about a minute to get tuned up and get rid of these joints and everything.” Such instruction marked the shared connection that audience and performers had with drugs, a trend present everywhere from the simultaneous marketing of smoking paraphernalia and iconic rock posters at head shops to the numerous scenes of drug use in Michael Wadleigh’s documentary of the 1969 Woodstock Festival. The names of subgenres like “acid rock” and “psychedelic rock” underscored this connection. Furthermore, rock advertisements appeared frequently in countercultural newspapers like the *Ann Arbor*
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Argus, Berkeley Barb, or Chicago Seed, all of which promoted the illicit sale and use of marijuana and psychedelic drugs. Instructing its readership to “[a]ct now before this offer is made illegal,” Rolling Stone magazine offered subscribers a roach clip, a tool used for holding marijuana joints in a manner that would limit the chances of a smoker from burning him or herself. The clip was described as both a “handy little device” and “an essential accessory for the successful musician and the completely equipped rock and roll fan.”

The rock community and the counterculture’s nonchalant attitude regarding drugs infuriated some agents and directors of the FBI and CIA as well as some law enforcement officials sworn to combat the spread of drug use. This was evident through the actions, writings, and reception of Dr. Timothy Leary, whose advocacy of LSD also drew the attention of the CIA. A Harvard University professor of psychology until his termination in 1963, Leary publicized accounts of what he believed were the psychological and spiritual improvements that LSD could bestow upon those suffering from various forms of anxiety or mental illness. According to Leary, Harvard fired him due to the CIA’s concern that Leary’s research could undermine the agency’s decade-long interest in clandestinely administering LSD for militaristic and diplomatic purposes. Leary later believed that as the drug became more popular among the American public, then the
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97 The author of this study has consulted original printings of these underground newspapers as found in the Alternative Press Collection at the University of Connecticut’s Dodd Center. Since articles which promoted either rock music or drugs appeared very regularly in almost all underground newspapers, any index of such literature would be quite voluminous and time-consuming. To cite one example, however, the August 5-12 1970 issue of the Ann Arbor Argus titled its “First Aid Page” by using the phrase, “Smoke Two Joints and Call Me in the Morning” (12). Just two pages after this drug reference, this same newspaper contained an article by John Sinclair titled “Killer Blues: a his/tory.” That article underscored the connection between the rock counterculture and blues musicians.

98 “This handy little device can be yours free!” advertisement, Rolling Stone, 10 February 1968, 63. This same advertisement appeared in more than one issue.
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CIA’s secret weapon would have been too well understood to remain efficacious, thus evoking the authorities’ concern.\textsuperscript{100} Although Leary had not broken any laws (since LSD was not made illegal in any of the states until California was the first to pass such legislation in October 1966), evidence of the federal government’s concern with Leary was apparent as early as 1964 when FDA (Food and Drug Administration) officials visited Leary’s Millbrook, New York estate to warn him that once LSD did become illegal, top politicians and FDA agents would actively pursue his arrest.\textsuperscript{101} While Leary persistently advocated the benefits of LSD, he was twice arrested on marijuana charges, first by an agent on the border of Texas and Mexico in 1965, and then in 1968 by a California police officer. Following his resulting trials and incarceration, Leary escaped from prison and ventured to Europe as a political exile where he would continually disturb many government officials and remain a countercultural icon into the 1970s. Leary’s story was an important example of the CIA, FDA, and California police officials’ interest in squashing a psychedelic movement associated with hedonism and self-abandonment that was anathema to the order of the military-industrial state.

While many of the authorities seeking Leary’s imprisonment realized the interrelation between rock music and illicit drug usage, Leary himself had a strong affinity for rock, especially the offerings of the Beatles and Rolling Stones. Born in 1920, one might have superficially contended that Leary was “too old” to appreciate sixties rock. He enjoyed the big band jazz of Maynard Ferguson, who frequented his Millbrook estate, and the Miles Davis Quintet, whose members (sans their eponymous

\textsuperscript{100} Leary, \textit{Flashbacks: A Personal and Cultural History of the Era}, 116-130, 148-163. A salient analysis of both the CIA’s experimentation with LSD and the controversy surrounding Timothy Leary appears in Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, \textit{Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond}, revised ed. (New York: Grove Weidenfeld 1992), passim.  

\textsuperscript{101} Leary, \textit{Flashbacks}, 197-198.
leader) performed at his 1964 wedding. Yet, seeking Leary’s psychedelic advice, both the Rolling Stones and the Beatles sent associates to Millbrook. Besides these encounters, Leary interpreted the Beatles’ 1967 album, *Sergeant Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*, as “a most influential media statement about multiple realities,” a message similar to Leary’s own. In June 1969, Leary augmented his relationship with the Beatles through his contribution of background vocals to John Lennon’s “Give Peace a Chance.” The next day Lennon bestowed upon Leary a recording of “Come Together” with lyrics different from those the Beatles soon recorded, for radio play in support of Leary’s campaign for California’s gubernatorial election. On a separate date, several other musicians, including the steadfast psychedelic drug users Jimi Hendrix and John Sebastian, recorded an instrumental track for Leary’s campaign. Despite support from these prominent musicians, Leary’s campaign failed due to his ongoing appeal against convictions of marijuana possession and transportation. The willingness of these musicians to help Leary confirmed the rock counterculture’s counter-hegemonic stance against the State of California, which had earlier outlawed LSD.

Such examples demonstrated a close relationship between Timothy Leary and the rock community. Also, outside these friendships, Leary directly employed the message and popularity of the Beatles and Rolling Stones to articulate his pro-psychedelic, subversive beliefs. In his 1968 essay, “The Magical Mystery Trip,” titled after the Beatles’ 1967 album, *The Magical Mystery Tour*, Leary appropriated lyrics from the Beatles’ “I Am the Walrus” and “The Fool on the Hill” into puns utilized for mocking his
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displeasure with those English Parliamentary officials averse to easing England’s drug laws. Scorning the Home Office Minister of State Alice Bacon, for instance, Leary quips, “SHAKING BACON CHOKING SMOKERS, DO YOU THINK THE KIDS WILL VOTE FOR YOU?”. Not only did Leary’s reference to the Beatles demonstrate his belief that the English youth would either advocate the easing of British drug laws or continue to flout them, but it also connoted the young counterculture’s refusal to follow a politician like Bacon, who was known for criticizing the mores of a drug-influenced youth culture. Bacon, as Leary realized, had even disparaged the Beatle Paul McCartney as a promulgator of psychedelic drugs and marijuana. By defining the Beatles as “[t]he Four Evangelists!” and noting his and his wife’s daily experience of listening to the Beatles’ *Sergeant Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* and the Rolling Stones’ *Their Satanic Majesties Request*, Leary verified the importance of both groups to his efforts of combating anti-drug legislative attempts fostered by what he viewed as an oppressive English government. Furthermore, his reference to the “Four Evangelists” revealed religious connotations of an evil anti-drug English government determined to block a holy transcendence reached through rock. Although Leary’s essay focused solely on English rock groups and politicians, the Beatles and Stones were immensely popular in the United States, a country in which the legal penalty for LSD possession was also increased. Among the areas in which they were popular was California, home to the Grateful Dead and center to some of the first State laws banning LSD.
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Besides using and expressing their appreciation for illegal drugs, the Grateful Dead had a close relationship with drug distribution in their respective region of San Francisco, California. Notably, the group had an ongoing relationship with Augustus Owsley Stanley III, commonly referred to as Owsley or Bear, often cited as the period’s most prolific manufacturer of LSD.\(^{110}\) As the band’s sound engineer, Owsley recorded their live performances and invented their unique concert speaker system. In addition, as noted by *Rolling Stone* in a news report of Owsley’s conviction for LSD possession and manufacturing, “[t]he Grateful Dead have immortalized Mr. Stanley . . . in an unrecorded song, ‘Alice D. Millionaire.’”\(^{111}\) The song’s title was a pun of a headline from a San Francisco *Chronicle* article that had described Owsley as an “LSD Millionaire” following his 1966 arrest by California authorities.\(^{112}\) Then, following one of Owsley’s prison terms in the early 1970s, the band even released an album titled *History of the Grateful Dead, Vol. 1 (Bear’s Choice)*. Although the mention of “Bear” referred to Owsley’s
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\(^{110}\) Owsley was one of, if not the most, prolific manufacturers and distributors in the United States. For more information regarding his impact on the growing presence of LSD within the counterculture, see Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1992), 146-147.

\(^{111}\) “Owsley Guilty: 67 ½ Righteous Grams,” *Rolling Stone*, 15 November 1969, 14. Evidence of the magazine’s support for Owsley and the Dead and disrespect for the authorities emerged through the description of Owsley’s drugs as “righteous.” Also, this article appeared in a section of the magazine titled “The Dope Page.”

engineering of the album’s contents, the artwork on the record jacket looked tellingly like the motifs on LSD blotter paper.\textsuperscript{113}

Whereas the Grateful Dead’s relationship with Owsley personified their association with drug dealing, the band’s notoriety for being arrested for drug possession solidified their outlaw status among the counterculture. Guitarist Jerry Garcia claimed that rock musicians buttressed the subversive counterculture through their purchase of drugs, an important commodity to the counterculture’s economic sustenance.\textsuperscript{114} Even arrests did not deter the band’s advocacy of drugs. An October 2, 1967 raid of the Dead’s communal home in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco did not result in embarrassment; instead the group held a press conference for sympathetic countercultural reporters like those from \textit{Rolling Stone}. There, manager Danny Rifkin stated, “The arrests were made under a law that classifies smoking marijuana along with murder, rape and armed robbery as a felony. Yet almost anyone who has ever studied marijuana seriously and objectively has agreed that marijuana is the least harmful chemical used for pleasure and life-enhancement.”\textsuperscript{115} Clearly, the Dead and their peers in the underground press and counterculture viewed marijuana as beneficial to their well-being. Their advocacy of the drug complemented the pervasiveness of marijuana and LSD at their performances, thus forming a tight bond between band and audience. Scholar Rachel Wilgoren has emphasized how the Dead’s lyricist John Perry Barlow believed that the idea of a community shared between the band members and their followers resulted from

\textsuperscript{113} The Grateful Dead, \textit{History of the Grateful Dead, Volume 1}, Warner Brothers BS 2721, long-playing record.


the inability of American society and culture to provide such a bond. The fact that drug users were castigated by the authorities but revered by the band demonstrated how the Dead formed this bond with their fans. Concurrently, the Dead’s arrest confirmed their countercultural heroism, while the authorities were vilified. The San Franciscan poet Richard Brautigan expressed such sentiments in a 1968 poem articulating that during this incident, “rain stormed against San Francisco / like hot swampy scissors cutting Justice / into the evil clothes that alligators wear.” Consequently, the Dead admitted no wrong following their arrest, a reaction parallel to their nonchalant discussion of a 1970 drug bust in New Orleans immortalized in their song “Truckin.’” Lyrics in that song alluded to the band as being “Busted down on Bourbon Street / Set up like a bowling pin.” Similar to their 1967 press conference, this later arrest of the Dead demonstrated their refusal to refrain from drugs despite the threat of additional surveillance, harassment, or arrest. Their fans remained supportive, as many of them also held a strong, psychedelic inclination.

While the Grateful Dead would maintain a strong cult status within the rock community for several decades (ending with guitarist Jerry’s Garcia’s death in 1995), John Sinclair, a jazz critic, the founder of the White Panther Party (discussed later in this chapter), the first manager of the hard rock outfit, the MC5, and a local (Detroit and then Ann Arbor, Michigan) marijuana dealer, also became a national icon for the counterculture’s insistence on the legalization of drugs following several arrests and jail
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119 A brief description of how the band’s manager, Lenny Hart, reacted to this arrest by warning fellow musicians to be careful with their drugs in New Orleans appeared in “New Orleans Cops and the Dead Bust,” Rolling Stone, 7 March 1970, 7.
time. Predating his tenure as the MC5’s manager, Sinclair was first arrested in 1961 on a commonplace charge of drunkenness. His initial marijuana-related arrest came following a small sale during a 1964 sting operation. That resulted in a $250 fine and two years of probation. Though Sinclair received no jail time, his arrest nonetheless led the Detroit Police Narcotics Division to open a file on him. They were particularly interested when Sinclair founded a chapter of LEMAR, a group dedicated to the legalization of marijuana. Sinclair was then arrested on marijuana charges in both 1965 and 1967. The 1965 arrest resulted in a six-month prison sentence. In 1967, Sinclair founded Trans-Love Energies Unlimited, a collective devoted to the promotion of rock concerts and counterculture publications, amongst other things.

As Sinclair became the manager of the MC5 and the founder of the White Panther Party, Michigan authorities, including the Detroit Police Department’s Red Squad, who were disdainful of the counterculture, continued to watch his activities. Further charges were brought against Sinclair in 1967 for a traffic warrant, in 1968 for assault and battery on a police officer following a disturbance at an MC5 concert, and in 1969 for violating narcotics laws, and attempting to enter Canada for a rock festival without properly registering as a felon before attempting to cross the Michigan-Canada border. According to the historian Jeff Hale, the intensive surveillance and “[t]he harassment by law enforcement officials was undoubtedly motivated by several factors, including their

120 Detroit Police Department Criminal Record number 244866 for John Alexander Sinclair, Jr., August 5, 1969, Red Squad and Surveillance Files – Detroit Police, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 1.
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124 Detroit Police Department Criminal Record number 244866 for John Alexander Sinclair, Jr., August 5, 1969, Red Squad and Surveillance Files – Detroit Police, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 1.
repulsion at the sight of long-haired hippies using drugs, mutilating the nation’s flag in public, and in the process influencing other young people to imitate their counterculture lifestyle.”¹²⁵ For all of these reasons, authorities viewed Sinclair as both a cultural and political threat who, if non-incarcerated, could entice impressionable youth to commit similar illegal (and thus un-patriotic acts) like dope smoking and flag desecration. Thus, the Detroit Police Department chronicled not just Sinclair’s activities, but also those of rock bands friendly with Sinclair. An August 1969 report regarding a rock festival in Canada noted how Canadian border patrol authorities were intending to prevent the Amboy Dukes from crossing over for a concert in Sarnia, Ontario. The border authorities’ reasoning, which paralleled that of the Detroit Police Department, as suggested by this document, was not just to put a damper on the festival, but also because “[t]his group has been known to associate with JOHN SINCLAIR, the MC5 and other known narcotic traffickers [sic.]”¹²⁶ Sinclair’s beliefs were more similar to the counterculture than the New Left; however, as described in the introduction to this chapter, the authorities interpreted his actions as both cultural and political, just as they often conflated the ideas of the counterculture with those of the New Left and other progressive groups. These arrests culminated with Sinclair receiving a prison sentence of nine-and-a-half-to-ten years in July 1969.¹²⁷ While in prison, Sinclair, with two other White Panthers, was indicted for

¹²⁵ Jeff A. Hale, “‘The White Panthers’ ‘Total Assault on the Culture.’” in Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ‘70s, eds. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 139.
¹²⁶ Detroit Police Department, Inter-Office Memorandum, Special Investigation Bureau, “INFORMATION REGARDING THE AMBUOY (sic.) Dukes,” Red Squad and Surveillance Files – Detroit Police, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 1.
¹²⁷ Sinclair’s sentence was specifically for his third marijuana arrest, in 1967. As scholar David A. Carson points out, Sinclair was not actually sentenced to prison until 1969 because his lawyers had appealed his arrest on the grounds that Michigan’s drug laws were unconstitutional. This argument contributed to
having a possible role in the September 1969 bombing of a CIA building in Ann Arbor. The growing discussion of Sinclair’s prison sentencing defined him as a martyr incarcerated by repressive marijuana laws.

Sinclair’s activism and arrests on behalf of marijuana legalization complemented his ideas about what rock music should do on behalf of activism. In his mind, rock and drugs were synonymous with revolution against an oppressive state. This idea became evident in his writings, including a February 1969 letter to *Rolling Stone*, in which he ironically criticized the periodical that lionized marijuana users and rock musicians for having a reporter who “wouldn’t even get high . . .” and too many articles containing celebrity gossip about the ostensible size of Jimi Hendrix’s penis and Janis Joplin’s breasts, instead of a more organized political polemic. In Sinclair’s words, “Rock and roll is about having a good time, getting laid, smoking dope and dropping acid, tearing down police stations, blowing up draft boards, taking over public buildings, fucking in the streets, free music in the parks, (. . .) things that make you feel good!” Similar rhetoric pervaded *Guitar Army*, a collection of essays drafted during Sinclair’s incarceration (and published after his December 1971 release), thus suggesting that Sinclair’s arrests never deterred his support for rock and its association with the drug scene.

While imprisoned, the counterculture, including the activist Abbie Hoffman, and the rock star John Lennon amongst others, ushered Sinclair’s transition away from a local
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Detroit-Ann Arbor region drug dealer, jazz critic, and rock aficionado and manager, into a national icon for the repeal of an oppressive state’s Draconian drug laws. By running onstage at the Woodstock Festival during a performance by the Who, Hoffman sought to publicize Sinclair’s nine-and-a-half-year prison sentence for providing two marijuana joints to an undercover officer. Although the Who’s guitarist, Pete Townshend, reacted by smashing Hoffman in the head with his guitar, thus silencing the activist, Hoffman wrote about the incident as well as what he viewed as Sinclair’s unjust imprisonment in his 1969 book, *Woodstock Nation: A Talk-Rock Album.*

Additional material released by the counterculture on behalf of Sinclair’s release included “Free John Now,” a 1971 single by the Michigan hard-rock band, the Up. Similar to Hoffman’s book, the song expressed its singer’s solidarity and praise for “all of the people [that] are smokin’ marijuana.” Moreover, its repetitive chorus, “Free John Now,” demanded Sinclair’s release, similar to Hoffman’s message in his book and at Woodstock. Although the Up received hardly any attention on a national level, their view of Sinclair as a victim permeated throughout the national counterculture.

Similar sentiments led to several benefit concerts on behalf of Sinclair’s legal appeal, including the famous December 10, 1971 John Sinclair Freedom Rally concert at the Crisler Arena in Ann Arbor. The poster for that event both demanded the liberation of “John Sinclair and all political prisoners” and featured a centered

134 Ibid.
135 While most of the bands and musicians examined in this study would have the majority of their catalogue remain in print for decades, the few recordings by the Up were generally unavailable commercially until the fall of 2010 when the following anthology was released: The Up, *Rising.* Applebush Records CPSSPCD002, compact disc. They never released a long-playing album.
136 For an overview of the concert, see Doggett, *There’s A Riot Going On*, 465-568.
photograph of Sinclair smoking marijuana above a listing of noted musicians like John
Lennon and Yoko Ono, Phil Ochs, and lesser known groups like Commander Cody and
His Lost Planet Airmen, and the Joy of Cooking.\footnote{Poster for 10 December 1971 John Sinclair Freedom Rally at Crisler Arena, Ann Arbor, reproduced in John Sinclair, \textit{Guitar Army: Rock and Revolution with MC5 and the White Panther Party}. Introduction by Michael Simmons. (Los Angeles, Process, 2007), 15.} The poster’s listing of such groups suggested that even the very few denizens of Ann Arbor who might not have heard of Sinclair might take interest in his case solely because of the notable acts performing on his behalf. Netting a profit of $28,000 from the sale of approximately 15,000 tickets, the event demonstrated the Ann Arbor counterculture’s solidarity with Sinclair.\footnote{Carson. \textit{Grit, Noise and Revolution}, 266-268.} At the benefit, John Lennon supported Sinclair by performing a song titled after the imprisoned activist. Lennon pleaded with the audience to lobby on behalf of Sinclair’s release: “It ain’t fair, John Sinclair / in the stir for breathing air. . . . won’t you care for John Sinclair / in the stir for breathing air.”\footnote{Footage of Lennon singing these lyrics appears in \textit{The U.S. vs. John Lennon}, dir. David Leaf and John Scheinfeld, 2006, Lions Gate, 2007, DVD.} While such lines demonstrated Lennon’s disgust for Sinclair’s incarceration, the song’s conclusion, “we’ve gotta, gotta, . . . gotta set him free” articulated that Lennon was willing to utilize all of his fame and power on behalf of both Sinclair’s release and the repeal of the existing marijuana legislation responsible for sentencing Sinclair and other countercultural participants to prison.\footnote{Ibid.} Such attention, particularly from Lennon- one of the most famous celebrities of the era, helped lionize Sinclair as a countercultural icon and a bane to the authorities.\footnote{An overview and analysis of Lennon’s support for Sinclair appears in Wiener, \textit{Come Together}, 187-196.} Furthermore, three days after the concert, the Michigan court released Sinclair on bond; in turn, Sinclair thanked
Lennon and the concert audience for publicizing his incarceration.\textsuperscript{142} Such an event illustrated both the rock community’s vehemence against anti-drug laws and the rock community’s lobbying power within local politics in Michigan. In March 1972, the Michigan Supreme Court decreed that the law used to sentence Sinclair was unconstitutional; yet, despite this victory for the counterculture, animosity persisted between those seeking to enforce anti-drug laws and rock fans, many of whom supported the individual’s choice to smoke marijuana.\textsuperscript{143}

Numerous primary and secondary sources have pointed out that like Sinclair, many musicians or musical audiences arrested for using or possessing drugs remained unrepentant for their illicit activity.\textsuperscript{144} This heightened the rift between legal authorities and the counterculture. Rock critic Richie Unterberger has recently argued that many rock bands, including the Rolling Stones and Beatles, were initially somewhat apolitical until the arrest of some of their members for drug possession. Because in the 1960s John Lennon was himself arrested for marijuana possession by an undercover officer, his sympathy for Sinclair would have complemented Unterberger’s assertions.\textsuperscript{145} Following their arrests, many musicians (the Beatles and Stones included) became increasingly

\textsuperscript{142} Carson, 	extit{Grit, Noise and Revolution}, 266-268. One reason for the Michigan Supreme Court’s decision to release Sinclair on bail was that on December 8, 1971, Michigan changed the law for marijuana possession from a felony to a misdemeanor. See Doggett, 	extit{There’s A Riot Going On}, 466.

\textsuperscript{143} Carson 	extit{Grit, Noise and Revolution}, 266-268.

\textsuperscript{144} This trend of musicians choosing to advocate illegal drug use despite the opposite wishes of law enforcement authorities was not unique to rock and folk musicians during the Long Sixties. Many jazz and blues musicians in the earlier years of the twentieth century also used and promoted drug use. For more about these jazz and blues artists, see Harry Shapiro 	extit{Waiting for the Man: The Story of Drugs and Popular Music} (London: Helter Skelter Publishing, 1999), 13-82.

\textsuperscript{145} Footage of Lennon discussing his arrest appears in dir. David Leaf and John Scheinfeld. 	extit{The U.S. vs. John Lennon}. 57
active in the period’s more political movements such as the mobilization against the Vietnam War.\footnote{Richie Unterberger, \textit{Eight Miles High: Folk-Rock’s Flight from Haight-Ashbury to Woodstock} (San Francisco: Backbeat Books, 2003), 248.}

**IV. Political Tensions between Authorities and the Rock Community:**

In addition to its ties with a hedonistic, sex and drug-oriented counterculture which alarmed some officials and law enforcement authorities for cultural or behavioral reasons, rock, despite its primary purpose as a means of entertainment, at times provided both monetary and inspirational support to protesters within such diverse groups as the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement, and the Black Panther Party. Some authorities who might have dismissed the policing of rock for its aesthetic content alone became attuned to the rapport that some musicians had with political activists. For instance, the FBI agent, M. Wesley Swearingen, later claimed that had John Lennon not associated with the wanted radical, Jerry Rubin, then the FBI would not have engaged in such intensive surveillance of Lennon in an effort to deport the musician back to his native England. As Swearingen believed, the FBI worried far more about Lennon’s funding and promotion of political dissent than they did about his lyrical content or profession.\footnote{Swearingen makes this claim in \textit{The U.S. vs. John Lennon}, dir. David Leaf and John Scheinfeld.} Swearingen’s statement confirmed a nuanced differentiation between his opinion of rock as a genre and rock as a political tool. In instances where rock was connected to political groups and radicals like Jerry Rubin (whom the FBI was watching intensely), Swearingen, as an FBI agent, was most attentive to the neutralization of rock.

Demonstrating how FBI agents and informants targeted political dissent far more than musical aesthetics or countercultural subversion, in his 1970 book \textit{I Lived Inside the Campus Revolution}, the paid FBI informant William Tulio Divale wrote nothing about
the records played by the campus groups that he was investigating and infiltrating. In fact, he mentioned a musician just once when he noted seeing a photograph of Joan Baez during a slide show presentation hosted by a chapter of the W.E.B. Du Bois Club. As documented by the Young Communist League which descended from the organization, between 1964 and the early 1970s, the communist-affiliated W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs, USA supported the civil rights movement and protested against the Vietnam War both on and off college campuses. For this reason, a writer for the Young Communist League’s website in 2012 contended:

The Du Bois Clubs were targeted by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover’s Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO). COINTELPRO not only harassed the CPUSA and the DuBois Club, but also caused trouble for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Malcolm X, the Black Panther Party and many other progressive and leftist figures. The FBI targeted the Du Bois Clubs for violent police attacks and right wing terrorism. When the San Francisco Headquarters of the DuBois was bombed in 1966 authorities never investigated the crime and no one was ever convicted.

In Divale’s case, the Bureau’s concern with the activities of political organizations engaged in dissent on college campuses did not extend to the musical preferences of those students. Divale was not at the slide show to document pictures of Baez the musician; instead, his presence demonstrated the Bureau’s primary interest in repressing antiwar activities, a political program analyzed by scholars ranging from David Garrow to James Kirkpatrick Davis. Yet, simultaneously, any musician, like Baez, could be noticed if visibly supportive of political dissent.

150 A confirmation and analysis of COINTELPRO’s efforts against Martin Luther King, Jr. appears in Garrow, The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr. James Kirkpatrick Davis, Assault on the Left: The FBI and the Sixties Antiwar Movement (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997), passim. Both studies contend that
As such tensions germinated between activist musicians and government officials, rock’s lyrics and concerts directed unceaseless attacks on the policies of federal institutions, including the military, the FBI, the CIA, and local police departments in cities ranging from New Haven, Connecticut, to Detroit, Michigan. At times, rock’s posturing went so far as to pronounce violence against law enforcement officials. Amidst all of rock’s political actions during the late 1960s and early 1970s, a large number of the period’s most visible political activists and groups used rock as a means of both inspiration and solicitation.

A. Rock’s Criticism of Federal and Local Law Enforcement Officials:

Lyrically and rhetorically, rock at times criticized such institutions as the CIA, the FBI, and local police officials. Folk-oriented rockers including the Fugs and Arlo Guthrie as well as psychedelic hard rock groups like the Doors and the Jefferson Airplane, frequently excoriated the government. This anti-FBI, CIA, or general police rhetoric appeared in their recordings, songbooks, and statements during interviews and concerts.

The Fugs were a New York City folk-rock group who in the words of its member Edward Sanders “were investigated by the FBI, by the Post Office, [and] by the New York District Attorney.”¹⁵¹ They were avid participants at the October 1967 levitation of the Pentagon protest and sundry acts of dissent in the New York City region, including the burning of an American flag during a 1967 concert. Sanders, as an associate of Abbie
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Hoffman, also served as a member of the Yippies. Band members, especially the poet, Sanders, had close connections to the authors of the Beat Generation, who, according to the scholar Ann Charters emphasized individual expression over the era’s dominant emphasis on consumption and arose “partly as a response to the tumultuous historical events of the Cold War, with the United States’ bloody efforts to curtail the global expansion of Communism, and partly as a reaction against self-complacent conformity at home.” Devoted to what Sanders has referred to as “non-violent revolution THEN,” the group without hesitation disparaged all government officials whom they viewed as responsible for the escalation of the Vietnam War and domestic repression or countercultural harassment. In addition to “Kill for Peace,” a song mocking the idea that fighting against a Communist North Vietnam would institute a more tranquil world for America, the Fugs took direct aim at the CIA with Tuli Kupferberg’s “CIA Man.”

“CIA Man” took umbrage with the CIA’s actions and alleged sense of power over the American people whose values it was sworn to protect in the realm of international politics. Asking “Who can get a budget that’s so great / Who will be the fifty-first state,” the Fugs questioned whether the CIA would attain complete control of the American people by attaining powers (as a “fifty-first state”) that it currently did not possess or deserve. Besides this criticism, the song included the lyric, “Who can take sugar from its sack / pour in LSD and put it back.” Considering that some LSD advocates including Timothy Leary believed that the CIA was behind the illegalization of the

154 Sanders, History of the Fugs.
156 The Fugs, “CIA Man.”
157 Ibid.
psychedelic drug, because it had previously intended to use LSD as a weapon, the mention of a practice that the government wanted to remain clandestine would definitely have ruffled the CIA.\textsuperscript{158}

While there was no solid evidence that the CIA was even aware of this song, members of the Fugs were placed under FBI surveillance.\textsuperscript{159} Moreover, on January 2, 1966, local officers raided the Peace Eye Bookstore that singer Ed Sanders operated in New York City. Seizing literature for evidence, they charged Sanders with the distribution of obscene materials.\textsuperscript{160} Interestingly, one of the seized mimeographed publications, titled \textit{Blacklist}, contained the lyrics to “CIA Man.”\textsuperscript{161} It is unknown whether the officers who seized this publication read “CIA Man,” because the description of the mimeographed magazine made reference to the cover on which a naked male with an exposed penis danced, and two poems containing explicit references to genitalia and sexual intercourse.\textsuperscript{162} The latter of these poems appeared on page thirty; the lyrics to “CIA Man” were printed nineteen pages later. Yet, the fact that a publication seized by the state contained such lyrics was befitting, because many within in the rock community and counterculture, particularly the Fugs, saw a connection between the widening of sexual mores and efforts to combat “repressive” state institutions like the CIA. Both acts symbolized the Fugs’ desire to expand their freedom from institutional laws and parties.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{158} Leary, \textit{Flashbacks}, 116-130, 148-163. Lee and Shlain, \textit{Acid Dreams, passim}.
\textsuperscript{159} This sentence does not mean to suggest that the FBI or CIA were intertwined. Like all government institutions, they were often in competition with each other.
\textsuperscript{161} \textit{Blacklist}, no. 6 (1965): 49. This publication is currently stored in a folder titled “Peace Eye Bookstore – Bookstore Materials Collected as Evidence in 1966 Arrest,” Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 443.
\textsuperscript{162} Description of contents of “Blacklist” (sic.) found in Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 443.
\end{flushleft}
While Fugs lyrics vilified the CIA, other musicians addressed rock’s relationship with the FBI. Country Joe McDonald, famous for his antiwar material and appearances at peace rallies, sympathized with someone running from the FBI in his 1971 recording, “Air Algiers.” Singing, “I can remember the day that the FBI called,” the song’s narrator expressed having “got to make my connection /a one-way on Air Algiers.” Such lyrics could be interpreted as more than a story of someone seeking to escape from the FBI; they could also have implied the musician’s affinity for the Bureau’s opponents. It is also possible that McDonald’s choice of Algiers as the song narrator’s destination referenced the plight of Black Panther Party official Eldridge Cleaver or Timothy Leary, both of whom sought political exile in that country as a means of continuing their revolutionary activity and avoiding time in federal prison.

A more direct criticism of the FBI appeared in Arlo Guthrie’s spoken piece, “The Pause of Mr. Clause.” This ridiculed the age, the attitude, and the actions of the stereotypical FBI agent, whom Guthrie referred to as “our boys” in “a great American organization.” Such nomenclature suggested a sense of friendliness between the FBI and Guthrie, a relationship that would not have existed between a political subject and an institutional pawn hired to watch him for any signs of illegal activity conducive to arrest. Guthrie feigned commiseration with the common FBI agent by sarcastically claiming, “It’s hard to be an FBI man. First of all, to be an FBI man you have to be over 40 years old, and the reason is that it takes at least 25 years with the organization to be that much
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163 Country Joe McDonald, “Air Algiers,” *Hold On It’s Coming*, Vanguard 79314, long-playing record. This album also contains “Mr. Big Pig,” McDonald’s satire of a cocky police officer.
164 The Weather Underground was instrumental in helping Leary to break out of the penitentiary. Some detail regarding Leary’s interaction with Cleaver and the Black Panthers in Algeria is found in Lee and Shlain, *Acid Dreams*, 267-268.
165 Arlo Guthrie, “The Pause of Mr. Clause,” in *This is the Arlo Guthrie Book* (New York: Amsco Music Publishing Company, 1969), 44.
of a bastard.”¹⁶⁶ This statement connoted Guthrie’s lack of respect for the agent, and also built upon the ubiquitous classic counterculture adage “don’t trust anybody over thirty.”¹⁶⁷ Guthrie exposed the supposed thoroughness of engaging in surveillance, which to the folksinger bordered on the ridiculous:

I’m out on the highway and I’m driving down the road, and I run out of gasoline. I pull over to the side of the road. They gotta pull over too. Make believe that they ran out. I go to get some gasoline. They have to figure out whether they should stick with the car or follow me. Suppose I don’t come back and they’re staying with the car.¹⁶⁸

For Guthrie, FBI surveillance was not only thorough; it was unwarranted. He expressed this through the story of a lonely, possibly mentally-unstable man for whom “nothin’s happenin’” until the moment when after begging for a dime he called the FBI to declare “I dig Uncle Ho and Chairman Mao, and their friends are comin’ over for dinner.”¹⁶⁹ Whereas a government institution uninterested in repression would have dismissed this as a crank call from a mentally ill man, who posed little threat to the American system, the FBI, as Guthrie hyperbolized, would have “got[ten] 30,000 feet of tape rolling! Files on tape. Picture, movies, dramas, actions on tape . . . to find out all they can about this guy!”¹⁷⁰ Arguing that the FBI was everywhere it should not be, Guthrie concluded:

And that’s why tonight I’d like to dedicate it [this spoken introduction to his next song] to every FBI man in the audience. I know you can’t say nothing. You can’t get up and say “Hi,” ‘cause then everybody knows that you’re an FBI man. . . . So you can’t get up and say nothin’ cause [sic.] otherwise you gotta get sent back to the factory, and that’s a drag for you and it’s an expense for the government. . . .¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.
¹⁶⁸ Guthrie, “The Pause of Mr. Clause,” 44.
¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 45.
¹⁷⁰ Ibid.
¹⁷¹ Ibid.
Here Guthrie attempted to call out the FBI for an accounting of its clandestine doings. Such ideas about the extent to which government concern, surveillance, and repression existed paralleled Pete Seeger’s interpretation of his being called before HUAC in the mid-fifties; neither of these musicians believed that the federal government’s activity was appropriate or warrantable. Doing more than just laughing at the extent of FBI engagement, however, Guthrie’s most famous work, “Alice’s Restaurant” – which also inspired an eponymous book and film, expanded his criticism of state officials, particularly, the draft board, the court system, and police officers in rural Massachusetts.

“Alice’s Restaurant,” Arlo Guthrie’s largely autobiographical song, first performed at the 1967 Newport Folk Festival, satirized both the folk singer’s 1965 arrest for littering and his displeasure with the draft board. The song, as well as the 1969 film it inspired, recounted a 1965 Thanksgiving dinner in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, after which Guthrie and his friend disposed of several bags of garbage illegally, because the town dump was closed for the holiday. While the song did not necessarily advocate illegal littering, it did parody the response of Stockbridge police “Officer Obie” (named Officer William Obanhein in real life) who arrested Guthrie. Lampooning Obanhein’s response to the situation, the song and movie showed him confiscating the toilet paper roll in the jail cell to prevent Guthrie, the song’s narrator and movie’s protagonist, from escaping out the window by using the roll as a slide, a clearly preposterous instance. Detailing Obanhein’s testimony at the resultant court date, the song’s lyrics (as quoted in the movie) described the police officer as introducing “twenty seven eight-by-ten color glossy pictures with circles and arrows and a paragraph on the back of each one,” a
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clearly excessive documenting of a mere littering arrest. Through these examples, Guthrie’s lyrics and story parodied what he interpreted as an instance of a police officer overreacting to what he found problematic behavior within the boundaries of public space. Similar to his argument in “The Pause of Mr. Clause” and that of the Fugs in “CIA Man,” Guthrie asserted that the police were in places where they did not belong.

The remainder of Guthrie’s song and its respective film demonstrated the singer’s advocacy of finding a means to avoid the draft and countering the demands of those responsible for its continuation. This culminated with Guthrie’s suggestion that if any potential draftee were to go into his draft board singing the lyrics to “Alice’s Restaurant,” then a movement of such persons rejected for induction would populate the U.S., thus (as Guthrie himself was doing) undermining the military’s war efforts. Moreover, a scene in the film depicting the 1965 Thanksgiving dinner revealed one character discussing the necessity of finding a route across the Canadian border, a common method of draft evasion. Besides sympathizing with draft resistance, Guthrie excoriated enlisted military officials, including a psychiatrist who in both the song and film jumped around with the protagonist while screaming the word “kill,” signifying Guthrie’s discontent with the overt violence of those military officials supportive of America’s actions during the Vietnam War.

Both song and film criticized more than the military—they also questioned the authority of federal government agencies in Washington D.C. The protagonist Guthrie was neither accepted into the Army nor able to prevent his fingerprints from being sent to Washington, D.C., (the site of the FBI’s main headquarters) for further investigation.

174 Ibid.
175 Ibid.
The illustrated book of lyrics that Guthrie published for this song included a drawing of these fingerprints enlarged to a height taller than several human beings and accenting the presence of a raised middle finger.\textsuperscript{176} This represented Guthrie’s disdain for the policy of fingerprinting citizens, which he interpreted as an invasion of privacy. Literally and metaphorically, Guthrie was raising his middle finger at a government that had called him into its draft center as part of a bureaucratic practice supportive of a war with which Guthrie disagreed and arguably found more outrageous than his arrest for littering. Thus, Guthrie not only expressed his discontent with such hegemonic institutions as the military and the FBI, but also laughed at their foundation in the process. The back cover of this lyric book quoted the \textit{New York Times} critic Richard Goldstein’s interpretation of the song as “a contemporary account of spiraling absurdity . . . [in which he] simply ignores their power. Grooving on the absurdity of it all is his final triumph.”\textsuperscript{177}

Ironically, this “triumph” of questioning the hegemony of the Stockbridge, Massachusetts police department, the FBI, and the U.S. Military’s draft board contradicted Guthrie’s real-life support from Stockbridge, Massachusetts police officer William Obanhein, whom Guthrie befriended despite the arrest. Also, several real-life draft board officials appeared in the movie.\textsuperscript{178} Obanhein likely appeared in the film for fame or money, as did the few real-life military and selective service officials who, according to Guthrie, had asked to participate in the movie shoot, thinking that it would be an exciting experience.\textsuperscript{179} Interestingly, for Obanhein and these military officials, the film’s encouragement of such illicit activities as marijuana smoking and draft evasion did

\textsuperscript{176} Arlo Guthrie, \textit{Alice’s Restaurant} (New York: Grove Press, 1968), no page number.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., back cover.
\textsuperscript{178} Guthrie’s relationship with these individuals is explained in the audio commentary track on \textit{Alice’s Restaurant}, dir. Arthur Penn, 1969, MGM, 2001, DVD.
\textsuperscript{179} Ibid.
not preclude their participation. Their appearance henceforth indirectly and implicitly compounded Guthrie’s satire of the excessiveness of both the Stockbridge, Massachusetts police department and the U.S. military. Ironically, this suggested either that the folk singer’s satire was not all that seditious, or that it was slightly subversive, yet still palatable to a mainstream audience that nevertheless recognized the imperfections of the police and military. While this interpretation could have appealed to supporters of the military or police, the sympathies and lyrics of both song and film clearly sided with the counterculture (and not the police or military whom were seen as antagonistic). The film asserted its favoritism of the counterculture over the police during a scene where after Guthrie and a friend were attacked on account of their long hair, they received criticism from Montana police officers instead of the sympathy that would naturally be expected as victims. In whole, the film, the songbook, and the lyrics all questioned whether police officers were a blessing or a nuisance for the rock counterculture. Furthermore, all could have coaxed some listeners into thinking critically about the values and methods of the military, the FBI, and police departments.

Whereas the antiauthoritarian acts and lyrics of the previous musicians arose from political differences, the otherwise somewhat apolitical Janis Joplin antagonized Tampa, Florida police officers for their treatment of her audience while she was onstage. Joplin, who the historian Alice Echols argues was most infamous for challenging dominant paradigms of race and gender alongside the growing Women’s Liberation Movement, was arrested in November 1969 for verbally berating and even threatening to kick an officer attempting to prevent fans from dancing.\textsuperscript{180} As Echols explains, after the August 1969 Woodstock Festival, rock became more commercialized as an increasing number of

\textsuperscript{180} Echols, \textit{Scars of Sweet Paradise}, xii, 265-268.
performers had become famous (and economically profitable) enough to appear at larger arenas instead of medium-sized ballrooms or dance halls.\textsuperscript{181} Moreover, these corporate or civic-owned arenas often relied upon actual police officers for security.\textsuperscript{182} Had Joplin performed that night in a different venue, it is possible that her outburst might not have occurred, because there would not have been a police presence focused on preventing any possible damage that could result from a dancing, “unruly” audience. Nevertheless, the story revealed underlying tensions and likely distrust between Joplin and police officers hired to work security.\textsuperscript{183}

Similar examples of performer conflicts with police officers were common occurrences at the Jefferson Airplane’s concerts. In fact, during a 1971 interview that the countercultural heroes Abbie and Anita Hoffman conducted with the band’s singer Grace Slick and guitarist Paul Kantner, the latter pair described their demographic audience member as approximately twenty-years-old and devoted to dancing fervently whilst ready to fight against all police officers attempting to patrol the aisles.\textsuperscript{184} Slick even implied that in 1971, her audience was more antagonistic towards the presence of law enforcement officials than it would have been previously.\textsuperscript{185} Perhaps this change in the audience’s behavior was the result of escalating tensions between youth and the representatives of a repressive state whose National Guard members had killed peers of

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid., xix, 265.
\textsuperscript{182} Ibid., 267.
\textsuperscript{183} Echols implies that Joplin’s decision to move out of the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco may have arisen from the police’s publicized October 1967 raid on the Grateful Dead’s communal home. See ibid., 188-190. If this is true, then one can conclude that Joplin distrusted the authorities, despite expressing such sentiments less frequently than her peers like the Doors and the Jefferson Airplane did.
\textsuperscript{185} Ibid. The FBI’s San Francisco office mentioned this article in a confidential documentary summarizing what they believed to be Slick’s beliefs. See August 14, 1970 report “Grace W. Slick, nee Grace Barnett Wing,” in Jefferson Airplane FBI File (available through the Freedom of Information Act).
the audience’s age during the May 1970 shooting at Kent State. The FBI has noted that “in 1970 alone, an estimated 3,000 bombings and 50,000 bomb threats occurred in United States.”\(^\text{186}\) As scholars like James Kirkpatrick Davis have noted, the increase of violent actions against the state corresponded with the intensified surveillance of leftist organizations.\(^\text{187}\) Thus, Slick’s beliefs and ideas were very similar to many of her fans, although Slick, of course, did not engage in any actual bombings or killings herself. Amidst such a contentious climate, this was just one example of the Airplane’s numerous battles with the law.

Various biographies and autobiographies about the Jefferson Airplane have noted their adverse relationship to the law. Biographer Jeff Tamarkin has noted one instance where Miami, Florida police arrested Paul Kantner for cursing them and shouting, “Wait till we burn down your society.”\(^\text{188}\) Considering the number of riots across America during the late 1960s, such rhetoric demonstrated the public disorder and property destruction that the police most feared. In her autobiography, Grace Slick remembered Kantner’s outburst as the result of the police’s efforts to impose a curfew. Kantner, who acted unfazed by the arrest, allegedly placed LSD in an open bourbon bottle resting on an officer’s desk following his quick release on bail.\(^\text{189}\) Some might have considered this playful; others spiteful; yet, it was definitely an act that would have upset those sworn to uphold the law and amused those favorable of illegal psychedelic drugs or rock culture. Speaking to Abbie Hoffman in the interview mentioned above, Kantner even took pride

\(^\text{187}\) James Kirkpatrick Davis, *Assault on the Left, passim.*
in the incident: “We’ve never really gotten hassled. I got busted once in Florida for disturbing the peace but it was humorous. I was in jail for about an hour and a half. Got right out. No hassles.” Compounding the disregard for authority associated with the guitarist’s psychedelic spiking of the officer’s bourbon, Kantner asserted a lack of fear. Such brashness against law enforcement also manifested itself in the chorus of the group’s 1971 song, “Law Man”: “Law man. I’m afraid you just walked in here at the wrong time / My old man’s gun has never been fired. / But there’s a first time and this could be, this could be the first time.”

Understanding that band members vocalized this antagonistic attitude regularly, one could easily comprehend the backstage arrest of Kantner and Slick following an August 1972 concert in Akron, Ohio. As *Rolling Stone* reported, “the cops said [that Chick] Casady [the band’s manager] was urging that pigs be killed,” as the police security detail encouraged the audience to leave the venue. For these remarks Casady was arrested backstage, just like in New Haven, Connecticut in 1967 when Jim Morrison of the Doors was arrested for verbally berating the New Haven police. According to Slick, as this occurred, she was walking around without her glasses. To keep herself afoot after stumbling blindly, she grabbed onto one of the officers, leading to her arrest for supposedly attacking him. Momentarily, the irate Kantner was also subdued and arrested. The quickness at which such arrests occurred demonstrated that law enforcement may have prejudged Slick and Kantner as criminals due to their anti-law enforcement rhetoric. Furthermore, the police that evening were also concerned by issues

of crowd control and a bomb threat. An arrest could also have dissuaded the band from considering a return visit.

Such arrests for the Airplane were indicative of the tensions between police and the performers of the 1960s and early 1970s; they were not as constant after the early 1970s as were the arrests of Deadheads outside of Grateful Dead concerts up until Jerry Garcia’s 1995 death. Later remembering the band’s 1989 reunion tour, a highly profitable and “corporate” affair, Slick would write: “Did we tell cops to eat shit and die? Not at all. Several ‘lawmen’ were in the paying audience, and they were half our age.” While addressing this shift in rhetoric and beliefs, Slick did not specify why the band refrained from antagonizing the authorities during its reunion, but instead implied that the band members’ aging had led them to be less rebellious than their previous incarnations. It is notable that many of the social issues, that had incensed the band, such as the Vietnam War, had long since ended by 1989. Moreover, as the band was using fewer if any drugs in 1989, they had little reason to fear arrest, thus lessening whatever differences they had with the authorities.

The story of rebelling against police officers persisted in the highly romanticized legacy of the Airplane’s contemporaries, the Doors and Jim Morrison. Due to the sensationalism of Oliver Stone’s 1991 film The Doors and the immensely popular Doors biography No One Here Gets Out Alive by Jerry Hopkins and Danny Sugerman, Jim Morrison came to represent the popular memory of the tensions between police officers
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and the rock community. Such depictions usually included the narration of Morrison’s December 9, 1967 onstage arrest in New Haven, Connecticut. Backstage before the concert, a police officer mistaking Morrison for a trespasser ordered the singer to stop interacting intimately with a young woman and depart from the performers-only area. Morrison’s refusal to leave and demonstration of obscene gestures prompted the officer to spray him with mace. Despite the officer’s apology, Morrison publicized the incident onstage. Unwilling to hear Morrison incite the crowd with anti-police rhetoric, the New Haven police ordered for the houselights to be turned up before walking onstage to arrest Morrison for “indecent and immoral exhibition.”²⁰⁸ Also arrested were a *Life* magazine photographer and a newspaper reporter. The audience reacted by rioting.²⁰⁹ The crowd’s reaction demonstrated the fears that rock’s critics like the Reverend David A. Noebel had expressed about rock fandom. If police officers at concerts attempted to silence rock’s heroes, audiences rebelled.

While this marked Morrison’s first onstage arrest, the singer encountered further trouble with law enforcement officials in Miami, Florida following a March 1969 performance in which he exhibited blatant intoxication, invited audience members onstage, removed a police officer’s hat which he then tossed into the crowd, allegedly pushed three police officers (as reported by the Miami press), and ostensibly exposed his penis.²⁰⁰ Days later, the Dade County’s Sheriff Office charged him with “lewd and
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²⁰⁰ Hopkins and Sugerman, *No One Here Gets Out Alive*, 227-238. Whether Morrison actually exposed himself is one of the most notorious questions in rock history, mythology, and hagiography. Morrison’s keyboardist Ray Manzarek contends that Morrison never actually exposed himself, but persuaded the audience to believe that he had. He also points out interestingly, that after the concert, the band drank beer
lascivious behavior,” “indecent exposure,” “drunkenness,” and “profanity,” charges that could have resultantly led to a prison sentence of approximately seven-and-a-half years (and the effects of which will be discussed in Chapter Four of this study).\textsuperscript{201} Despite the severity of these offenses, they represented just one more incident in the group’s history with the police.

Doors keyboardist Ray Manzarek would remember the band’s first major confrontation with police that resulted in Morrison’s arrest as the outcome of a party hosted in July 1967 in commemoration of the ascent of the song “Light My Fire” to #1 on the \textit{Billboard} singles charts.\textsuperscript{202} Since the \textit{Billboard} charts were the industry’s standard means of tracing sales and radio airplay, the event had public importance. The behavior of an inebriated Morrison led the manager of the Delmonico Hotel to call for the New York Police Department, whose officers shut down the party. While the arrest triggered little public outcry by the band or its fans at the time, Manzarek would later interpret the event as “perhaps, one of the first confrontations between the counterculture and the blue muscle-arm of the Establishment, which would culminate in the Chicago police riots at the Democratic National Convention and the murder of four college students by the National Guard at Kent State University.”\textsuperscript{203} Considering the changes wrought by the passage of time and the creation of memory, a historian could wonder whether Manzarek would have spoken about the “blue muscle-arm” in such a manner to his contemporaries with the police officers backstage, and that no citations for arrests were made for several days. Manzarek, \textit{Light My Fire}, 315, 318. Another of Morrison’s band mates, drummer John Densmore, believes that Morrison did not expose himself. Instead, argues Densmore, “some parents got curious about their kids coming home half clothed, called the local politicians, and they decided to use Jim as an example of moral decay. Or it was some right-wing bullshit plot.” John Densmore, \textit{Riders on the Storm: My Life with Jim Morrison and the Doors} (New York: Dell Publishing, 1990), 220. Densmore’s perspective underscores the extent to which many authorities viewed rock as dangerous to the stability of American society.

\textsuperscript{201} Hopkins and Sugerman, \textit{No One Here Gets Out Alive}, 236-237.  
\textsuperscript{202} Manzarek, \textit{Light My Fire}, 229.  
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in 1967. After all, the presence of violent rhetoric against the state intensified as the decade progressed. Nevertheless, the Doors’ legacy would be remembered as one of struggle against police officers. Clearly, law enforcement officials viewed Jim Morrison’s rhetoric as a threat to public order and codes of morality. Moreover, these officials likely feared that Morrison’s actions could incite audiences into the destruction of the civic and private property to which they were sworn to protect. Also, while Morrison’s actions in these instances did not necessarily order audiences to attack police officers physically, other groups like the MC5 and Jefferson Airplane were far more evocative.

B. Rock’s Connotations of Violence:

Rock’s common disdain for police officers (as epitomized in songs like the Jefferson Airplane’s “Lawman”) was complemented at times by a posturing of violent protest against institutions supportive of the Vietnam War. Writing about the New Left’s October 21, 1967 efforts to “exorcise the Pentagon” as a reaction against the Vietnam War, the novelist and journalist Norman Mailer defined the protestors as “the armies of the night,” engaged in an act of civil warfare against the Pentagon’s promotion of the Vietnam War.204 While the event itself manifested the anger of the growing antiwar movement, including many people completely disassociated from rock, Mailer described many of the attendees (some of whom were arrested) as “hippies on the trail of Sergeant Pepper” that were encouraging the military troops assigned to protect the Pentagon to abandon their government’s orders and join the antiwar movement instead.205 Mailer’s allusion to the consumers of the Beatles 1967 Sergeant Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club

205 Ibid., 270.
 Bands served as a metaphor for those antiwar protestors who did not step back from a literal fight against the Vietnam War. Supporting this idea was Mailer’s description of the centrality of the Fugs vocalist Ed Sanders, who in conjunction with his band’s performance at the protest, demanded the burning of money (an illegal, yet metaphorical act of violence), and ceremonially “call[ed] on the demons of the Pentagon to rid themselves of the cancerous tumors of the war generals” responsible for the country’s actions in Vietnam.\textsuperscript{206} Apart from the Fugs, the protestors at this event were not rock musicians; nevertheless, the idea that rock could complement violent resistance shined clearly through Mailer’s account of the symbolic violence invoked by Sanders’s theatrics.

Photographs depicted the folk-rocker David Crosby and the hard-rocking MC5 as posturing with guns in a stance that metaphorically brought Norman Mailer’s equation of rock with violent resistance beyond the “exorcism of the Pentagon.” One 1970 photograph depicted Crosby as a shirtless, and thus primal, masculine, and potentially dangerous individual who would not think before acting due to his naked vulnerability, pointing a gun painted like the American flag at his head. A caption beneath a copy of this image as published in one of Crosby’s later memoirs interpreted this photograph as a metaphor for Crosby’s fear of the government during that period.\textsuperscript{207} Crosby was neither a pacifist nor a participant on the frontline of the antiwar movement;\textsuperscript{208} nevertheless, his

\textsuperscript{{206}Ibid., 122.}\textsuperscript{{207}David Crosby and Carl Gottlieb, Long Time Gone: The Autobiography of David Crosby (New York: Doubleday, 1988), no page number.}\textsuperscript{{208}In reference to his political stance on peace and war, Crosby writes, “I’m not a pacifist by any stretch of the imagination. I’m anti-war, which is an altogether different ballgame. War is an extension of politics and war is usually based on a massive greed for power. War is guys who never risk themselves going in and forcing a situation to happen: men and women with no choice then have to risk their lives and lose them. I’m totally anti[[-]draft. I believe that any politician who wants to start a war should have to lead it. Physically, personally, and as the point man. Then I’ll listen—any guy that wants me to get into a battle and is willing to lead me into it, I’ll listen to him. But if someone says, ‘You boys go fight for this [be]cause because your government says [that] it’s right,’ I know he’s a crock of shit” (ibid., 247). Though
belief that he was at war with the government was evident in his participation in the recording of Neil Young’s “Ohio” days after the May 4, 1970 Kent State shootings. In Crosby’s words, “[T]he record was out within days. It was on the street within a week of the event. With the finger firmly pointed right where the guilt lay: Nixon and the warmongers. At that point, we were powerful. We affected the world, right then.”

Thus, for Crosby, Young’s lyrics provided an opportunity to strike back at the National Guard, the President, and anyone else whom he deemed responsible for what he believed was the murder of four students at an antiwar protest on the Kent State campus.

Like Crosby, members of the MC5 were photographed with guns. Instead of being the victims, they posed as potential aggressors. A promotional photograph taken on behalf of their debut album, *Kick Out the Jams*, revealed the band mates bare-chested (a stance connotative of revolutionary masculinity and violence akin to that of a half-clad boxer) with buttons representing the White Panther Party (John Sinclair’s revolutionary, communal organization modeled after the Black Panther Party), with one member festooned with an ammunition belt. In other shots, drummer Dennis Thompson brandished a rifle, while Rob Tyner posed with a rifle and a saxophone crossed over his head. Extending this metaphor, Sinclair himself wrote in December 1968 that “rock and roll is a weapon of cultural revolution.”

Yet, for Sinclair, the revolution against the American state was more than just metaphorical or cultural. The platform of
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Sinclair’s White Panther Party included such demands as: the release of all prisoners (including convicted criminals incarcerated by the state), “no more conscripted armies” sending troops to Vietnam, “the end of money” – which of course was necessary to sustain the capitalist economy upon which the U.S. was built, and “All power to the people”- a process that would have completely undermined the ostensible power of the executive branch and law enforcement officials. Moreover, the White Panthers pledged solidarity with the Black Panther Party at a time when police officers nationwide in addition to the FBI sought to obliterate the revolutionary black nationalist organization that had demanded its right to bear arms and publicized a harsh, direct criticism of police brutality. As Jeff A. Hale argues, much of the Panthers’ violent rhetoric (including the MC5’s lyrics) was “tongue-in-cheek,” although law enforcement officials in Detroit and Ann Arbor, as well as the FBI, believed otherwise, especially considering the violence of the 1967 race riots in Detroit. Furthermore, in 1969, the federal government indicted Sinclair and two other members of White Panthers (who were neither musicians nor in the MC5) with conspiracy charges related to a 1968 explosion at a CIA office building in Ann Arbor. This event was completely unrelated to the MC5 aside from the band’s connection to the accused, who at the time of the indictment was no longer the band’s manager; nonetheless, the group’s money and notoriety did help to publicize the White Panthers’ existence.

214 The White Panther Party’s “ten-point platform” is reprinted in ibid., 91.
215 Ibid., 91. Facsimiles of primary documents exposing the Bureau’s attempt to destroy the Panthers via its COINTELPRO programs appear in Ward Churchill and Jim Vanderwall, eds., The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI’s Secret War against Domestic Dissent (South End Press: Boston, 1991). A solid explication of the Panthers’ ideology is found in Ogbar, Black Power, 69-122.
217 Sinclair describes this incident in Guitar Army, 286-293. For an analysis of the resulting trial, see Hale, Wiretapping and National Security, passim.
Despite the MC5’s connection to the White Panther Party, the band itself advocated violence in the lyrics of its 1968 song, “Motor City Is Burning.” Generating a modicum of notoriety as a single, the song rose to number eighty-two on the *Billboard* charts.\(^{218}\) It became a concert staple and appeared on their first LP, *Kick Out The Jams*.\(^{219}\) A commentary on the 1967 Detroit race riot, the song’s lyrics praised “Black Panther snipers” for shooting at the firefighters, police officers, and National Guardsmen ordered to subdue the riot and arrest anyone found damaging property or committing arson.\(^{220}\) When the song’s narrator contended, “I’d just like to strike a match for freedom myself / I may be a white boy, but I can be bad too,” he was threatening a similar desire to damage both private and public property as a means of demonstrating against the racist and economic inequalities of a society protected by such institutions as the Detroit Police Department and the National Guard.\(^{221}\) Moreover, the line “I can be bad too,” suggested an alliance between the white band and the Black Panthers, suggesting that both entities were in violent resistance against the same oppressive racist system. This idea foreshadowed arguments made in an April 20, 1969 press release from Trans-Love Energies, the communal organization enveloping the MC5 and White Panther Party which argued that “Along with attempts to silence, arrest, and confine the leadership of the black community, the odious forces of repression inherent in capitalistic societies have begun to strip the young white communities of their spokesmen.”\(^{222}\) Such actions resulted in what Trans-Love Energies referred to as “Fears of pig plots to get Sinclair and
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stop the MC5,” leading to the arrest of the band’s manager during the MC5’s excursion to
play a scheduled concert in Canada. Both this 1969 press release and the 1968 song
“Motor City Is Burning” demonstrated the band and manager’s refusal to cower before
such oppression. Concluding with the lines, “Let it all burn / let it all burn,” the song’s
narrator unabashedly maintained that any opponents of the band, the White Panther Party,
or the black Detroit rioters would suffer a violent demise. This attitude led the Detroit
Police Department’s red squad to place the aforementioned press release in their
surveillance file on John Sinclair.

As scholar David Carson has discovered, some MC5 members would later
undermine any associations of violence by suggesting that the band favored music over
revolution (and that if they had not been associated with Sinclair, they may have
presented themselves differently):

The politics of John Sinclair ‘confused’ Dennis Thompson: ‘John was
getting too biased toward the politics. At the time, there was a lot of
camaraderie happening with SDS, the riots, the war in Vietnam and so
forth. So there was some polarization on the left and because John’s in
that mix, we become part of that mix. It was hard for us to separate the
politics from the music at that point.’ What about photos of Thompson
wearing a bullet belt strapped around his chest? ‘It was done tongue in
cheek,’ says the MC5 drummer. ‘It wasn’t like we were guerillas in the
mountains. We weren’t guys with guns. People should know that there
was an awareness inside the band [and] that we weren’t that fuckin’
stupid. It was veering from the music, and the music is what it was about.
It was about rock ‘n’ roll music. Sure, politics got us a lot of press, but we
really wanted to be a big, big rock ‘n’ roll band, not just Sinclair’s
personal political platform. We believed in politics and philosophy, but
we didn’t want to teach.
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Despite Thompson’s disassociation from violence, greater-Detroit and Ann Arbor law enforcement authorities did take the band’s posturing seriously, especially in the context of their union with the White Panther Party, the arrests that took place at some of their concerts, and the violence of 1968 and 1969. Furthermore, as suggested by historian and music scholar Steve Waksman, the band’s popularity with its audience was galvanized by its battle with the police. Waksman writes:

As performing music and going to shows became contested activities, both the crowds and the band were compelled to take sides if they were to hold on to ‘their’ culture in the face of police and club owners fearful of disorder. The actions of the police did much to cement the sense of solidarity between the MC5 and its audience, and also contributed significantly to the band’s politicization.  

Waksman’s argument undermines Thompson’s more recent attempts to disassociate the MC5 from revolutionary assertions by situating the band’s presence within the discursive perimeters of rock versus police.

This theme also permeated the history of the Doors. Though different from the MC5 through their non-association with any particular party of political revolutionaries, the Doors were similar in that they for a time shared the same record label (Elektra), incited rioting at their concerts, and in their 1968 song “Five to One” presented lyrics in which a narrator encouraged violence as a means of obliterating social inequalities. “Five to One” referred to a generational distance between the nation’s youth (many of whom faced the possibility of being sent to Vietnam) and their elders (representing the military and political authorities responsible for the war). Similar to the narrator of “Motor City Is Burning,” Jim Morrison dictated through the lines, “They got the guns, but we got the
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numbers / Gonna win, yeah, we’re taking over / Come on,” that because the “old” military establishment commanded weaponry, then the youth’s revolutionary struggle would be violent. Nevertheless, through its numerical strength, the revolution would succeed, argued Morrison. Such rebellious sentiments would have concerned law enforcement officials committed to stopping violent protests, especially during the tumultuous year of 1968, which wrought the escalation of antiwar protests as well as a series of race riots following the April assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Furthermore, as rock’s lyrics were largely appropriated and used as an inspiration tool by political activists already committed to fomenting change and combating an oppressive political system deemed responsible for racism, economic inequality, and the Vietnam War.

Conclusion:

This chapter has argued that before and during the “Long Sixties,” folk and rock music were rooted in counter-hegemonic traditions that often challenged parental and law enforcement authorities on both the national and local level. Such genres were more than a forum for entertainment; in fact, one’s role as a folk or rock listener or concertgoer often demonstrated a subversive attitude towards the dominant political or cultural order in myriad ways. Such music sometimes commented on, and provided support for, various organizations connected to the period’s progressive, civil rights, and antiwar movements, in an era when law enforcement officials worried about the potential disturbances which such protestors could incite. Consequently, folk and rock were
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important elements to participants in both the New Left and the counterculture. The performance of such music in public space demonstrated tensions related to volume, an increasing use of psychedelic drugs and marijuana, and changing standards regarding sexuality and appropriate behavior in public. The rhetoric of this music often challenged the authority of the FBI, the CIA, and local police departments. While some of this violence and resistance was sometimes nothing but metaphorical or merely subversive, law enforcement authorities frequently sought to police it. Chapter Two examines more deeply the connections between folk and rock musicians and political groups whose beliefs and actions generated varying degrees of harassment, surveillance, or repression.
Chapter Two: How Revolutionaries and Political Activists Used Folk and Rock in Support of Their Ideological Beliefs:

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the genres and performers of folk and rock inspired and complemented the thoughts and actions of many political activists. As the historian Jon Wiener argues in his monograph regarding the politics of John Lennon and the consequential FBI surveillance that resulted, mainstream publications such as *Time* magazine, some employees or supporters of the government, and the counterculture all viewed rock music as a potentially incendiary force. At the same time, however, corporate America generated considerable capital from the commercialization of rock. ¹ Consequently, not all aspects of folk and rock were viewed as counter-hegemonic or subversive, particularly as such music was appropriated and co-opted by corporate and hegemonic political institutions. Nonetheless, as Wiener demonstrates in the case of John Lennon:

Rock could become a real political force, however, when it was linked to real political organizing. The 1972 anti-Nixon tour John Lennon planned with Jerry Rubin and Rennie Davis was intended to forge that link. Many others worked on similar projects, including radio stations like Boston’s WBCN, which mixed music that challenged the status quo with news about protest movements. ²

While it is myopic to suggest that all rock listeners and musicians, some of whom were interested solely in entertainment, would have equated rock with any type of political activism, a number of stalwart political radicals did use music as a tool of resistance. Many of them viewed the music and its culture as synonymous with their revolutionary or radical efforts to create a new society accepting of communal, egalitarian fellowship outside of corporate control. This society would be disassociated from the racist,
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imperialist, and capitalist materialism associated with the Cold and Vietnam Wars. Such activists included Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, the Black Panther Party, and the troops in the G.I. Movement that sought to stop the Vietnam War.

I. Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, the Yippies, and the Chicago Conspiracy:

Two of the most visible 1960s political activists who warranted government surveillance were Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman. Both men advocated psychedelic drug use, achieved notoriety as founding members of the politically-active countercultural group, the Yippies (Youth International Party), and were tried during the Chicago Seven conspiracy trial emanating from the chaos outside of the 1968 Democratic National Committee Convention (DNC). In addition to their well-publicized attempts to stage the rock-oriented Festival of Life as a means of protesting against the official platform of the Democratic National Committee, Rubin and Hoffman’s criticism of the state and political utilization of rock persisted through both their published manifestos and behavior during and following the Chicago Conspiracy Trial.

A brash critic of American capitalism and imperialist participation in the Vietnam War, Jerry Rubin actively promoted revolution. Rubin’s actions and rhetoric underscored his status as a revolutionary fearless of any authorities supportive of American imperialism. Many of Rubin’s theatrics, alongside and apart from his fellow Yippie, Abbie Hoffman, were inspired by rock.

A chapter in Rubin’s 1970 manifesto *Do It!* titled “Elvis Presley Killed Ike Eisenhower” expressed Rubin’s belief that listening to rock and roll music during the 1950s was an important step in his development as an opponent of state authority. In his words, “The New Left sprang, a predestined, pissed-off child, from Elvis’ gyrating
pelvis.”³ Whereas Presley’s gyrations represented the sexual freedom and self-expression typified by the New Left, Eisenhower symbolized a sexually inhibited state in which Rubin wanted no part.⁴ For Rubin and the Yippies, this connection between music and revolution persisted as 1950s rock and roll evolved into 1960s rock music. Rubin cited Bob Dylan, the Fugs, the Beatles, and the rock-friendly poet Allen Ginsberg as “teachers” whose sonic, literary oeuvre was just as meaningful to an effective revolution as were street protests and acts of draft resistance.⁵

Bringing this belief to one particular antiwar debate, Rubin once shocked an older audience of socialists by playing Bob Dylan’s “Ballad of a Thin Man” and the Beatles’ “I Am the Walrus” when he was instead supposed to offer cogent analysis of how the antiwar movement should proceed with future demonstrations.⁶ This confirmed rock’s importance to Rubin. Yet, as Rubin himself pointed out about this incident, not everyone in the antiwar movement appreciated the polemics and aesthetics of rock, or even comprehended his equation between rock appreciation and Vietnam War condemnation. Rubin complained that at an April 1967 antiwar demonstration in San Francisco, “Country Joe and the Fish were cut off during their second song to make time for more speeches. We were pissed off.”⁷ This incident demonstrated that despite Rubin’s affinity for rock as a political tool, such music was not an intrinsically rebellious instrument for those opposed to the war.

Rubin also contested that by 1970 rock music had been co-opted by capitalists averse to the subversive nature supposedly embedded in the genre’s origins. As the
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journalist Fred Goodman would later argue, entertainment corporations annually generating millions of dollars increasingly controlled the direction of rock and folk during the late 1960s, thus removing many recording artists from what Goodman defines as “that old folk ethos—making music with conscience and meaning.”

For rock to sustain a counter-hegemonic essence, Rubin believed, it needed to be directed specifically towards political action such as those contained in Rubin’s plans for the Festival of Life during the 1968 DNC. In Rubin’s words, “Beware the longhair who says he’s more ‘revolutionary than thou’ because he’s ‘beyond politics.’ Beware the guru who thinks that his thing—be it . . . rock music or pacifism—will make the revolution all by itself.” Rubin’s comment related to the countercultural debate as to how revolutionary rock could be. Since not all rock listeners wanted revolution, Rubin realized that a certain political consciousness was necessary.

Although Rubin realized that not all political activism was galvanized by rock and that by denying appropriate permits, the City of Chicago had prevented the occurrence of the intended Festival of Life as an alternative to the 1968 DNC, the August 1969 Woodstock Festival left Rubin optimistic that rock would persist as a revolutionary harbinger. Noting that an estimated 450,000 attendees had constituted so large of an audience that the commercial festival became free of charge, Rubin viewed Woodstock as a revolutionary success against both those who sought to profit economically from rock and agents representing a political entity ostensibly antagonistic to the music, hedonism, and therefore freedom of its audience. He pondered what might have
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happened at previous political demonstrations had all of Woodstock’s audience participated in them, before concluding that “millions of free young people will overwhelm every city and town in Amerika.”¹¹ Thus, in Rubin’s prediction, Woodstock was a harbinger for the fall of the materialistic, imperialistic, and oppressive “Amerika.”

A similar interpretation of how Woodstock could be the template for a new society that would transcend “Amerika” was shared by Rubin’s co-Yippie, Abbie Hoffman, who akin to Rubin, was subject to frequent surveillance and legal hassles regarding his political activity.¹² For Hoffman, rock was so central to revolution that it inspired the title of his manifesto, Woodstock Nation: A Talk-Rock Album.¹³ Scholar Jonah Raskin summarizes Hoffman’s conception of “Woodstock Nation” as “... a cultural and political entity composed of hippies and dropouts who smoked marijuana, listened to rock ‘n’ roll, and rejected the Protestant work ethic.”¹⁴ Such beliefs led to Hoffman’s presence at major rock festivals, including Woodstock, and personal relationships with musicians like Phil Ochs and the Jefferson Airplane. In a mimeographed pamphlet titled “Revolution Towards a Free Society: Yippie!” that was distributed in Chicago during August 1968 and then reproduced in his book, Revolution for the Hell of It, Hoffman defined his concept of the “revolution” that a year later he

¹¹ Ibid., 240. This misspelling of America was common in counterculture and revolutionary publications of the era. Referring to America as “Amerika” signified the activist’s condemnation of the United States’ systematized imperialist exploitation of minority groups.

¹² Detailed surveillance files on Hoffman compiled by the New York City Police Department are found in the Hoffman Family Papers, Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 4, Folders 130-132. This same collection contains the FBI’s files on Hoffman. See Box 4, Folders 133-137 and Box 7, Folders 138-163.

¹³ FBI surveillance of Hoffman led a New York-based agent to read Woodstock Nation and inform Director J. Edgar Hoover: “Hoffman makes clear the ‘Woodstock Festival’ which he describes as the ‘Woodstock Nation’ constituted a clear warning to the American establishment that it is finished in every sense... It may be said, however, the ideas of revolution to ‘bring down the system’ is prevalent throughout the entire text.” Memorandum to FBI Director from SAC, New York, January 26, 1970, in the FBI File on Abbott Howard Hoffman (available on CD-Rom through the Freedom of Information Act).

would define as “Woodstock Nation.” For Hoffman, the revolution would amongst other things, ensure the end of capitalism and money, thus creating “[a] society which works toward and actively promotes the concept of ‘full unemployment.’”\(^{15}\) It would also result in “[a] political system which is more streamlined and responsive to the needs of all the people regardless of age, sex or race,” as well as “[a] restructuring of . . . foreign policy which totally eliminates aspects of military, economic, and cultural imperialism. . .”\(^{16}\) Censorship would be non-existent; the Black Panther Party would be respected; drugs and sexual freedom would be legalized; the police would be disarmed; students and local communities would control education; and everyone would have access to an “open and free use of the media.”\(^ {17}\) Such values were clearly contrary to the dominance of American corporations, as well as a challenge to law enforcement officials, many of whom exemplified the systematic racism, classism, and sexism despised by Hoffman and his followers. They also mirrored the values of John Sinclair (as discussed in the previous chapter).

Hoffman’s efforts to build this revolutionary society coalesced at concerts. Attending the annual Newport, Rhode Island folk festivals in the early 1960s during his tenure as a SNCC organizer, Hoffman discovered that music festivals could be “organizing tools.”\(^ {18}\) Showing that he continued to hold this opinion in 1971, Hoffman wrote:

> At rock concerts, during intermission or at the end of the performance, fight your way onto the stage. Announce that if the electricity is cut off the walls will be torn down. This galvanizes the audience . . . Lay out a short exciting rap on what’s coming down. Focus on a call around one

\(^ {16}\) Ibid.
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action. Sometimes it might be good to engage rock groups in dialogues about their commitment to the revolution. For Hoffman the use of the rock concert or festival as a place for making announcements on behalf of the revolution could include mentioning whether FBI or red squad agents had interviewed specific individuals regarding a fugitive whom the revolutionaries were intending to protect. Hoffman realized that not all rock concerts or festivals were political; however, he also believed that if the counterculture (instead of corporate-minded promoters) controlled the proceedings and proceeds then the revolution would benefit. Evidence of this appears when he wrote: “The generally agreed upon flag of our nation [the “Woodstock Nation” that transcends the oppressive “Amerikan” state] is black with a red, five pointed star behind a green marijuana leaf in the center. . . . Rock concerts and festivals have their generally apolitical character instantly changed when the flag is displayed.” For Hoffman, it appeared that while rock was not intrinsically revolutionary in a political sense, the incorporation of politics into rock would ensure the revolution’s success. That was why Hoffman ensured that Woodstock Ventures, the promoters of the legendary festival, donated $10,000 and space for political activists to distribute materials. After the festival ended, thus reducing the necessity of printing political pamphlets for a rock audience of hundreds of thousands, the printing press was given to the Black Panther Party.

Outside of concerts, Hoffman associated with several rock musicians on a personal basis, viewing much of their rhetorical and cultural contributions as vital
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inspiration for revolution. For instance, during the 1967 March on the Pentagon, Anita Hoffman dressed up as Sergeant Pepper from the eponymous Beatles album, and a yellow submarine (also the subject of a Beatles song) appeared at the April 15, 1967 march to the United Nations headquarters in New York. Through Jimi Hendrix’s funding, Hoffman’s Yippies mailed three thousand marijuana joints to unknown individuals chosen at random, a stunt designed to spread the popularity of the illegal herb requisite for countercultural enjoyment.

Hoffman’s affiliation with the Jefferson Airplane’s Grace Slick led to him almost dosing the family of President Nixon with LSD. One of Slick’s college suitemates from Finch College invited the singer to attend a school reunion at the White House, since President Nixon’s daughter, Tricia, was also a graduate of that institution. Although the State Department informed the event organizer that Slick would be denied admittance, the singer decided to show up nevertheless with Hoffman as her escort. A White House guard detained them and explained to Slick, “We know you’re Grace Slick and we consider you a security risk. You’re on the FBI list.” The pair eventually departed after the White House guards decreed that only Slick would be allowed entrance. Both Slick and Hoffman, however, took great pride in how close they had come to dosing the President and his family’s tea with LSD. While Slick was invited as an alumna and not
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25 Ibid., 113. The New York division of the FBI took note of this incident by both collecting a copy of the letter that accompanied the joints, and attributing the mailing to Hoffman and associates. Interestingly, however, if the New York agents knew of Hendrix’s role, they did not mention the guitarist in their documentation. This demonstrated a differentiation of FBI interest in Hoffman and Hendrix based on the Bureau’s concern with Hoffman’s political stunts. See documents in the FBI Files on Abbot Howard Hoffman (available on CD-ROM through FOIA request).
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as one of rock’s most famous singers, her notoriety as a performer had alerted the guards of her alleged danger to the President’s family. Hoffman could have attended the affair if he was friendly with any other alumnus; however, due to his close affiliation with the rock community, he received an invitation from Slick.28

Further evidence of the inspiration that music provided for Hoffman’s radical politics appeared in his writings. His 1971 counterculture classic Steal This Book strongly advocated such illegal activities as the procurement of “free dope,” shoplifting, and building Molotov cocktails and small bombs. Its dedication, which via the phrase “Aiding and Abetting,” connoted support for unlawful activity, thanked the enemies of the American state, including the Viet Cong, the fugitives on the FBI’s Most Wanted List, and the then-exiled Timothy Leary, who had recently escaped from federal prison. Simultaneously it extended appreciation for such rock icons as Jim Morrison, Janis Joplin, and Jimi Hendrix (all of whom like Hoffman had FBI files).29 Accenting Hoffman’s equation between rock and political revolution, the book’s final paragraph referenced the Weather Underground (a group notorious for bombing police stations and government offices on behalf of an anti-imperialist, anti-Vietnam War revolution) before showing a photograph of Janis Joplin accompanied with the lyrics “Freedom’s just another word for nothin’ left to lose / nothin’ / I mean nothin’ honey if it ain’t free.”30 By juxtaposing these lyrics with his mention of the Weather Underground, Hoffman

28 Attentive to Slick’s comments regarding this incident, FBI agents in New York (home to Hoffman) and San Francisco (closest to Slick’s residence) investigated Hoffman’s relationship with the singer. They also transcribed statements from published articles in which Slick stressed her interest in dosing Presidential daughter Tricia Nixon with LSD. See Memorandum to J. Edgar Hoover from SAC, San Francisco, May 14, 1970, and Memorandum to FBI Director from SAC, New York, November 10, 1970 in the FBI File on Abbott Howard Hoffman (available on CD-Rom through the Freedom of Information Act).
29 Hoffman, Steal This Book, ix. Although these musicians all had FBI Files, theirs were much smaller than Hoffman’s, thus demonstrating that the Bureau viewed them as a much lesser threat.
30 Ibid., 308. Nearly every reader of Hoffman’s book should have recognized these lyrics from the chorus of “Me and Bobbie McGee,” a popular hit of 1971, the same year as Steal This Book’s release.
suggested that both the revolutionary organization (who had recently lost four members in a well-publicized March 1970 accidental explosion in a New York City townhouse) and Joplin, a countercultural icon who had overdosed on heroin in October 1970, had died in opposition to the oppressive American imperialism. While overdosing on heroin was not in itself a heroic act, Hoffman viewed drug use as a direct attack on societal mores and laws. Such thinking was in partial accord with what the historian Alice Echols would later interpret as Joplin’s subversion of the dominant culture’s racial and gender conventions.  

Joplin, like the Weather Underground and Hoffman, chose to do what she wanted—rather than what societal laws dictated. For Hoffman, this message would persist via the actions promoted by *Steal This Book*.

Perennially determined to combine rock aesthetics with radical politics, Rubin and Hoffman’s most visible campaign to wed performance and revolutionary politics through a festival held concurrently with the August 1968 DNC. On January 16, 1968, the countercultural underground press’s Liberation News Service publicized that Hoffman and Rubin’s Youth International Party (Yippies) intended to host the Festival of Life as a protest against amongst others: the U.S. President, the FBI Director “J. Edgar Freako,” and the potentially dead victims resultant from the Vietnam War and the “National Death Party” meeting at the convention. The press release claimed that musicians like Phil Ochs, Arlo Guthrie, Ed Sanders, and Country Joe McDonald would perform at the festival. Later, in the February 16, 1968 issue of the countercultural newspaper the *Berkeley Barb*, Rubin hinted that the festival’s performers would include
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such counterculture luminaries as Bob Dylan, the Beatles, the Jefferson Airplane, and Janis Ian. Summarizing Rubin’s intentions, the historian David Farber writes, “In Rubin’s scenario rock bands would be sharing the stage with revolutionaries and everybody would be laughing right up to the barricades.” With this idea, fellow Yippie and Fugs member Ed Sanders took charge of inviting performers. Farber’s allusion to Rubin’s thoughts of “barricades” connotes ideas of violence and a revolutionary overthrow of the government; yet, the biographer Michael Schumacher has contended that Sanders (as well as the poet Allen Ginsberg and folk singer Phil Ochs) did not share the violent proclivities of Rubin and Hoffman. Of course, state authorities would have viewed the ideology and actions of all these musicians and activists as either a nuisance or threat to the city’s stability. Nonetheless, Sanders and Ochs remained active with the Yippies both before and during the actual week of protest, August 25-30, 1968.

In preparation for the festival, the Yippies encountered numerous obstacles from Chicago officials committed to preserving law and order during a year that saw violence in numerous American cities following events like the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy. Per Abbie Hoffman’s suggestion, the Chicago-based activists, the Free City Survival Committee (with assistance from the Chicago Park District), hosted weekly rock concerts in Lincoln Park during the late spring and summer of 1968. The activists believed that holding this concert series would alleviate the fears of Chicago’s residents by introducing them to the sonic and visual experiences of rock
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before the convention began. Aside from several residential noise complaints, the series generated no major concerns, arrests, or violence. Yet, these concerts were relatively small events that attracted local teenagers and young people— not protestors from across the country. The city’s cosponsoring of this summer concert series did not mean that Chicago would issue full permits for a Festival of Life intended to draw large numbers of antiwar protestors viewed as antagonistic to the Democratic convention, or alleged drug abusers whose behavior could be distracting to the preservation of security that week. Prognosticating that the city would never issue these permits, the Chicago Free City Survival Committee feared that the actions of these protestors outside the DNC could potentially lead the Chicago Police Department to suppress their actions even after the convention had ended. The Chicago activists thus published this warning: “Don’t come to Chicago, if you expect a five-day festival of life, music and love. The word is out. Chicago may host a festival of blood.”

The Chicago Free City Survival Committee was not the only group concerned with the potential violence that could erupt. Many believed that if the Festival of Life had occurred as originally advertised, then it would have increased the number of protestors outside the convention. The chances of such a large audience troubled both the FBI and Chicago Police Department. Top FBI officials worried about rumors regarding potential bombings and the heavy drug use which they associated with the counterculture
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and New Left. Similar concerns led the City of Chicago to refuse the issuance of permits necessary for the festival’s legality. As Farber has discovered, the City’s denial of permits led almost all of the invited musicians to decline. These musicians feared that without permits, their performance would incite the violent reaction of police officers and possible arrests. Farber also contends that some activists, specifically those of a more moderate nature, avoided Chicago for the same reasons. As Todd Gitlin, a Chicago activist known for his contributions to the activist organization Students for a Democratic Society (itself a victim of FBI repression), would remember:

You [many of the potential protestors and festival-goers] stayed away if you wanted to avoid trouble and you went if you couldn’t stay away. Most of the movement stayed away. The fear, the squabbling maybe above all the lack of permits, took their toll. The tens of thousands of demonstrators once trumpeted did not materialize. A few thousand did, three or four thousand on most days, up to perhaps eight or ten thousand at the peak on Wednesday, August 28. By educated guess, at least half came from Chicago and environs. Police outnumbered demonstrators three or four to one.

Although Rubin and the Yippies repeatedly tried to secure a festival permit, when crowds arrived in Chicago’s Lincoln Park on August 25, 1968, the day Rubin and Hoffman had intended for the festival, the only band that actually performed was the MC5. Because of their close association with John Sinclair, the band had publicized their appearance in the weeks before the festival. Just weeks prior, a press release from Sinclair’s collective Trans-Love Energies publication, Sun: Free Newspaper of Rock and Roll, Dope, and Fucking in the Streets, predicted that the necessary permits would be acquired “with the added stipulation that the Festival area be left alone by Chicago
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police, who will be busy enough trying to keep the Democrat ‘candidates’ from getting murdered on stage.” 45 Such predictions of violence would have concerned the law enforcement officials that equated the counterculture with criminal activities contiguous with the dangers surrounding the Democratic conventioneers. Perhaps even more infuriating to the authorities would have been the press release’s assertion: “Unlike the Democrat scene, no one will be barred from the YIP convention, and we damn sure won’t need ‘15,000 police, troops, and FBI personnel’ (As reported in the Ann Arbor News last week) to keep us from murdering each other while we do OUR thing.” 46 Such rhetoric demonstrated a deep-rooted antagonism towards the Chicago police officers and FBI agents determined to squash dissent outside the DNC. Also, the appearance of so few musicians revealed a widespread unwillingness to appear in such a contentious environment, especially without permits and amidst so many law enforcement officials.

Consequently, the Yippies’ intended festival was quite short. Minus his band the Fugs, Ed Sanders read a few poems. When the MC5 began its set, tensions quickly escalated between the assembled crowd and the police, causing the band to shorten its performance and return home to Michigan. Following the band’s rapid departure, some skirmishing persisted inside of Lincoln Park until the police forcefully drove the protestors away that evening. 47 Clearly, the Festival of Life never amounted to its planners’ intentions, while the MC5 delivered a quite limited amount of incendiary encouragement. The police presence highlighted the contentiousness of rock as the Chicago Police Department and FBI assembled for purposes of repression. So concerned
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were the Chicago police and the FBI with maintaining order, that at least one historian states that an estimated one in six non-uniformed attendees were undercover officers or government agents.\textsuperscript{48} The clash between protestors and police in Lincoln Park continued during the convention week, intensifying three days later in Grant Park and the streets of Chicago as part of various protests, not all of which were associated with the Yippies.

Yippie associate and folksinger Phil Ochs either witnessed or participated in many of these events. Interestingly, the campaign staff for the Democratic candidate Eugene McCarthy hosted Ochs’s hotel stay. Even after McCarthy, the candidate seen as most likely to end the Vietnam War, lost the Presidential nomination to the more bellicose Hubert Humphrey, Ochs hoped that the Democratic Party would adopt a peace platform.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, Ochs, unlike some of his fellow activists and Yippie associates, particularly Jerry Rubin, was more willing to work with the Democratic Party instead of demanding revolution.\textsuperscript{50} As remembered by the peace activist David Dellinger, whose own dedication to non-violent civil disobedience and political activity before, during, and after the events in Chicago resulted in strenuous arrests and trials, Ochs worked alongside him to discourage protestors from clashing with police outside of Chicago’s Hilton Hotel, at which many delegates were housed.\textsuperscript{51}

While working alongside Rubin as well as the nameless protestors who were either arrested or attacked by police that week, Ochs found his political beliefs challenged. That week Ochs, Rubin, and other Yippie participants, were arrested at a theatrical ceremony mocking the choosing of the Democratic Presidential candidate.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 170.
\textsuperscript{49} Schumacher, \textit{There But for Fortune}, 194, 199-201.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 183-184.
Nominating a pig named Pigasus as the Yippie candidate for the Presidency, Ochs and Rubin were among those arrested for not having a permit to bring a pig into the city.\textsuperscript{52}

The theatrical stunt connoted the Yippies’ disrespect for law enforcement officials, whom many activists derided by using the pejorative epithet, “pig.” At an event at the Chicago Coliseum named the “un-birthday party” as a protest against President Lyndon B. Johnson’s actual birthday, Ochs performed several songs. Schumacher mentions that at least one attendee burned his draft card as Ochs sang the anti-war ballad “I Ain’t Marching Anymore.”\textsuperscript{53} This act showed how civil disobedience and illegal activity (the burning of a draft card) merged with music in the minds of many protestors. Ochs also performed the song in Grant Park after Hubert Humphrey, viewed as less likely to stop the Vietnam War than Eugene McCarthy, received the Democratic nomination.\textsuperscript{54}

Schumacher argues that that day’s culmination in a televised police riot challenged Ochs’s belief system by quoting the singer as stating:

\begin{quote}
Chicago was the formal death of democracy in America,’ he said in an interview conducted not long after the convention. ‘I no longer feel any ties of loyalty to the present American society . . . I’ve gone from being a left social democrat to an early revolutionary mentality. I haven’t the total courage or commitment yet to be a full-fledged revolutionary, but that is my direction.\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

Interestingly, Schumacher contends that after Chicago, Ochs became disillusioned with not only the government, but also with some of the political acts of the far Left and the Yippies. As one example of evidence, Schumacher mentions Ochs’s dismay during an incident at a Berkeley concert where someone wrapped an American flag around a pig.
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\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 200.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 201.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
Ochs viewed the act as desecration. Yet, the FBI, having started a surveillance file on Ochs in 1963, increased their attention towards the singer. Trying to interview Ochs prior to the Chicago Eight Trial, they received little cooperation from the singer. The FBI also hoped to charge Ochs under an anti-riot law; however, an assistant attorney for the U.S. government decided that not enough evidence had been gathered to make a trial worthwhile. Such attention towards Ochs demonstrated the FBI’s concern regarding the folksinger’s political ties; the effects of their surveillance will be discussed later in this study.

Although the federal government never indicted Ochs for any major crimes following the violence outside the 1968 DNC, eight activists were placed on trial for amongst other charges traveling interstate to incite riots. As defendants in the late 1969 to early 1970 trial, the Yippies Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, the Black Panther Bobby Seale (who would eventually receive a separate trial), Rennie Davis, Tom Hayden, David Dellinger, Lee Weiner, and John Froines, and their defense attorney William Kunstler sought to avoid incarceration, while using the courtroom to argue that America had become a police state repressive towards the counterculture. Not all of the defendants were participants in the counterculture; however, all of them were known for their antiwar activity that had alerted the authorities in the first place. Collectively, they believed that they were guilty of no actual crimes, but instead had been forced into the courtroom by a state determined to stifle their Constitutional right to free speech and assembly, which in this case was directed to ending the Vietnam War. For many of the
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defendants, the period’s rock music was an important means of political expression against a bellicose, oppressive system that had denied their right to mobilize against the war. As Jerry Rubin wrote about the trial in 1971:

Music expresses the soul of our revolution.

The ideas of going to Chicago and the Democratic convention in the first place was to bring our rock bands there—because with the rock bands come the people.

We wanted the jury to feel our music to understand us. Could we get the courtroom singing and dancing to the beat? We reach people not through rational political argument—but through the raw animal emotion of music.

Our culture was on trial because our culture attacked the convention in Chicago and our only hope was to turn the jury on to our music.

. . . We argued, in defense, that we really wanted a festival in the park, we seriously sought permits and we did not advocate or lead crowds in violent defense of the park when attacked. 60

Rubin’s writing highlighted the disparity between what he viewed as a violent Chicago Police Department (in collusion with the judicial system) and the rock-loving counterculture. Such tensions between a court insistent on order and a more unruly counterculture were apparent when the defense called several musicians to the stand as witnesses only to see such testimony limited by the presiding judge Julius Hoffman and prosecutor Tom Foran. Judge Hoffman forbade folksingers and counter-cultural icons like Arlo Guthrie, Judy Collins, Phil Ochs, and Country Joe McDonald from singing, presumably because they would disrupt regular courtroom proceedings; however, the defendants viewed the judge’s actions as evidence that they were on trial for their politics and culture, and not because they were guilty of an actual crime. In what those favorable to the defendants would most view as repressive acts inappropriate to a proper trial, the

judge shouted at Guthrie, while a court marshal held Collins’s mouth shut. Additionally, ten court marshals shook a singing Country Joe McDonald. 61 Referring to Judge Hoffman’s refusal to allow Collins to sing, Foran responded: “Each time your Honor has directed Mr. Kunstler that it was improper in the courtroom. It is an old and stale joke in this Courtroom, your honor.” 62 Interestingly, Foran then claimed that he and his six children believed that Collins “is a fine singer.” 63 Notwithstanding Foran’s ostensible praise for Collins’s voice, he firmly contended that in a political trial defendants should not use entertainment as a means of persuading the jury’s favoritism. 64 Because the defense had intended for the musicians to demonstrate that the Chicago Seven trial was politically-based (and perhaps legally questionable), Foran’s refusal to hear Collins sing underscored the defense’s intended point by affirming the political contentiousness of the period’s rock and folk music.

Like Rubin and Foran, defendant Tom Hayden understood this point. In his 1970 account, Trial, Hayden wrote:

> The conflict of lifestyles emerged not simply around our internationalism but perhaps even more around ‘cultural’ and ‘psychological’ issues. For instance, music. When Arlo Guthrie, Judy Collins, Phil Ochs, Country Joe, Pete Seeger, and others tried to sing for the jury, they were admonished that ‘this is a criminal trial, not a theater.’ No one, including the press, understood what was going on. From the judge to the most liberal journalist there was a consensus that we were engaged in a put-on, a further ‘mockery of the court.’ They seemed incapable of coming to terms with the challenge on any deeper level. The court’s concession was that the words to the songs, but not the singing of them, were admissible. But this was a compromise that missed the entire point. The words of ‘Alice’s Restaurant,’ ‘I Ain’t Marching Anymore,’ ‘Vietnam Rag,’ ‘Where Have All the Flowers Gone,’ and ‘Wasn’t That a Time’ may be
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moving even when they are spoken, but the words gained their meaning in this generation because they were sung. To understand their meaning would be to understand the meaning of music to the new consciousness. [. . .] Singing in that courtroom would have jarred its decorum, but that very decorum was oppressing our identity and our legal defense.65

Hayden’s observation and mention of these songs revealed the centrality of music, including black spirituals, as well as rock, to both the counterculture and much of the Sixties Left. This affirmed their differences from court “decorum.” Such differences were manifested in the trial itself, as witnessed by the judge and prosecution’s interest in preventing the musicians from performing, possibly because they feared that as a form of entertainment, music could potentially sway some jurors towards exonerating the defendants, particularly if those jurors held similar auditory appreciation. Also telling was that nearly all of the songs mentioned by Hayden contained strong antiwar content. Some of them, including Phil Ochs’ “I Ain’t Marching Anymore,” were frequent staples at rallies. Much of the violence in Chicago resulted from the Chicago Police Department and FBI’s desire to squash antiwar expression, particularly at a time when the mass media was present due to the DNC; Judge Hoffman’s interest in banning musical performance in the courtroom was similarly minded. The severity of his tone and the physical actions of the court marshals confirmed that at a time when the antiwar movement was growing and violent dissent was escalating authorities were serious about suppressing the political left and the counterculture.66

66 For more information on the trial, see Peter Doggett, There’s a Riot Going On: Revolutionaries, Rock Stars, and the Rise and Fall of the ‘60s (New York: Canongate, 2007), 293-301.
II. The Black Panther Party:

One member of the alleged Chicago Conspiracy, Bobby Seale, concerned law enforcement officials not just for his presence in Chicago during August 1968, but also for his membership in the radical organization, the Black Panther Party. Founded in 1966, the Black Panther Party personified what the historian Jeffrey Ogbar has termed “radical ethnic nationalism,” a self-described revolutionary nationalist movement that also included such groups as the (Chicano) Brown Berets, the (Puerto Rican) Young Lords, and the American Indian Movement. Determined to end police abuse and terror against African Americans through armed patrols of the police, the Party also mobilized on behalf of community self-empowerment by operating such programs as free breakfasts for poor, inner city youth. Identifying capitalism, racism, and imperialism as “evils,” it asserted militant resistance to the political and economic repression embedded within an American state empowered by white supremacy. Consequently, many government authorities in locations as diverse as New Haven, Connecticut and Oakland, California equated the Panthers with violence. Undeterred, on May 2, 1967, several Panthers demonstrated their commitment to armed patrols by marching on the California state house with guns to protest a bill that would outlaw carrying weapons in California cities. This was just one gesture of their commitment to self-defense and agency in what they viewed as an oppressive system. Scholar Laura Pulido has interpreted the Panthers as frequently ascribing to a “third world” ideology that stressed their identities as being both against and situated outside of oppressive U.S. imperialism. This ideology
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made the Panthers averse to racism, the economic impoverishment of inner-city African-Americans, and imperialism.\textsuperscript{71} As one of the Panther founders Bobby Seale allegedly told member David Hilliard, “We’re nationalists because we see ourselves as a nation within a nation. But we’re revolutionary nationalists. We don’t see ourselves as a national unit for racist reasons but as a necessity for us to progress as human beings and live on the face of this earth. . . . We fight capitalism with revolutionary socialism.”\textsuperscript{72}

Such ideas paralleled and inspired those of John Sinclair and his (Ann Arbor, Michigan) White Panther Party examined elsewhere in this study. They also explain why from Oakland to New Haven, the Panthers’ demonstration of militancy led to an unfathomable amount of government surveillance, arrests, and trials – such instances of government repression even included the assassination of the Chicago leader, Fred Hampton.\textsuperscript{73}

Similar to other political activists and organizations, the Black Panther Party received both inspirational support and monetary contributions from rock performers and audiences, although law enforcement officials and the FBI targeted the Panthers far more than any musician or concertgoer. One example of a rock group aiding the Panthers was the Grateful Dead’s performance at the 1971 Intercommunal Day of Solidarity, an event which directed its proceeds towards defending arrested Panthers in court.\textsuperscript{74}
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\textsuperscript{74} Doggett, \textit{There’s A Riot Going On}, 410-412. Activists at some major rock festivals raised money for the Black Panther Party’s ongoing legal trials. See, for example, the Caucasian, female volunteer collecting money for the Black Panther Defense Fund in \textit{Gimme Shelter}, the documentary of the December 1969 Rolling Stones concert at the Altamont Speedway in California.
Much of the rock and folk music important to the era’s larger counterculture and political revolutionaries spoke either to or about the Black Panther Party as well. As Panther Eldridge Cleaver contended in his 1968 *Soul on Ice*:

> The characteristics of the white rebels which most alarm their elders – the long hair, the new dances, their love for Negro music, their use of marijuana, their mystical attitude toward sex – are all tools of their rebellion. They have turned these tools against the totalitarian fabric of American society – and they mean to change it.\(^{75}\)

In this passage, Cleaver did not directly state that he was describing rock music; however, most listeners likely realized that such sounds emanated from what Cleaver called “Negro music.”\(^ {76}\) As explained by the historian William Van Deburg, during the late 1960s, some black critics scorned white rock and soul musicians for creating a bowdlerization of what they viewed as “black music.”\(^ {77}\) Unlike Cleaver, such critics of that time probably overlooked the importance of the rock community. Following Cleaver, however, many Panthers realized what numerous critics and scholars would later argue: the rock counterculture and the BPP fought against the same repressive system. For instance, in reference to the political ideology of Country Joe and the Fish, the rock critic Greil Marcus wrote: “The Fish, one of the country’s most political rock bands, who dedicated an album to Bobby Hutton, an eighteen-year-old Black Panther shot by the Oakland police, were our Marx-Brothers-reminder that youth is the enemy, not only to the police, but to the nation.”\(^ {78}\) Marcus’s mention of the record’s dedication to Hutton demonstrated at least one instance of rock’s support for the Panthers. Additional bonds between the
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Panthers and rock were apparent in the Party’s origins and connections to amongst others, Bob Dylan and the African American Jimi Hendrix (whom Van Deburg’s study does not address).

It is a known fact that while drafting the Black Panther Party’s Ten Point Platform, their ideological manifesto, the document’s authors Huey Newton and Bobby Seale listened to Bob Dylan’s “Ballad of a Thin Man” as either background noise or inspiration.79 Thus, the Panthers’ founding members were at the very least aware of Dylan. Decades later, the writer Mike Marquese analyzed the similar values expressed in both Dylan’s music and Black Panther ideology:

> The Panthers were a political response to many of the same tides that shaped Dylan’s artistic arc: the successes and frustrations of the civil rights movement, the bankruptcy of Vietnam War liberalism, a distrust of academic or formal discourses, and a commitment to authenticity and the language of the street. They shared Dylan’s rage at being patronized, as well as his contempt for middle-class liberals. . . . 80

Such tropes in Dylan’s music complemented the beliefs of Panther leadership.

The connection between Dylan and the Panthers persisted into the early 1970s when the singer was far more secluded and unproductive. Ironically, in 1971, A.J. Weberman, a New York City countercultural activist and author, expressed that Dylan was not supportive enough towards the Black Panther Party. Weberman seemed particularly upset that the singer was critical of the Panthers’ favoritism of Palestine over Israel.81 Yet, in November 1971 Dylan released “George Jackson,” a single honoring the Black Panther field marshal slain in prison just months earlier. The song expressed the
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composer’s sympathy by defining Jackson as “a man I really loved.” Further affinity for the subject appeared in the rumination: “Sometimes I think this whole world / Is one big prison yard / Some of us are prisoners.” Despite its controversial subject, the single received moderate radio airplay and sales exposure, reaching number thirty-three on the Billboard charts. If nothing else, Dylan’s recording of the song provided yet another reason for Panther leadership to listen to the singer.

Similar to Dylan, Jimi Hendrix had some association with the Panthers. Regarding Hendrix’s relationship with the organization, biographer Charles R. Cross has written: “The Black Panthers had made extensive attempts to involve him, and while he had been quietly supportive, he didn’t want to be a spokesperson for a group he felt advocated violence.” Cross’s summary of Hendrix’s support paralleled Dylan’s criticism of the Panthers’ stance on Israel; neither musician was fully comfortable with being too close to the organization, but nevertheless extended some sympathy. For example, at a May 1970 concert in Berkeley, California, Hendrix dedicated his performance of “Voodoo Child (Slight Return)” to the Panthers.
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In addition to both the live and recorded performances of Dylan and Hendrix, the Panthers found inspiration in other styles of music, including jazz and soul. Years before the Party’s existence, jazz musician Miles Davis was a formative influence on a young Bobby Seale. 88 Similarly, the politics of many jazz musicians was impacted by Black Power. As the historian and jazz critic Frank Kofsky asserted during the late 1960s and early 1970s, “in recent times it has been the jazz musicians who, of any identifiable group of blacks, have been the first to be converted and to espouse the tenets of black nationalism.” 89 Soul music was viewed by many black listeners, including Panther members, as synonymous with resistance politics 90 In this spirit, arising from the Party’s membership were three performance groups that played both soul and R&B (a style at times associated with rock) at Panther events: the Freedom Messengers, the Lumpen, and the Vanguard. 91 Also important to the Panthers’ ideology were the jazz-like performances and recordings of fellow Panther Elaine Brown. 92 While these musicians never attained the popular, international acclaim of Country Joe and the Fish, Bob Dylan or Jimi Hendrix, their existence confirmed the centrality of music to Panther activity. Furthermore, as the historian Jeffrey Ogbar has argued, the regular appearance of these musicians at Panther events demonstrated how like “[m]any black power organizations [the BPP] considered music an essential complement to the black freedom struggle.” 93

90 While this claim was quite popular, historian Jeffrey Ogbar contends that the equation between soul music and black resistance was not absolute. Not all soul musicians advocated black nationalism or black power. Also, not all soul groups contained African American performers. See Ogbar, *Black Power*, 110.
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Such beliefs paralleled rock’s importance to the era’s other political radicals and revolutionaries.

III. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Weather Underground:

As it did for the Black Panther Party, popular music provided inspiration to the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and its revolutionary offshoot, the Weather Underground. Throughout the 1960s, SDS was one of the most active New Left organizations fighting on behalf of civil rights, student rights, and the termination of both U.S. imperialism and the Vietnam War. SDS played an instrumental role at antiwar rallies as well as the April 1968 Columbia University occupation in which students commandeered university buildings. The Columbia occupation was their means of protesting against the school’s ties to military-industrial contracts and the Vietnam War. Students also deemed the university’s plans to erect a gymnasium in a Harlem park as a racist intrusion and control of black public space. The illegal occupation resulted in a violent altercation with the New York Police Department and numerous arrests.\(^94\) In 1969, a small group of SDS members (which according to historian Jeremy Varon numbered only in “the dozens”) broke away from the larger organization to found Weatherman (later known as the Weather Underground).\(^95\) This political outfit drew inspiration from the actions of small bands of Cuban revolutionaries who subscribed to a Third World ideological view that imperialistic, capitalistic and oppressive governments like the U.S. could be effectively transformed only through violent revolution led by a
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select few. Believing that acts of violence against state institutions would foment revolution and destroy imperialism and the Vietnam War, the Weathermen orchestrated protests like the October 1969 Days of Rage in Chicago, a riot culminating in the mass destruction of private property and numerous arrests. Between 1970 and 1972 particularly, they coordinated numerous bombings of buildings associated with imperialism, capitalism, and the Vietnam War. Sites for these bombings included: New York City police headquarters, the Presidio, California army base and military police station, the Haymarket statue in Chicago, the U.S. Capitol building in Washington, D.C., and the Pentagon. Such illegal and destructive activity greatly concerned law enforcement officials, including the FBI, which engaged in so much surveillance that the organization’s voluminous FBI file would total 10,984 pages. Consequently, during the early 1970s almost all of the Weather Underground’s members went “underground” to avoid government prosecution and imprisonment.

Rock was especially important to the Weather Underground. It used songs as a means of galvanizing its beliefs and articulating its public communiqués, referenced lyrics as code words for their illegal actions, and provided a sense of comfort and camaraderie for its members, who probably at times encountered doubts or loneliness regarding their “underground” status and fear of arrest. Evidence of this appeared throughout their contemporary writings and later memoirs.
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Beginning with its 1969 inception and continuing through the mid-1970s, the Weather Underground revealed its close relationship with rock in its public *communiqués* and statements. First, the collective’s name was a direct reference to lyrics from Bob Dylan’s 1965 “Subterranean Homesick Blues,” which warned its listeners to “watch the plain clothes / you don’t need a weatherman / to know which way the wind blows.” As the lyric addressed the narrator’s fear of the (“plain clothes”) police, so it defined Weatherman as the latter institution’s antagonist. Once naming itself, the collective used rock to spread its anti-imperialistic ideology. Weatherperson Susan Stern would later write about the importance of mentioning Jimi Hendrix to high school students as a means of getting such a young audience to consider adopting the Weather Underground’s message. This appropriation of rock for political proselytizing carried into the collective’s writings. For example, Stern would remember distributing one pamphlet referring to the character, Maxwell, from the Beatles’ song “Maxwell’s Silver Hammer” as a metaphor for the necessity of violence. According to her logic, the song’s fans could be inclined to adopt the Weather Underground’s practice of violence as a means of defeating American imperialism. In another publication, November 1969’s *Fire Next Time*, an author from the collective argued, “The [Rolling] Stones always close with Street Fighting Man. What they’re saying to us is—Revolt! Tear it down! Rip it up! Chicago, Washington, and Your Town USA. The time is right for violent revolution.
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The time is right for fighting in the streets!” This directly suggested that fans of the Rolling Stones should react violently against police repression in Chicago, the site of the 1968 riots outside the DNC, and Washington D.C, the capital of the American government responsible for the Vietnam War, the CIA, the military, and the FBI, all of which the Weather Underground viewed as its imperialistic enemy. Besides referencing rock in their body paragraphs, these releases received their titles from a direct appropriation of familiar songs or recordings. For example, a December 1970 statement debating the efficacy of its bombings was titled “New Morning—Changing Weather.” The first half of the title referred to the latest Bob Dylan album, which was devoid of the topical material found in his earlier songs associated with the civil rights movement; the second part suggested the organization’s thoughts about changing its practices.

The Weather Underground frequently appropriated the language of rock, because they viewed it as a symbolic code that resonated particularly with radical youth. Consequently, they turned to rock as a means of secretly communicating their illegal activities in ways they believed the authorities would either miss or misinterpret. Former Weatherman Bill Ayers would write:

105 Compounding the violence associated with “Street Fighting Man” was that the timing of its August 1968 release nearly overlapped the protests and violence surrounding the DNC in Chicago. This point is emphasized by Jack Hamilton, “‘Just a Shot Away’: The Rolling Stones and the Death of Sixties Music” (paper presented at the EMP Pop Conference, New York, New York, 25 March 2012). As Peter Doggett notes, some consumers of the record mistook the photograph on the single’s sleeve as shots of the DNC protests. Doggett, *There’s A Revolution Going On*, 195.
107 Author Ron Jacobs has argued that the Weather Underground’s direct references to rock music and the counterculture associated with rock declined after the capitalist cooptation of rock following the 1969 Woodstock festival had begun diluting its anti-hegemonic statements. Ron Jacobs, *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground* (Brooklyn: Verso, 1997), 152-153. More likely, any lessening of this rhetorical trend should be attributed to the fact that Weathermen had increasingly gone “underground.”
We expropriated an entire lexicon of Weather words from the music—‘You don’t need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows,’ of course from Bob Dylan, ‘Bad Moon,’ our code word for the Haymarket statue, from Creedence Clearwater Revival, and the ‘Place’ for the New York Police Headquarters from ‘We Gotta Get Out of This Place,’ by the Animals. ‘Rescue’ from Fontella Bass’s ‘Rescue Me’ was the name for a two-year effort, finally successful, to break a Black Liberation Army comrade from jail. We drew on ‘Kick Out the Jams’ by the MC5 for names and codes, ‘Purple Haze’ in tribute to Jimi Hendrix, and ‘Volunteers’ from the Jefferson Airplane. The Pentagon was called ‘Maggie’s Farm,’ again from Dylan, because we were planning to put a bomb in it and then, we said simply, ‘I ain’t gonna work on Maggie’s farm no more.’

Ayers confirmed the importance of music to the Weather Underground’s clandestine plans. Once authorities like the FBI had driven the Weather Underground into hiding, many of these revolutionaries listened to music for a sense of comfort.

Following the accidental explosion of her parents’ Greenwich Village townhouse on March 6, 1970, which had resulted in the inadvertent death of three of her fellow Weather Underground members who were constructing illegal bombs, Cathy Wilkerson was advised to hide out in California to escape from police and government investigators. While living “underground” in the homes of unidentified friends and mourning those who had died in the townhouse, music provided her with consolation. She addressed this by writing, “I had no money, but food was obtained by someone, somehow, and I had no other needs. There was a stereo with headphones and lots of records—The Stones, Dylan, the Beatles, the Band, Janis Joplin, Miles Davis, Jimi Hendrix, Otis Redding, and Ike and Tina Turner. The music, at least, was familiar.” Consequently, even during her seclusion, a time that most likely invoked a great fear of arrest and mourning for her deceased comrades, music provided a psychological outlet

110 Ibid., 352.
for her survival. This had begun prior to the explosion as well, for, in her words, “[Bob] Dylan validated my alienation and anger; the Beatles, the absurdity of the public world.”

She believed that music initiated bonding between Weatherpersons. Yet, in subsequent pages she would astutely mention that not all rock fans advocated the same platforms as the Weather Underground did. Wilkerson’s account thus demonstrated that music was affirming for those in the struggle, even though not all of the musicians (such as Ike and Tina Turner) were seen as explicitly political. Furthermore, while the music did not cause her political acts, it nonetheless provided a cultural setting alongside of which her political ideas existed.

As the Weather Underground found inspiration, direction, and solace in rock’s lyrics, some musicians paid tribute to the Weather Underground in their actions or lyrics like they were doing for the Black Panther Party. Folksinger Phil Ochs avidly read the Weathermen’s *communiqués*. Paul Kantner and Grace Slick’s 1971 album *Sunfighter*, an offshoot from their regular releases in the Jefferson Airplane, contained the song “Diana,” a tribute to Diana Oughton, one of the Weathermen who died in the March 6, 1970 townhouse explosion. Whenever the Airplane performed this song in concert, sometimes as a prelude to one of their most famous tunes, “Volunteers,” they exhorted their audience to “Sing a song for Diana / Huntress of the moon and a lady of the Earth / Weather woman Diana.” In sum, the song eulogized Oughton as a strong woman who
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should be remembered and appreciated by those whose values remained as strong as the Earth, thus telling the Weather Underground and their fellow revolutionaries to persist. Like the mythological moon’s goddess huntress, Diana Oughton would continually watch over the Weather Underground.  

IV. The Antiwar Movement, Draft Resistance Movement, and GI Movement:  

Such radicals and revolutionaries as the Yippies, Black Panthers, and Weather Underground constituted the most visible, feared, and at times, extreme, opponents of American imperialism and its ties to racism and the Vietnam War. Yet, the politics of the era were also synonymous with more anonymous protestors, many of whom maintained some ties with a more mainstream, hegemonic society. Such persons included those who spoke out against American involvement in the Vietnam War. As with other social and political movements of this period, the antiwar movement at times had a relationship with folk and rock music. Many contemporaries and later scholars conflated the message of rock music with the resistance to America’s military activity in Vietnam. For instance, in the 1980s, rock critic Herbert I. London, in a monograph comparing the evolution of rock music to such historical events as the French and Russian Revolutions wrote, “Vietnam was to become to this [rock] revolution in sensibilities what World War I was to the Russian Revolution. It was lighter fluid put on the fire.” For London, just as
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Russia’s military failures in World War I had upset a peasant populace, led to the return of the exiled Vladimir Lenin, and resulted in a decline in power for the country’s social and economic elites, the Vietnam War fostered an iconoclastic uprising demanding the upheaval of the American government’s imperialist status quo. Yet, while London believed that both the Vietnam War and the resulting antiwar movement were integral to rock’s growing popularity among America’s youth, other scholars and critics have argued that rock’s support for the movement was not as extensive as once understood. For example, the rock critic Dorian Lynskey has recently contested, “It is an axiom of baby boomer mythology that rock artists were in the vanguard of the antiwar movement, but by the strictest measure, musical opposition to the war was feeble, tentative, and diffuse.”  

Lynskey’s contention both suggests that few musicians were noticeably active in the antiwar movement, and implies that little antiwar material, in comparison to the full range of the era’s rock music was actually created. Lynskey’s interpretation complements the scholarship of historians Kenneth J. Bindas and Craig Houston, whose examination of the paucity of antiwar songs on the era’s Billboard charts, which constituted less than two percent in number, led them to argue, “While a few antiwar rock songs became popular hits, when placed in the broad context of rock music’s anti-Establishment stance from 1965 to 1974, the attention given to the Vietnam War by the rock ‘n’ roll industry was minimal.”  

Bindas and Houston nonetheless contributed to the debate by arguing that even though the majority of rock and folk musicians and recordings did not criticize the war directly and were henceforth apolitical from an
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organizational point of view, such music nevertheless had at least some degree of political or cultural effect on those opposed to the war and the draft, particularly because of its “anti-Establishment stance.”\textsuperscript{121} Furthermore, while demonstrating that far from all rock and folk musicians made political contributions to the antiwar movement, the historians did realize that the genre of rock itself was arguably “the first popular music to be antiwar.”\textsuperscript{122}

Adding to the findings of Bindas and Houston, while examining the antiwar content of other genres of popular music, the music scholar James Perone has argued that in reaction to the antiwar statements of some of the era’s folk and rock music, “…the country songs relating to the Vietnam Conflict . . . frequently incorporate stereotypes of various types of characters, from patriotic, brave soldiers, to obedient, understanding spouses, to those in the antiwar movement, frequently characterized as cowardly, long-haired, poorly dressed, hip-talking students influenced by liberal, atheistic, Communist-leaning college professors.”\textsuperscript{123} Thus, other genres at times were seen in opposition to rock and folk’s supposed counter-hegemonic and counter-cultural values, perhaps perpetuating among government officials the idea that rock, folk, and antiwar activism were closely intertwined.

As Perone contends, even though the actual number of antiwar songs to achieve widespread attention and commercial success was minimal, country musicians, many of whom stereotypically supported the war, felt threatened by the antiwar offerings of rock and folk. Such beliefs were also held by numerous state officials. This was evident
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through observation like that of the counterculture author, Paul Krassner, who claimed that intelligence representatives of the U.S. Army engaged in surveillance of attendees of the 1969 Woodstock festival:

At Woodstock people could camp overnight and there was no violence. And the [1968 DNC] convention [in Chicago] was officially labeled by a government report as a police riot. One thing that they had in common was police surveillance. At the press tent, some guy pointed out to me this photographer who he said was part of the CID, the Criminal Intelligence Division of the army . . . they just knew that virtually none of the four hundred, five hundred thousand or whatever it was, virtually none of them would be interested in fighting the Vietnam War. And of course, it goes without saying that in’68 there was more than police surveillance. So it was a connection in their minds between the counterculture and the antiwar people.124

Scholarship has suggested that in reality, police made very few actual arrests at the Woodstock Festival, not because of the absence of illegal activity, but because of the difficulty of undertaking such a large number of them in a crowd of hundreds of thousands of people.125 Also, as the British publication, The Guardian, noted, at Woodstock U.S. Army helicopters were used to transport injured concertgoers to more appropriate medical facilities.126 Yet, such examples of police and the military actually helping (or at least not oppressing) the Woodstock audience would not have entirely lightened the stance of the hardest antiwar activist.

Although the historians and music critics listed above have demonstrated that the number of antiwar songs were tiny in comparison to the entire gamut of rock and folk offerings during the era, scholars cannot deny the importance of folk and rock music to the antiwar movement, especially via the presence of some musicians at political marches
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and rallies. Numerous monographs on the antiwar movement cite the presence of either music or notable performers. For example, one study cites the presence of 3,000 youths marching alongside a yellow submarine, an object familiar to all fans of the Beatles, at a May 1968 peace march in New York City. Moreover, in an examination of how the mainstream news media depicted the antiwar movement, the historian Melvin Small argues that the presence of musicians at larger antiwar rallies was for some attendees “a drawing card.” Small speculates that while approximately three million people participated in the October 15, 1969 Moratorium, about 75,000 of them found particular interest and entertainment in Janis Joplin’s performance at New York City’s Bryant Park. Likewise, Small’s analysis of the November 15, 1969 Moratorium protest at the Washington Monument addresses both the appearance of the folk musicians, Peter, Paul, and Mary, Arlo Guthrie and Pete Seeger, alongside political speakers, and the fact that the CBS television network’s national news coverage of the event suggested that the crowd directed most of its attention towards the musicians. The message offered by these musicians would have complemented the antiwar bantering at some concerts, such as the July 1967 Monterey (California) Pop Festival, at which the largely unknown band, the Blues Project, upon finishing a song chose to “dedicate it to peace and to the end of this dirty and dishonorable war.”

Finally, those deeply committed to ending the Vietnam War would probably have known or appreciated at least one antiwar song. Such songs received airplay on AM
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radio, and appeared on records and in songbooks. An examination of any one songbook would have demonstrated the diversity of such antiwar songs. *The Vietnam Songbook*, compiled in 1969 by activists Barbara Dane and Irwin Silber, contained antiwar selections from several countries, including: Vietnam, Italy, Australia and Japan. Some songs criticized the war directly; others, such as the rather obscure “Piss On Johnson’s War” referred to particular state officials, in this case President Lyndon B. Johnson, the President responsible for the war’s escalation.\(^{132}\) Although that song had very limited reception, others in the book had been performed by more famous artists like Pete Seeger, Country Joe McDonald, and the Fugs. Seeger’s songs included, “Waist Deep in the Big Muddy” (1967), which utilized the metaphor of a World War II training camp in Louisiana to exemplify the narrator’s belief that the military had foolishly led its troops into a pointless quagmire.\(^{133}\) Also by Seeger, “Ballad of the Fort Hood Three” (1966) presented the testimony of three army privates court marshaled and imprisoned for their refusal to go to Vietnam.\(^{134}\) Lyrics from Seeger’s “The Housewife Terrorists” (1966) had the narrators’ stating: “But we feel It’s our government that’s really breaking laws / And that’s what we demonstrated for.”\(^{135}\) Collectively, these songs revealed Seeger’s criticism of the American military’s presence in Vietnam, and solidarity with those who had chosen to break the law for political purposes. Such songs clearly supported and most likely would have comforted some of the most ardent antiwar activists.

Apart from general antiwar protest, some folk and rock musicians both contributed to the draft resistance movement, and encouraged youths to become draft dodgers. Ranging from youths who fled to Canada as a means of avoiding military induction to those who blatantly defied the law by burning their draft cards in public, individual draft dodgers and organized draft resisters clearly upset those state officials who were determined to provide support for an American victory in Vietnam. In his study of the middle-class organization, the New England Resistance (NER), whose publicized activities included the illegal act of throwing away draft cards in public and the conduction of protests outside of military induction centers, the historian Michael S. Foley has cursorily addressed the importance of rock to the movement. Although Foley’s research indicates that only one-half of these Boston-region draft resisters associated with the “counterculture,” implying that the resisters’ musical or aesthetic tastes did not necessarily direct their political activity, the historian provides examples of some musicians who expressed support for the NER. For example, during a 1969 concert at the Boston Garden, Mick Jagger conveyed his respect for the NER by wearing a shirt emblazoned with the organization’s symbol, the omega sign. Similarly, the folksinger Joan Baez elicited the attention of potential male draft resisters by popularizing the phrase, “Girls Say ‘Yes’ to Guys Who Say ‘No,’” implying that draft
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resistance could increase their sexual activity. As a British citizen, Jagger’s support for draft resistance was not as extensive as that of Baez, who devoted large amounts of time to the promotion of civil disobedience and illegal actions on behalf of draft protestors and resisters. Besides these two musicians mentioned by Foley, other performers were asked on occasion to aid the draft resistance movement. In 1967, the Boston Draft Resistance Group wrote to Ed Sanders asking him and the Fugs to consider performing a benefit concert at a time when “we really need bread desperately, as we have guys going to court for draft refusal, two full-time black counselors ($30 per wk), police harassment, post office brutality, and a huge hole in our window, which is the result of The Boston Globe’s vicious Sunday features.” The letter writer’s promise to “provide grass” for the performers demonstrated how at times the values of the counterculture, as evidenced by this mention of marijuana, bore close relation to the Resistance Group’s antiwar activism. Although research for this dissertation has uncovered no confirmation of whether the Fugs actually played that concert, Sanders would later admit that he “helped soldiers fleeing the war” by allowing them to hide out and dispose of their uniforms at his Peace Eye bookstore. Such efforts, however, were far surpassed by the ongoing activism of the folksinger Joan Baez.

One of the most cited musicians to express direct support for the antiwar and draft resistance movements was Joan Baez. As the political scientist Markus Jager has noted,
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Baez’s commitment to the antiwar movement predated that of many of her contemporaries. Whereas the majority of musicians were hardly vocal about the draft and Vietnam War until the decade’s later years, Baez’s outspokenness encompassed the entire decade and era.¹⁴⁵ Baez also differed from her musical peers in the degree to which she engaged in political activity. As stated in a 1968 *Rolling Stone* article, “If by her reckoning she lags behind the trends it is only because she has willfully relegated music to a secondary role in her life. And that role has increasingly been as a vehicle to communicate the philosophy of non-violence.”¹⁴⁶ Such beliefs and commitment to civil disobedience directed Baez’s music and activism throughout the Vietnam War era and even into the 2000s.¹⁴⁷ Ironically, at the height of the antiwar movement some groups like the Students for a Democratic Society believed that Baez’s nonviolent platform was insufficient to inciting change, leading that organization to abstain from working with her.¹⁴⁸ Yet, apart from these organizations, and even more such among the larger draft resistance movement, Baez’s efforts generated media attention, arrests, and government concern.

Whereas some musicians participated in the occasional march or criticized either the Vietnam War or American state in an isolated recording or random onstage comment,
Baez engaged in ongoing resistance to an American state synonymous with Cold War militarism and the intensification of military intervention in Vietnam. Although scholars have recognized that her earliest 1960s recordings addressed traditional, apolitical themes like love and historical legends, as the sixties ended her albums included blatant political rhetoric.¹⁴⁹ By that time, Baez had repeatedly invoked the ire of police officers and even President Lyndon Baines Johnson, while breaking several laws in the process.

Baez’s vocalized opposition to the war was blunt and direct. During an invited 1964 performance in front of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, Baez notably refused to perform the national anthem, and asked the President to initiate no further aggression in Vietnam.¹⁵⁰ The writer David Hajdu has described the incident as concluding with Baez’s performance of Bob Dylan’s songs. As this occurred, “Johnson met her eye to eye but carried on a conversation with an aide while she sang. Baez suspected that the president was saying something like ‘Keep a watch on that girl, she’s a Commie,’ and she was proud to have made that kind of an impression.”¹⁵¹

Also, in 1964 Baez famously mailed a letter to the IRS (Internal Revenue Service) and several newspapers announcing her decision to pay only 40% of her federal tax, in order to prevent the remaining 60% from funding a war which contradicted her religious and pacifistic beliefs.¹⁵² Scholars like Jager have suggested that the publicizing of Baez’s decision may have inspired other pacifists to withhold taxes as well, possibly taking away
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some military funding as a result. Others like Hajdu have pointed out that many pacifists had been withholding their taxes for years before Baez did. Because Baez is still alive as of 2012, privacy restrictions in the Freedom of Information Act have made it difficult for researchers to ascertain the degree to which federal institutions like the FBI were concerned with Baez’s publicized withholding. Nevertheless, publically-released documents suggested the FBI’s interest in the tax-withholding of the antiwar activist and professor, Howard Zinn. For instance, a December 1970 “Correlation Summary” of the Bureau’s information regarding Zinn stated:

Howard Zinn was listed as one of the signers of an advertisement entitled ‘If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-bills this year,’ which appeared in the ‘New York Post,’ 1/30/68, page 51. This advertisement stated that the undersigned writers and editors, who believed it morally wrong to be involved in the Vietnam war, would not pay the 10% income tax surcharge and that many of them would not pay the 23% of their income tax which was used to finance the war.

While Baez was far from the only activist to publicize her tax withholding, her political activism also included performing at antiwar rallies such as the September 24, 1965 “Sing-In for Peace” where she instructed men to avoid the draft.

As the antiwar and draft resistance movements intensified throughout 1967 and 1968, Baez’s antiwar activity persisted. On October 26, 1967 Baez and over 100 additional protestors were arrested for blocking the doors to the Oakland, California Armed Forces Induction Center. Ten days of imprisonment resulted. As Jager has contended, Baez would have served a longer sentence if her fame had not attracted the
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national media attention that further extended her message. Jager contends that the singer’s fame may have prompted an early release.\textsuperscript{158} When released from jail, Baez told reporters, “It was one of the best things I’ve done in my life. I will probably do it again.”\textsuperscript{159} On December 10, 1967, Baez and additional protestors were once again arrested for obstructing the doors to the same induction center. This time sentenced to ninety days of imprisonment, Baez ultimately served only thirty days of a reduced sentence of forty-five. Baez believed that her early release resulted from the guards’ aversion to the media’s frequent discussion of Baez’s case.\textsuperscript{160}

Such prison sentences neither deterred Baez’s commitment nor softened her rhetoric. In 1968, Baez’s autobiographical \textit{Daybreak} included the dedication: “This book is dedicated with love, admiration, and gratefulness to the men who find themselves facing imprisonment for facing the draft.”\textsuperscript{161} Explaining the religious and political reasoning behind her actions, Baez defined herself as a follower of “antinationalism,” an ideology clearly averse to Cold War American patriotism.\textsuperscript{162} These beliefs underlay Baez’s March 1968 marriage to David Harris, the leader of a draft resistance organization known as the Resistance, and a man whose resultant activities had him facing a five-year prison sentence.\textsuperscript{163}

The FBI agents who had personally interviewed Harris regarding his anti-draft activities referred to him in their internal documents as guilty of “SELECTIVE
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SERVICE ACT, 1948_SEDITION, COUNSELING EVASION.”164 Yet, to Baez, Harris was not a criminal but instead a martyr whose prison sentence exposed the cruelty of American bellicosity. Before and throughout Harris’s incarceration, Baez used her fame as a performer to draw attention to the resister’s fate and message. Harris would later write:

Where I alone might draw a crowd of 200 if I was lucky, having Joan on the stage with me multiplied those numbers by at least four to five times. Where I alone might get a short mention in the back pages, as her political partner I was part of a feature story with pictures. She was treated as a legend wherever she went, and I was swept up in some of that charisma.165

Harris clearly recognized that his then-wife’s celebrity status led to increased funding and crucial national publicity necessary to disseminate his anti-draft commentary. Consequently, he and Baez both believed that his incarceration would not silence the Resistance.

Discussion of Harris’s imprisonment became a major theme of Baez’s concerts and recordings. Baez insisted that any potential marital or personal discomfort caused by her husband’s incarceration served a higher purpose of opposing what they believed was the American state’s immoral intervention in Vietnam. Onstage at the August 1969 Woodstock Festival, she dedicated to Harris her performance of “Joe Hill,” a paean to the eponymous pre-World War I labor organizer.166 The song’s line, “I never died, said he,” complemented Baez’s belief that her husband’s willingness to risk his personal safety and wellbeing resulted not in harm, but instead in the inspiring of others to follow his moral
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example. Baez’s recordings and concert appearances were popular, ensuring that a large audience became aware of Harris. For instance, *David’s Album*, released in 1969, spent six months on the *Billboard* charts, reaching as high as number thirty-six.\(^{168}\)

Although Baez’s 1971 *Carry It On* was not as commercially successful as were her previous albums, it was a soundtrack to a 1970 documentary movie regarding Harris’s beliefs and incarceration. An advertisement for that movie published in *Rolling Stone* implicitly challenged United States Vice-President Spiro Agnew, by stating, “Yes Spiro, there is a Joan and David.” \(^{169}\) It also referred to the married activists as “America’s First Family of the Resistance,” connoting that the readers of *Rolling Stone* should favor Baez and Harris over Agnew and other supporters of the Vietnam War within America’s society and government.\(^{170}\) This advertisement was yet another affirmation of Baez’s commitment to the antiwar and draft resistance movements.

Harris and Baez divorced in 1973 for personal reasons; however, the folksinger’s antiwar activism persisted. In 1972 she went to Vietnam with a group of activists including Barry Romo, a leader of Vietnam Veterans Against the War, an organization that warranted much government concern and surveillance regarding its antiwar rhetoric.

---

\(^{167}\) Ibid. Baez included this song on the soundtrack to *Carry It On*, a 1971 documentary about Harris. In the liner notes for that album she equated the song’s meaning with the still-imprisoned Harris’s hunger strike. *Carry It On* also contained a rendition of the Civil Rights Movement anthem, “We Shall Overcome,” dedicated to both the imprisoned Harris and the Resistance members who had pasted an antiwar bumper sticker on the very police car that had taken Harris to prison. Joan Baez, *Carry It On*: Original Sound-Track Album, Vanguard Recording Society, VSD79313, long-playing record. Unlike Baez’s previous albums, however, *Carry It On*, appeared on the *Billboard* sales charts for only five weeks, never ranking higher than 164. Charles J. Fuss, *Joan Baez-A Bio-bibliography* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 69.


\(^{169}\) Advertisement for *Carry It On*, *Rolling Stone*, 3 September 1970, 51.

\(^{170}\) Ibid.
and political demonstrations. On that trip Baez recorded sounds of the December 1972 “Christmas Bombings” of North Vietnam. She incorporated this audio footage into her 1973 release, where are you now, my son? In total, despite the arrests discussed in the preceding paragraphs and the government actions against her discussed in forthcoming chapters of this study, Baez’s antiwar, antimilitaristic activism continued long after the Vietnam War ended, and into the twenty-first century.

Known for appearing at numerous antiwar rallies and participating extensively in the protest activities outside the 1968 Democratic National Committee Convention in Chicago, Phil Ochs worked closely with the antiwar movement at large. Music scholar James E. Perone has credited Ochs for recording the first notable song regarding the draft, “Draft Dodger Rag,” released in 1965. Listing numerous reasons for why a young man could receive a deferment, the song was commercially recorded and sung at antiwar events. It received national attention among the counterculture when performed by the Smothers Brothers on the November 9, 1967 episode of the Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour. In that segment, the comedian Dick Smothers introduced his performance as “. . . a contemporary song about a great effort that some of the young men in our country are making.” As the media studies scholar Aniko Bodroghkozy has written, such comments suggested that while hawkish critics may have laughed at the song’s

171 Firsthand testimony regarding the beliefs and activities of Vietnam Veterans Against the War (as well as the federal government’s reaction) appears in Richard Stacewicz, Winter Soldiers: An Oral History of Vietnam Veterans Against the War (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997), passim.
173 Brockman, “Forever Young.”
174 James E. Perone, Songs of the Vietnam Conflict. Music Reference Collection, Number 83. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), 29. Although Perone dates this song’s release to 1965, Ochs had been performing “Draft Dodger Rag” as early as the 1964 Newport Folk Festival at which it was recorded. Phil Ochs, “Draft Dodger Rag,” Live at Newport, Vanguard Records 77017-2, compact disc.
satirical listing of ways in which one could avoid induction, Smothers’ commentary and an understanding of Ochs’s commitment to the antiwar movement would have confirmed the song’s support for draft dodging to the antiwar activists and potential draft dodgers or resisters viewing the show on television.\textsuperscript{176}

In addition to the well-publicized acts and songs of Baez and Ochs, a few other musicians publicly advocated draft resistance, and glorified those who had sought exile in Canada. Published in the May 1969 issue of the folk music magazine \textit{Broadside} were the lyrics to “Talking Draft Exile Blues,” a song written by an anonymous migrant to Canada.\textsuperscript{177} The song’s anonymous authorship and appearance in such a niche publication most likely ensured that most draft resisters would not have heard it. Yet, the song “Draft Resister” on the 1969 album \textit{Monster} by the popular hard-rock group, Steppenwolf, would have received much greater exposure considering that the LP on which it appeared reached number seventeen on the \textit{Billboard} album charts.\textsuperscript{178} In “Draft Resister” vocalist John Kay commended “all the draft resisters who will fight for sanity,” and expressed sympathy for their fate of imprisonment by singing that “when they march them off to prison, they will go for you and me.”\textsuperscript{179} In other lines, the song condemned “the threat and awesome power of the mighty Pentagon” as “traitors to humanity,” thus depicting the draft resistance movement as saviors both fighting against and being immorally oppressed by a war destructive to both the Vietnamese and Americans.\textsuperscript{180}

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{177} Perone, \textit{Songs of the Vietnam Conflict}, 59.
\textsuperscript{178} “\textit{Monster/Suicide/America} by Steppenwolf,” Song Facts, \url{http://www.songfacts.com/detail.php?id=6439} (accessed November 22, 2010).
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid.
Besides the numerous rock performances at anti-Vietnam War rallies, the activism of Joan Baez, and Steppenwolf’s “Draft Resister,” rock personally affected many military troops themselves. To understand this trend, historians must consider the morale of the typical U.S. soldier. While the Vietnam War escalated, the antiwar G.I. Movement coalesced both in Vietnam and in coffeehouses near army bases. As later articulated by the documentary film, *Sir! No Sir!*, antiwar songs frequently served as the soundtrack behind G.I. Movement gatherings at coffeehouses, establishments that the military command disdained and at times worked to shut down with the aid of local authorities.  

Similarly, the illegal drugs associated with rock increasingly gained users in the soldiers. The counterculture publications which military officials often seized at domestic military bases both quoted rock lyrics and praised drug use.  

Scholar Matthew Rinaldi found that by 1971, top military officials had become concerned with what they perceived as a sudden, unexpected low morale and a constant pattern of disobedience among its troops in Vietnam, other countries overseas, and the U.S. itself.  

Rinaldi quoted U.S. Colonel Robert D. Heinl as writing to his fellow high-ranking officials: “. . . our army that now remains in Vietnam is in a state approaching collapse, with individual units avoiding or having refused combat, murdering their officers and non-commissioned officers, drug-ridden, and dispirited where not near mutinous.”  

Estimates suggested that circa 1971, approximately eighty percent of U.S. troops were suffering from combat refusal.

---


182 Ibid.


184 Robert D. Heinl as quoted in ibid., 17-18. Since Rinaldi’s article first appeared in 1974, additional secondary literature has confirmed a high degree of “mutinous” sentiment among U.S. troops stationed in Vietnam. One scholarly work that examines the class and race issues behind such levels of “mutiny” (which it terms as “combat refusal”) among U.S. soldiers in Vietnam is Christian G. Appy, *Working-Class*
troops had used either marijuana or psychedelic drugs like LSD; in addition, an estimated one-third of American soldiers in Vietnam developed heroin addictions.\(^{185}\) Moreover, the number of deserting soldiers rose as did the percentage of those who either refused to fight or engaged in acts of violent “fragging” against their commanding officers.\(^{186}\) Clearly, the military’s command believed that its troops were increasingly committed to disobeying orders. As a scholar, Rinaldi never suggested that the mere usage of drugs or the presence of troops at a coffeehouse would automatically have turned soldiers against the war or military authorities; yet, this idea existed in the mind of both military brass and even some musicians. For example, at the 1964 Newport (Rhode Island) Folk Festival, the folksinger Tom Paxton excited his audience with “Talking Vietnam Pot Luck Blues,” a lyrical account of U.S. soldiers engaging in marijuana smoking with their supposed Viet Cong enemy.\(^{187}\) What entertained the concertgoers in 1964 predicted what in the coming years would increasingly upset the military brass.

Such tensions between the military authorities and militant soldiers manifested themselves far beyond just internal documents, coffeehouses, and the G.I. Movement’s publications. In 1972, Motown Records released Guess Who’s Coming Home, an album that the rock publication Creem announced as “a recording of disgruntled black vets,

---

\(^{185}\) Rinaldi, “Olive-Drab Rebels,” 42.


\(^{187}\) Perone, Songs of the Vietnam Conflict, 34.
talking about doing what they learned in ‘Nam in the streets of America.”\(^{188}\) Although the record appeared as part of Motown’s commercially-unsuccesful, politically-oriented, spoken-word Black Forum line (as opposed to its immensely wealthy music label), the fact that a company renowned for its musical hits would release such a contentious recording demonstrated its belief that in the height of the Black Power Movement, a strong undercurrent equated the African-American troops’ domestic struggle with their overseas discontent. Such thoughts would clearly have upset the military brass representative of an institution that had been hesitant to counteract racism.\(^{189}\) The record’s release, regardless of how few copies it may have sold, demonstrated once again the interrelation between the music industry and both a black America expressing both protest and self-pride through counter-hegemonic music, and a G.I. movement determined to fight against what it viewed as American imperialism, both in Vietnam and in America’s inner cities.

Conclusion:

This chapter has contended that folk and rock music were important tools for the political revolutionaries of the 1960s and early 1970s. From such famous counterculture luminaries as Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, to the Black Panther Party and the Weather Underground, the sounds and rhetoric of rock and folk provided inspirational support, a means of expression, and an interpretative lens through which these revolutionaries galvanized their beliefs. Yet, folk and rock also permeated throughout the larger political opposition to the Vietnam War, including many anonymous civilian draft

---


\(^{189}\) Solid discussion of the revolutionary demands that African Americans, including black soldiers, made during the Black Power Movement’s battle against racism appears in Van Deburg, New Day in Babylon, passim. The story of Motown Records and Black Forum is told in Suzanne E. Smith, Dancing in the Street: Motown and the Cultural Politics of Detroit (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).
resisters and enlisted soldiers. At times, music supplemented political action and rhetoric, even serving as what the historian Melvin Small has referred to as a “drawing card” that may have brought some audience members to political rallies that they otherwise may have avoided. Such expression led to legal troubles and arrests for musicians like Joan Baez, as well as a concerted but varying degrees of harassment and repression analyzed in Chapter Three.

---

190 Small, *Covering Dissent*, 36.
Chapter Three: The Harassment and Repression of Rock and Folk Music:

The 1960s and early 1970s was an era of great social upheaval and protest associated with the civil rights movement, the demands of what historian Jeffrey Ogbar has termed the “radical ethnic nationalism” of groups like the Black Panther Party, and the widespread demonstrations and sometimes illegal acts committed in protest against the Vietnam War by such organizations as the Students for a Democratic Society (portions of which evolved into the Weather Underground).1 Gendered confrontation also arose through the Sexual Revolution, the Women’s Liberation Movement, and the Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movements.2 Many government officials and law enforcement authorities sought to repress the political upheaval and disruption to public space associated with these movements. Concurrently, while these authorities viewed political revolutionaries as most dangerous, they were to a lesser degree also dismayed about the subversive nature of the youth counterculture’s promotion of illicit drug use, style of long hair (that while non-criminal nonetheless defied established gender conventions), and rock music.3 Moreover, in municipalities across the nation, often

---

1 The term, “radical ethnic nationalism,” is coined and analyzed in Jeffrey O.G. Ogbar, Black Power: Radical Politics and African American Identity (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 158-189. In Ogbar’s words, these revolutionaries “struggled for a world where whiteness was no longer the standard by which all else was judged and for a class-free society” (ibid, 188). Consequently, they were distinct from the traditional left, which focused more on class and economic issues than on race and ethnicity (ibid., 188). An early, yet, still frequently-cited source on the Students for a Democratic Society is Kirkpatrick Sale, SDS (New York: Random House, 1973). Also, see Todd Gitlin’s analytical memoir The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage (New York: Bantam Books, 1987).


3 Definitions of countercultural values appear throughout the various essays in Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, eds., Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ’70s (New York: Routledge, 2002). An examination of the nationwide condemnation of long haired youth by more staid authorities appears in Gael Graham, “ Flaunting the Freak Flag: Karr v. Schmidt and the Great Hair
working as isolated law enforcement units (as opposed to being in collusion with each other or the FBI), police vice squads and red squads, operating as what scholar Frank Donner has titled “protectors of privilege,” sought to preserve their localities’ cultural and discursive values, all of which favored class privilege and financial interests over true democratic inclusiveness.⁴

The voluminous activities of antiwar protestors and political revolutionaries like the Black Panther Party marked the late 1960s and early 1970s as a highpoint of the repression and harassment of political dissenters. As noted by the scholar James Kirkpatrick Davis, (despite personal, bureaucratic, and political party ideological differences) Presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, the FBI, the CIA, the IRS, and the U.S. Navy, intensely conducted surveillance of the antiwar movement, although they did not always work together.⁵ Such efforts were incorporated into such operations as the FBI’s dubious COINTELPRO programs designed to undermine and destroy groups like the Students for a Democratic Society and Black Panther Party. COINTELPRO projects included the mailing of derogatory letters to family members of political activists (such as the wife of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and the parents and university administrators of SDS members), the use of undercover agents to infiltrate political organizations and incite intra-group discord, and even the 1969 murder of the Chicago Black Panther Party leader, Fred Hampton.⁶ Although J. Edgar Hoover dismantled


⁶ A delineation and analysis of COINTELPRO actions against Martin Luther King, Jr. appears in David J. Garrow, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr. From “Solo” to Memphis* (New York: W.W. Norton &
COINTELPRO following the theft and publication of confidential FBI documents in the spring of 1971, it served as just one example of government repression.\textsuperscript{7} Outside of COINTELPRO, the FBI and other government agencies (federal, state, county, and municipal), engaged in the repression, surveillance, harassment, or whenever possible, arrest of a wide range of political activists. Such efforts were varied in intensity and effect. For example, the FBI’s role in the assassination of Fred Hampton was far more severe than any vice squad’s arrest of a musician on grounds of drug possession or obscenity. There was never a concerted COINTELPRO-rock music or COINTELPRO-folk music in the manner there was a COINTELPRO-New Left, because the FBI never viewed music to be as threatening to national security as it did the New Left. Nonetheless, instances did arise when the FBI, the U.S. military, vice squads, and law enforcement personnel, for various reasons attempted to restrict (or even appropriate) rock’s political or ostensibly subversive discourse.

Nationally, as this chapter will demonstrate, political personages ranging from federal luminaries such as J. Edgar Hoover and Vice-President Spiro Agnew to anonymous police officers in cities like Ann Arbor, Chicago, and Miami denounced rock musicians for both being supportive of such controversial causes as the antiwar movement and advocating such behavior as illegal drug use, seen as synonymous with the counterculture. This pattern emerged in the harassment or repression of rock and folk musicians: although many musicians, particularly on a local level, were placed under

\textsuperscript{7} Davis, \textit{Assault on the Left}, 1-17.
surveillance, denounced, or even arrested for either drug possession or an expression of allegedly profane acts, those with blatant ties to radical political groups, such as Phil Ochs and Joan Baez, evoked an even greater proportion of concern on the federal level.\(^8\) Nationwide, rock audiences in numerous localities became increasingly subjected to club closures, festival cancellations, potential surveillance, and arrest at concerts. Henceforth, such efforts against rock affected a larger body than the musicians alone; they also confirmed how amidst regional differences, local police departments, the FBI, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and even the military brass, tried to curb some of rock’s counter-hegemonic or subversive undertones from reaching the nation’s youth. In the words of authors Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, “[t]he harassment of rock musicians was part of a crusade against the emerging counterculture and the alternative politics associated with radical politics in the late 1960s.”\(^9\) This crusade included the policing, suppression, and even appropriation of some of rock’s discourse and tropes.

I. Politicians’ General Criticism:

Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s campaigning or elected political officials warned parents and their record-buying children about rock music’s supposed links to sex, drugs, and dangerous protest. In one example, the Indiana Attorney General, Theodore Sendak, when seeking to introduce legislation banning outdoor rock festivals, publically declared that rock concerts were “drug supermarkets.”\(^10\) On the federal level, in 1969, President Richard Nixon mailed a congratulatory letter to the organizer of an

---

\(^8\) The author must acknowledge correspondence in which the historian Jeffrey Ogbar has suggested that such repression mirrored the state’s efforts against political activists. In other words, law enforcement officials, such as FBI agents, imposed far greater surveillance, counterintelligence, and repression on political radicals like the Black Panthers than on random marijuana smokers or long-haired students. Nonetheless, state harassment of the latter individuals also occurred.

\(^9\) Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1992), 226.

anti-rock “decency rally” organized in the aftermath of the notorious March 1, 1969 Doors concert resulting in the later arrest of singer, Jim Morrison. In 1970 Nixon met with forty state governors to discuss the promotion of drug usage in rock lyrics. Their meeting coincided with the FCC’s 1971 issuance of a warning that radio stations needed to demonstrate an awareness of the lyrical content surrounding these songs, avoiding them whenever possible. While the actions of the FCC will be examined elsewhere in this chapter, their publicized objections to rock music were compounded by the very public grievances expressed by the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Vice President Spiro Agnew.

J. Edgar Hoover’s thoughts about rock were likely connected to his belief that, as evidenced by the flowering counter-culture and booming antiwar movement, America was in “moral decline,” a theme addressed by the historian Richard Gid Powers. On July 6, 1968 Hoover suggested that local FBI offices should clandestinely inform parents and college administrators of the counter-cultural lifestyles of antiwar students as a means of imposing parental and university discipline on those students whose antiwar and countercultural activities were seen by Hoover as counter-hegemonic and dangerous to American society. Two examples of such “depravities” as defined by Hoover were “the use of narcotics and free sex.” Although the Director’s statement did not specifically mention rock music, many of the parents and campus administrators receiving letters from the FBI likely viewed sex, drugs, and rock music as being

12 Nuzum, Parental Advisory, 141-147. The FCC’s precise acts and statement are addressed later in this chapter.
14 Ibid., 432.
interconnected. As Powers argues, Hoover’s criticism of these “immoral behaviors” was an effort to act like a “foster parent” in order to correct what he saw as the misguided behavior of American teenagers and college students.\(^\text{15}\) Just as Hoover sought to curtail drug use, public sexuality, and antiwar protest, so he also determined that at least some aspects of rock music – which he believed could bear “serious effects on our young people” – should be suppressed.\(^\text{16}\)

Hoover’s aversion to rock and folk music extended to such performers as the Doors, the Fugs, the MC5, John Lennon, and Phil Ochs. Unlike Hoover, some FBI agents, including those younger in age, would have enjoyed rock and folk music, or at the very least not have viewed such genres as threatening. For example, the former FBI agent M. Wesley Swearingen later asserted that the FBI’s interest in John Lennon resulted not because of Lennon’s musicianship, but instead because of his developing association with the political radical Jerry Rubin.\(^\text{17}\) As delineated by the historian Jon Wiener, the FBI particularly feared Lennon’s efforts to organize a 1972 concert tour intended to persuade voters to not reelect President Richard Nixon. In Wiener’s words, “Here was FBI rock criticism: J. Edgar Hoover’s middle-aged men in dark suits trying to figure out whether John Lennon would succeed in bringing rock and revolution together. No other rock star aroused the government’s fears this way. No other rock star was ordered deported, as John was, in a government effort to prevent a concert tour.”\(^\text{18}\) A close reading of Lennon’s FBI files confirms that Hoover was quite active in the effort to

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 462.
\(^{17}\) The U.S. vs. John Lennon, dir. David Leaf and John Scheinfeld, 2006, Lions Gate, 2007, DVD.
deport Lennon, thus suggesting that the Director personally disliked the musician. What Weiner does not address, however, is that Hoover’s active interest in deporting Lennon contrasted with the Director’s coinciding distrust of Nixon. Since Hoover held personal and bureaucratic animosity towards Nixon, he really must have detested Lennon to take such concern regarding the musician’s potential threat to the President’s reelection.19

Hoover also viewed both Phil Ochs and the MC5 as a threat. While the New York division of the FBI had been investigating Ochs’s alleged ties to Communism as early as 1963, Hoover took a personal interest in the folksinger in 1966. Due to the August 1968 protests in Chicago (analyzed in Chapter Two of this study), Ochs was placed on the FBI’s Security Index. Although Ochs was not officially charged with any crimes (unlike his associates Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman), Hoover insisted that close tabs be kept on Ochs.20 Moreover, as Ochs’s friend and later biographer Marc Eliot has written, “In 1969, Hoover became very convinced that Phil Ochs was a very real threat to the life of the president of the United States after the Bureau received a letter from a woman complaining that her fourteen-year-old son had bought a Phil Ochs record containing a song that threatened the life of the president. ‘Pretty Smart on Mary Part’ was an obvious satire of what Phil labeled ‘the masculine American male.’”21 Hoover’s fear of Ochs thus resulted from his belief that the singer was dangerous as a threat to Nixon’s physical wellbeing as well as a cultural menace. Such thoughts paralleled Hoover’s disgust with the MC5. As the historian Jeff A. Hale points out about Hoover’s

19 Anthony Summers chronicles the uneasy relationship between Hoover and Nixon, which included the FBI Director’s collection of information regarding the President’s supposed infidelity as potential material for blackmail. See Anthony Summers, Official and Confidential: The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1993), 11-12.


21 Ibid., 338.
reaction to a violent confrontation that had erupted in June 1969 between White Panther Party members and police officials:

For FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who had been incensed by what he termed ‘filthy’ and ‘obscene’ lyrics by the MC5, the mere presence of White Panthers at the riots was proof that they had coordinated the revolt. After reading reports on the riot, Hoover ordered that actions be taken to monitor, disrupt, and damage the WPP.22

Although the FBI directed its surveillance and prosecutorial efforts against the White Panthers (and not the MC5), in this passage Hale has nonetheless demonstrated that while Hoover was most concerned by the violence connected with the White Panthers he was simultaneously dismayed by what he defined as the band’s “filthy” and “obscene lyrics.”23 The Director’s moral objection to the MC5’s lyrical content mirrored his detestation for the Doors (who unlike the MC5 were not affiliated with any political organization).

In 1969 both Hoover and U.S. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (North Carolina, Democrat) received letters from an FBI Special Correspondent, Charles H. Crutchfield of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Company.24 Crutchfield, per the suggestion of the music director at his company’s radio stations, articulated his displeasure about a recent release by the Fugs, titled Virgin Fugs, containing songs that criticized the CIA and

23 Ibid.
24 Although this letter’s authorship predated such events, in 1970 Senator Sam J. Ervin would attempt to pass legislation that would have prevented the U.S. military from spying on civilians for political (as opposed to military) purposes. Ervin would also head the Congressional Committee created to examine President Nixon’s role in the Watergate Crisis. Consequently, Ervin most likely would not have approved of the FBI’s surveillance of rock musicians for political reasons. For information regarding Ervin, see Aryeh Neier, “Surveillance as Censorship,” in UnAmerican Activities: The Campaign against the Underground Press, eds. Geoffrey Rips, Anne Janovitz, and Nancy Peters (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1981), 15-16.
advocated the use of saran wrap for contraceptive purposes. The letter proposed that in reaction to this record by the Fugs, as well as the material of the Doors, whose singer Jim Morrison had recently been arrested in Miami for allegedly masturbating onstage, either the FBI or the Attorney General should put forth “any efforts to make record racks and newsstands refrain from peddling such filth.” Responding to Crutchfield, Hoover wrote, “I, too, share your concern regarding this type of recording which is being distributed throughout the country and certainly appreciate your bringing it to my attention. It is repulsive to right-thinking people and can have serious effects on our young people.” Hoover’s reply, though not written for the general public, demonstrated his abhorrence to rock musicians, particularly, in this case, to both the Fugs (whose member Ed Sanders had a close relationship to wanted activists like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, and the Doors (who held no close personal ties to any political radicals).

While Hoover lacked any legal authority to choose or censor what radio DJs played, his words nonetheless promoted censorship, a form of artistic repression that would have had major economic repercussions for professional musicians. Radio broadcasts were a particularly important forum for bands to market their singles and albums on a national level. In this instance, Hoover’s words could have warned the broadcasting executive that any station which broadcasted music by the very popular Doors and the less famous Fugs, could find itself under the attention of government agencies like the FBI (and possibly, although Hoover did not write so, the FCC, the

25 “CIA Man” is examined in Chapter One of this study.
27 Letter from J. Edgar Hoover to Charles Crutchfield, March 26, 1969.
agency responsible for issuing and renewing radio station licenses).\textsuperscript{28} Although Crutchfield wrote to Hoover, thus implying that he would not have permitted the broadcasting of the Doors and the Fugs anyway, some broadcasting executives (including Crutchfield) would have realized the economic benefits of working in alliance with the FBI. As one of Hoover’s top officials, William C. Sullivan would later write:

> On occasion, Hoover would extend the services of the FBI to business executives. We helped some of the top men from Warner Brothers by setting up meetings for them with foreign political leaders and businessmen; they got the same treatment that some elected officials did. All courtesy of the FBI, all paid for by the tax-payer. Hoover bragged that he had the motion picture studio under his thumb.\textsuperscript{29}

Although Sullivan did not mention any possible relationship between Hoover and the executives of either record labels (including Warner Brothers) or radio stations such as Crutchfield’s, the existence of this close liaison between Hoover and the film industry bespoke of the Director’s ability to either threaten or help entertainment and media conglomerates.\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, despite the private nature of such correspondence, Hoover’s words bore consequence.

Another politician who criticized rock music, and implicitly advocated for its censorship, was Vice-President Spiro Agnew. In a September 1970 speech to Republican Party donors, Agnew warned that “there is one rapidly growing [drug] culture that contributes nothing to our well-being and, indeed, threatens to sap our national strength

\textsuperscript{28} The FCC’s warnings about the broadcast of drug-oriented songs on radio station playlists is addressed later in this chapter.


\textsuperscript{30} While no evidence has been found suggesting that Hoover contacted the Doors’ label, Elektra Records, biographer Marc Eliot has addressed the FBI’s contacting of Phil Ochs’s label, A & M Records. Eliot, \textit{Death of a Rebel}, 334.
unless we move hard and fast to bring it under control.”

Believing that the increase in drug use amongst America’s youth was bolstered by allusions to drugs in rock lyrics, Agnew declared:

I do not suggest that there is a conspiracy among some song writers, entertainers, and movie producers to subvert the suspecting listener. In my opinion, there isn’t any. But the cumulative impact of some of their work advances the wrong cause. I may be accused of advocating ‘song censorship’ for pointing this out, but have you really heard the words of some of these songs?

Agnew then listed such songs as the Beatles’ “With a Little Help From My Friends,” the Jefferson Airplane’s “White Rabbit,” and the Byrds’ “Eight Miles High.” He also contended that rock festivals were “run by men who use young people as props in pot-smoking, acid-dropping events.” Wanting to curtail the promotion of drugs by and within rock culture, Agnew decreed: “It is time that we wake up—that we listen to and understand what’s going on in the drug culture. It’s time that we counter the propaganda with the truth.” He also encouraged censorship from radio stations, parental restrictions on what children could hear, and a change in lyrical motifs by songwriters, stating:

I am sure that very few, if any, station managers in America would deliberately allow the use of their radio facilities to encourage the use of drugs. Few parents would knowingly tolerate the blaring of a drug-approving message from phonographs in their homes. And few musicians intend their ‘in-jokes’ and double meanings to reach past the periphery of pot users. But the fact is that the stations do, the parents do, and the musicians do.

Agnew’s speech would have reminded any attuned radio station manager, parent, or musician that the highest echelon of the federal government equated much of rock music

---

32 Ibid., 308.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 310.
35 Ibid., 309.
with illegal drug use, and consequently wanted to repress the popularity of rock’s message. Such repression encouraged radio censorship, a strict surveillance and suppression of rock festivals, and a warning to any pro-drug musician that a potential arrest could occur. As Vice-President, Agnew did not personally arrest anyone; nevertheless, law enforcement officials ranging from the FBI to local narcotics squads agreed with his interpretation that rock was dangerous.36 These said officials of law and order attempted to undermine the careers and livelihood of musicians through drug arrests and the enforcement of profanity and obscenity statutes.

II. Drug Busts and Arrests:

Summarizing the FBI and federal government’s actions against him, the antiwar radical and Chicago Seven defendant Jerry Rubin wrote:

Every young person has at least one personal atrocity story. Mine are about typical: two 30-day jail sentences, another on appeal, a phony dope bust, admitted federal wiretapping, an undercover cop, 24-hour-a-day police tail, travel restrictions, $25,000 bail/ransom and a federal conspiracy-to-riot indictment . . . . Their goal is to tie our hands with legal self-defense so that we have no time for revolution, and to make some of us an example in order to frighten and silence you.37

While Rubin’s writings and actions with the Yippies elsewhere demonstrated his belief in an interconnectivity between rock music and political radicalism, this passage conveyed how through a “phony dope bust,” the government sought to force Rubin into forgoing his antiwar activities in order to concentrate on his court appearance. Local police forces

36 For additional discussion of Agnew’s speech, see Linda Martin and Kerry Segrave, Anti-Rock: The Opposition to Rock and Roll (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1988), 202-204. Apparently, Agnew’s tirade against the Jefferson Airplane did not deter the band’s counter-hegemonic expression and behavior. As Rolling Stone reported, the Airplane’s Paul Kantner reacted to news of Agnew’s speech by mailing him the band’s albums. See “Spiro Agnew vs. The White Rabbit,” Rolling Stone, 29 October 1970, 24. Of course, some record label owners and radio executives would have been more concerned about upsetting Agnew. Peter Doggett has reported that an Agnew complaint to Atlantic Records caused the label to stop selling Eugene McDaniels’s Headless Heroes of the Apocalypse. Peter Doggett, There’s A Riot Going On: Revolutionaries, Rock Stars, and the Rise and Fall of the ’60s (New York: Canongate, 2007), 536.
as well as the FBI commonly used this tactic against radical political groups like the Black Panther Party. Apart from Rubin’s associates John Lennon and Phil Ochs, and the MC5’s manager John Sinclair, no musicians suffered as much FBI surveillance as Rubin did.\textsuperscript{38} Nonetheless, numerous musicians were arrested on drug charges due to the interest that various law enforcement agencies across the nation had in repressing both political radicalism and counterculture mores. Chapter One of this study analyzed the noted October 1967 raid of the Grateful Dead’s communal home in San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district as well as the several arrests, and, beginning in 1969, the incarceration, of John Sinclair. Whereas California and other local authorities took umbrage with the Dead’s countercultural lifestyle and association with LSD distributors law enforcement officials on both the local (Detroit and Ann Arbor, Michigan) and federal level were most concerned by Sinclair’s radical associates in the White Panther Party. Consequently, the FBI’s files on Sinclair and the White Panther Party were far more voluminous than those on the Grateful Dead. Sinclair also suffered more time in court and prison. His drug arrests and incarceration resulted not only because of his countercultural values (including the sale, use, and advocacy of illegal drugs), but primarily due to his radical politics. The Dead, however, upset authorities primarily because of their countercultural lifestyle. The cases of Sinclair and the Dead demonstrated how the arrest of musicians on drug charges resulted from both their political beliefs and countercultural practices. Those working closely with political causes such as the antiwar movement experienced federal repression; simultaneously, musicians somewhat unconnected to radical politics suffered only local harassment and arrests. Thus, due to his leadership activity with the

\textsuperscript{38} Writing that “[t]he Rubin file is one of the largest of all the New Left COINTELPRO files,” scholar James Kirkpatrick Davis has detailed the FBI’s acts against Rubin. Davis, \textit{Assault on the Left}, 150.
White Panther Party, Sinclair was targeted for a greater neutralization than were the Dead.

As author Harry Shapiro has argued in his popular history on the relationship between drugs and twentieth-century music, the practice of busting musicians for drugs was more than an attempt to repress political radicalism. Some police officers hoped to bolster the reputation of law enforcement agencies, while using the media’s interest in a celebrity’s arrest to discourage sympathy or drug use by the area’s youths. Despite the problem of conflating what happened in Britain with events in the United States, thus failing to differentiate between the British and American governments, Shapiro writes:

Musicians are also good copy in the propaganda war against drug users, showing that fame and fortune are no protection against drug problems. Indirectly, the bust is a means of exercising unadmitted social revenge and in default of the Mr. Bigs who are rarely apprehended, nabbing Mr. Pop Star ensures the police front-page headlines.

While citing examples of musicians from several decades, Shapiro briefly alludes to (but does not fully analyze) the January 1966 arrest of the folksinger, Donovan Leitch. Though arrested in his native Britain and not the United States, Donovan (as he was billed as a performer) was certainly renowned by at least some members of the American counterculture. In his memoir, Donovan later explained the significance of his being arrested soon after the broadcast of a television documentary about his music and lifestyle:

This was the first time a British television audience had caught a glimpse of the lifestyle of beatniks, and many were shocked. So I was now the youth demon, and I had to be punished. The Drug Squad (newly formed) would make an example of me. I would be the first sensational “bust” of

40 Ibid.
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the 1960s. Little did I know that the British newspapers and the London Ding Squad were planning to systematically bust all important music stars of the time.\textsuperscript{42}

Despite writing four decades after the arrest, Donovan emphasized how his fame led the London police to target him. By busting someone famous, the Drug Squad intended to promote its recent creation and presence. Even though Donovan’s use of the term “beatniks” referred more to the counterculture of the 1950s than to the “hippies” or political radicals of the 1960s, authorities exerted repression on both groups.\textsuperscript{43}

Like Donovan, Jimi Hendrix also suffered a high publicity arrest for drug possession. At a Toronto airport in May 1969, Royal Canadian Mounties arrested Hendrix for heroin. Pointing out that the guitarist and party were searched in view of the general public, instead of a private room customary for such investigations, a \textit{Rolling Stone} article suggested that the authorities had intended for the arrest to complement its attack on the Canadian city’s nascent counterculture:

\begin{quote}
. . . the Mounties do not typically lie in wait at the airport, ready to pounce. Toronto authorities have been getting tough on the free living hippie community of Yorkeville, more or less Toronto’s version of the Haight-Ashbury [in San Francisco], in recent months, and there is the possibility that Hendrix may have been caught in the squeeze.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{43} In her biography of Janis Joplin, historian Alice Echols made a similar point by citing three main examples of the state’s repression of “beat culture”: the publisher Lawrence Ferlinghetti’s arrest for publishing obscene material (specifically, Allen Ginsberg’s \textit{Howl}), the State of California’s issuance of a five-year prison sentence to Neal Cassady (the inspiration for Jack Kerouac’s landmark novel, \textit{On the Road}), for a marijuana possession charge, and J. Edgar Hoover’s derision of whom he referred to as “communists, beatniks and eggheads” during a speech at the 1960 Republican Party National Convention. Alice Echols, \textit{Scars of Sweet Paradise: The Life and Times of Janis Joplin} (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1999), 60. By examining the relationship between Allen Ginsberg and Bob Dylan, the historian Sean Wilentz has noted that despite some differences between the 1950s Beats and 1960s counterculture, some links such as the magnanimous presence of Ginsberg within both movements existed. See Sean Wilentz, \textit{Bob Dylan in America}, (New York: Anchor Books, 2011), 47-84.

\textsuperscript{44} Ritchie Yorke and Ben Fong-Torres, “Hendrix Busted in Toronto,” \textit{Rolling Stone}, 31 May 1969, 10.
Although *Rolling Stone* defined Yorkeville as similar to the Haight-Ashbury community in San Francisco, thus conflating a Canadian community with one in California, scholars should realize that Hendrix was arrested by Canadian authorities, while Donovan had been charged by London police officers. This demonstrated that musicians and writers for the music press realized the illegality of drugs in different countries; however, neither of these arrests constituted evidence of the repression or harassment of musicians by American law enforcement officials, because they were not active participants in such incidents.

Although the British Donovan was arrested in London and the American Jimi Hendrix suffered a similar experience in Toronto, law enforcement authorities in the U.S. also arrested musicians like the Grateful Dead on drug charges. Months after Hendrix’s Toronto arrest, a *Rolling Stone* article addressing the January 1971 raid of the Grateful Dead’s hotel room in New Orleans, similarly argued how local authorities upset by a blossoming counterculture targeted visiting rock musicians. Writing that “New Orleans police seem to fear their good town will become the next Haight-Ashbury,” the anonymous author quoted band manager Lenny Hart’s description of the band being “handcuffed . . . all together and lined . . . up in front of the building for press photos.”

Both *Rolling Stone* articles emphasized how the detestation towards the counterculture expressed by police officers in Toronto and New Orleans fearful that their communities were coming to resemble the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco related to the arrests of Hendrix and the Dead, although such police authorities were actors on behalf of different governments.

---

With intentions similar to those of the law enforcement officials in Toronto and New Orleans, in 1966 the vice squad of the Austin, Texas Police Department began watching the locally popular band, the Thirteenth Floor Elevators. Just weeks into their investigation, police raided the home of two band members, leading to the entire group’s arrest on drug charges. Then, in 1969, an Austin patrolman pulled over the band’s lead singer, Roky Erickson, who while driving had thrown a marijuana joint out his car’s window. Will Sheff, an Austin musician who, as of 1969 was unborn, but would record with Erickson nearly forty years later, would write:

To Austin music fans, the 13th Floor Elevators were legendary – commonly credited as the inventors of psychedelic rock. To the law enforcement community, though, they were notorious as counterculture celebrities who openly advocated drug use. It has been a long-held opinion in the Austin police department that if the Elevators – and especially their charismatic lead singer – were successfully convicted on drug charges, their severe punishment might serve as an example to impressionably young people. Police had been trying to catch them for years, but had been evaded or had their cases thrown out due to technicalities. . . . He was a walking target.

Sheff’s interpretation of this arrest complemented the pattern delineated by Harry Shapiro’s popular study, Donovan’s memoir, and Rolling Stone’s coverage of the arrests of Jimi Hendrix and the Grateful Dead. In all cases, law enforcement authorities arrested drug-using musicians in conjunction with their attack on the counterculture. The effects of these arrests, mostly financial, though in Erickson’s case also resulting in imprisonment, will be addressed next chapter. Such arrests demonstrated the revulsion which some law enforcement officials had towards both the counterculture and some rock

---

46 Will Sheff, Liner Notes to Roky Erickson with Okkervil River, True Love Cast Out All Evil, Anti 87078-2, 12, compact disc.
musicians in general. Similarly, arresting musicians on charges of indecency and obscenity was another method utilized by law enforcement officials.

III. The Use of Profanity and Obscenity Statutes:

As demonstrated in the correspondence between J. Edgar Hoover and Charles H. Crutchfield of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Company (examined earlier in this chapter), the FBI Director did express concern with rock’s expressions of obscenity and profanity. That particular correspondence resulted in no arrests or charges, demonstrating that while Hoover was offended, he did not feel the necessity of exerting methods of full repression or neutralization against the Fugs or the Doors (in contrast to the Bureau’s acts against the Black Panthers or Weather Underground). Yet, on other occasions unconnected to Hoover’s correspondence with Crutchfield, both Ed Sanders (of the Fugs) and Jim Morrison (of the Doors) suffered arrest and trial for charges related to either obscenity or profanity.\(^{48}\) Sometimes, the FBI could and did relay its intelligence and prosecutorial opinions to the local and state law enforcement officials under whose jurisdiction most obscenity and profanity laws fell. Typed notes affixed to the letter from Hoover to Crutchfield noted how New York authorities had already examined the second LP by the Fugs, and chosen to not prosecute the band.\(^{49}\) Despite that decision, a handwritten note on that letter stated, “Record delivered to Robert Mahoney, [illegible], 4/1/69 for prosecutive (sic.) decision [illegible initials].”\(^{50}\) The FBI’s decision to forward the record suggested some interest in the band’s prosecution, but not enough to do anything further. Though the Fugs were not affected by this action, the Bureau


\(^{49}\) Ibid.

\(^{50}\) Ibid.
demonstrated that some of its agents under Director J. Edgar Hoover were upset by the inclusion of profane and obscene language on commercial recordings. Five years earlier, before the counterculture’s widespread, mainstream ascent, FBI agents in six cities had investigated whether the popular Kingsmen record, “Louie Louie,” contained obscene lyrics, that if distributed, would have broken federal laws prohibiting the “Interstate Transportation of Obscene Material.” This investigation followed the FBI’s Indianapolis branch’s receipt of a letter from an angry consumer who had purchased the record as well as the U.S. Assistant Attorney Irvin R. Lester’s request for a lab analysis of the record’s lyrics. Ultimately, the Bureau decreed that the song was “unintelligible at any speed,” thus preventing any prosecutorial measures. Writing from the perspective of a journalistic rock critic, Dave Marsh has contended that the FBI’s interest in “Louie Louie” paralleled the “moral panics” that followed the uproar concerning fears of juvenile delinquency brought by the 1950s song “Rock Around the Clock” (addressed briefly in chapter two of this study) and rap music in the 1980s and 1990s. Yet, because he is not a historian, Marsh does not address why the Bureau would have been interested in the activities and lyrics of some rock musicians during the late sixties. Those reasons included rock’s connection to the rise of the youthful dissenters of the New Left, the counterculture, the antiwar movement, and radical groups like the Black Panther Party (as explained in Chapters One and Two of this study).

51 Dave Marsh, Louie, Louie: The History and Mythology of the World’s Most Famous Rock ’n’ Roll Song: Including the Full Details of Its Torture and Persecution at the Hands of the Kingsmen, J. Edgar Hoover’s F.B.I., and a Cast of Millions; and Introducing, for the First Time Anywhere, the Actual Dirty Lyrics (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 117.
52 Ibid., 122-123.
53 Ibid., 116.
54 Ibid., 114-115.
Although no arrests or bans resulted from the FBI’s 1964 examination of “Louie Louie,” throughout the 1960s local law enforcement officials nationwide used profanity and obscenity statutes against political radicals, authors and booksellers, and rock musicians as a means of either censoring or discouraging their political rhetoric. Such arrests constituted the harassment of political radicals, and at times, ensured the legal shutdown of unwanted political, countercultural, or sexually-explicit publications. Abbie Hoffman was just one activist arrested on such charges. In the earlier years of the sixties, Hoffman was arrested at the Newport Folk Festival for distributing sexually-explicit literature to nuns.  

Then, while in Chicago for the protests surrounding the 1968 Democratic National Committee Convention (examined in Chapter Three), Chicago police arrested Hoffman in a restaurant for wearing the obscenity, “FUCK,” on his forehead. It could be argued that the Chicago police arrested Hoffman not for his choice of words, but rather because of his radical antiwar activism and presence outside the Convention; the obscenity statute merely provided them a legal means for making an arrest. Although the arresting Chicago police officers had intended for these arrests to deter Hoffman’s activism, they instead increased Hoffman’s condemnation of the police in his public appearances and published writings.

Whereas Hoffman’s arrests demonstrated its repression of an individual activist, law enforcement officials also used obscenity statutes to impede the publication and distribution of underground counterculture newspapers, many of which questioned law enforcement and military officials, promoted the use of illegal psychedelic drugs and

marijuana, and commonly praised and advertised rock music. Unlike Hoffman, who was not deterred by these arrests, numerous underground papers ceased publication following police raids and the arrest of their editorial staff. Examining the connections between John Lennon and the British counterculture press, the historian Jon Wiener has noted that in 1971, the British government shut down the antiwar, revolutionary newspaper OZ by incarcerating its editors under obscenity convictions. Although that was an act of a British state quite separate from domestic American authorities, author Geoffrey Rips has pointed out that similar to the case of Britain’s OZ, in the U.S., “the government rarely attempted to prosecute any underground newspaper for its open political statements and never obtained a conviction on a political charge.” Instead, “They hunted for marijuana, arrested editors for obscenity, and quibbled over street vending rights.” Rips argues that while such busts and arrests resulted in the destruction and confiscation of important papers and expensive equipment, they more tellingly forced writers and publishers into costly court cases which they could almost never afford, thus leading many of these newspapers to cease publication as a means of avoiding further legal hassles. Such examples demonstrated the police’s use of obscenity statutes against activist publishers and the newspapers manifesting their subversive or revolutionary ideas. Similarly, some rock performers were arrested.

---

57 Such newspapers included the Ann Arbor Argus, Berkeley Barb, Chicago Seed, and East Village Other. Various issues of these publications can be viewed in the Alternative Press Collection at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center at the University of Connecticut.
58 Wiener, Come Together, 156-159.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
Although these arrests never led to actual incarceration (despite Morrison’s likelihood of going to prison if he had not died in Paris while his case was under appeal), they did make some record company executives, record store owners, and concert promoters wary of releasing certain material or working with particular artists (a topic addressed next chapter). Too, they sometimes resulted in protests and boycotts.

The examination of lyrics and arrest of musicians and record store owners under obscenity statutes should be understood within the context of how popular culture was affected by the use of such laws as a means of political repression in the “Long Sixties,” including the arrests of the comedian Lenny Bruce during the early 1960s. This is because such arrests like those of Lenny Bruce demonstrated that police action resulted not because of the genre performed, but instead as a reaction against the political content of certain performances. Vice squads in the early 1960s took umbrage with Bruce’s satire on organized religious figures. The comedian’s associate, the writer Paul Krassner has described how in December 1962, when Bruce was released on bail for a prior obscenity arrest in Chicago, that city’s “head of the vice squad warned the manager of the Gate of Horn: ‘If this man ever uses a four-letter word in this club again, I’m going to pinch you and everyone in here. If he ever speaks against religion, I’m going to pinch you and everyone in here. Do you understand? You’ve had good people here. But he mocks the Pope . . . I’m going to tell you your license is in danger. We’re going to have someone here watching every show.”63 Such warning demonstrated that the Chicago vice squad’s treatment of Bruce was twofold: offense taken with the comedian’s political

---

62 It is also possible that government authorities might have clandestinely removed or damaged some underground publications. The FBI allegedly destroyed copies of the Black Panther Party’s newspaper. See Peter Doggett, There’s A Riot Going On, 248.
message—the satirical exposure of the hypocrisy of religious authorities (in a city with a
sizeable Catholic population)—coincided with its interest in arresting Bruce for obscene
language. It was not so much Bruce’s profanity that upset the vice squad, but instead the
combination of his profanity and criticism of organized Christianity, an institution that
many viewed as a dominant ideology in Chicago. The lawyer, William M. Kunstler, who
after representing Bruce in 1965 would become the renowned defense lawyer for such
countercultural and radical clientele as the Chicago Seven and the White Panther Party,
would state:

My experience with Lenny Bruce—often described as a stand-up comic but really one of the greatest political satirists of our time—was the first
time I saw in action the government’s use of the might and power of the
criminal justice system to crush dissent. Establishment minions complained that Lenny’s nightclub routines were smutty and lewd, immoral and indecent, and that the government had a responsibility to stop them. His brilliant and unconventional humor had riled the Establishment so much that the authorities busted him for indecency, obscenity, and a whole range of trumped-up charges that would be impossible to bring today.64

Although Bruce’s death from a drug overdose in 1966 prevented him from joining the
countercultural and radical political movements of the late sixties, the Chicago vice squad
head’s threats to the Chicago club owner paralleled the forthcoming efforts of other law
enforcement officials to impede the activism and careers of some rock musicians and
political radicals through obscenity arrests.65 Just as obscenity arrests led to the closure
of many underground newspapers, Bruce lost opportunities to present his largely
irreligious dialogue. So many club owners became fearful of vice squad raids at Bruce

64 William M. Kunstler with Sheila Isenberg, My Life as a Radical Lawyer (New York: Birch Lane Press, 1994), 167.
65 Despite Bruce dying just when the counterculture was beginning to grow nationally, Ralph J. Gleason, a
San Franciscan music critic and one of the founding editors of Rolling Stone, defined him as “the unwilling
martyr of his time and the father of us all.” See Ralph J. Gleason, “Lenny Bruce at the Turning Point: How
He Became the Unwilling Martyr of His Time and the Father of Us All,” Rolling Stone, 26 October 1972, 32.
performances, that in 1965, a San Francisco judge ruled the once successful comedian financially destitute due to his inability to attain bookings. Obscenity arrests thus caused the decline of Bruce’s performing career while his legal defense fees escalated. Such an effect could be interpreted as what vice squads intended; however, not every performer subjected to obscenity arrests encountered as many subsequent problems.

In January 1966 (as addressed briefly in Chapter Two of this study), New York City police officers raided the Peace Eye Book Store and arrested Fugs member and poet Ed Sanders on charges of selling pornographic material.\(^\text{66}\) Sanders believed the raid was intentional as he wrote that the police came “ostensibly to investigate the possibility of a burglary having occurred.”\(^\text{67}\) The use of the adverb, “ostensibly,” connoted Sanders’s distrust of the police’s official explanation. Among the publications seized by the police were numerous issues of Sanders’s self-published, mimeographed *Fuck You/a magazine of the arts*, a publication that combined countercultural values (such as drug usage and sexual experimentation) and radical political activism\(^\text{68}\) The cover of the June/July 1965 issue advertised itself as “the magazine of butt-fucking, revulsed (sic.) freaks, dope dealers & group grope.”\(^\text{69}\) Such language with its blatantly profane sexual descriptions appeared next to a list of dedications which included: the Rolling Stones singer “Mick Jagger . . . THE FUGS, pacifists in jail because of war creeps, & all those groped by J.

---

\(^{66}\) See documents and manuscripts in folder titled, “Peace Eye Bookstore – Bookstore Materials Collected as Evidence in 1966 Arrest,” Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 443.

\(^{67}\) Ed Sanders Newsletter, April 1966, Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 441.

\(^{68}\) Ibid.

\(^{69}\) *Fuck You/a magazine of the arts*, no. 5, vol. 9, (June/July 1965), found in Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 444.
Edgar Hoover in the silent halls of congress.” These words glorified the rock bands, the Rolling Stones and the Fugs, showed support for those incarcerated for refusing to participate in the Vietnam War, accused the FBI’s Director of sexual promiscuity, and glorified illegal drug use. Such content was sexually suggestive, but also blatantly political. The material seized as well as the police’s actions in this incident paralleled the general pattern that Geoffrey Rips has defined as police harassment of the underground press. Although many of the underground newspapers examined by Rips decided to shut down due to their staff’s inability to afford court defense fees, Sanders ultimately won his case with important assistance from the American Civil Liberties Union. Thus, like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, both of who were regular conspirators with the Fugs singer and radical activist, Sanders, unlike some of the underground newspaper writers and editors, was not silenced by the harassment of confiscated material or obscenity trials.

As the historian Jon Wiener has proven, it was John Lennon’s association with radicals connected to the antiwar movement, particularly Rubin and Hoffman, (as opposed to his music) that most concerned the FBI. Yet, the Bureau also noted how the University of Hartford temporarily shut down the campus newspaper for printing pictures of the naked Lennon and Ono (that were associated with the couple’s Two Virgins album). Soon afterwards, a New Haven FBI agent informed Hoover about a January 1969 student demonstration protesting the University’s decision. The FBI forwarded this report to military officials (probably because of the coinciding antiwar activism of
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71 “Ed Sanders Wins Obscenity Case,” May 22, ’67, found in Ed Sanders Papers, Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 439.
72 Jon Wiener, Come Together, passim.
Lennon, Ono, and most likely the University of Hartford Students), but concluded that the *Two Virgins* photographs were not obscene. Although the FBI itself did not press to have Lennon arrested for the nudity on this album cover, local authorities sought to prevent the album’s distribution by charging potential vendors of the record under obscenity laws. *Rolling Stone* reported three separate incidents detailed to limit the public availability of *Two Virgins*. These included: a raid on a Chicago record store, a New Jersey judge ruling that the record’s jacket (but not the actual music) was obscene—and thus illegal to sell—in that state, and distributors recalling the album from the Cleveland, Ohio region to prevent being imprisoned for what in that state would have constituted the felonious sale of “obscene materials.” The aforementioned magazine also experienced its own distribution problems by featuring a photograph of a naked Lennon and Ono on the front cover of one particular issue. It reported that one street vendor was arrested for selling that issue in San Francisco, and that the Post Office initially refused to deliver the issue on the East Coast. While the Post Office’s actions regarding Lennon’s *Two Virgins* resulted from the album’s artwork and not because of the actual lyrics on that release, the numerous examples of repression and censorship demonstrated the use of obscenity statutes as a means of silencing Lennon’s opposing political views. This also paralleled efforts against the underground press. Yet, unlike the underground newspapers, many of which ceased publishing, *Two Virgins* ultimately remained available in many stores. This happened after its original distributor, Capitol

---
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75 “From the Editor,” *Rolling Stone*, 7 December 1968, 4.
Records, sold the album’s rights to another label, Tetragrammaton Records, which chose to envelop the album in a brown paper bag that obscured all nudity.76

Similar to John Lennon, Country Joe McDonald (of Country Joe and the Fish) was both an advocate of psychedelic drugs and marijuana as well as a regular performer at antiwar rallies and countercultural gatherings, particularly on the West Coast. The FBI and law enforcement officials of California would have disapproved of such events; however, they did not actively seek to engage in repression against McDonald. A naval veteran who was both discharged with honor and proud of his service, McDonald became an outspoken critic of the Vietnam War, particularly through his song, the “I-Feel-Like-I’m-Fixin’-To-Die Rag.”77 Although his label, Vanguard Records, was initially hesitant to release the song due to its content, it became nationally known among the counterculture and antiwar movement as evidenced by its later inclusion in the documentary film on the 1969 Woodstock Festival.78 The song satirically depicted the U.S. military’s presence in Vietnam as a losing effort, which according to its chorus, meant that to its soldiers: “Well, there ain’t no way to wonder why, / Whoopee! We’re all gonna die.”79 When performing the song live, McDonald began by engaging the audience to spell out the obscenity, “fuck,” letter by letter. This call and response technique captured in Woodstock provided vice squad agents with a legal means to discourage McDonald’s antiwar message, which in itself was not illegal.

76 Nuzum, Parental Advisory, 74. Martin and Segrave, Anti-rock, 187-188.
Although law enforcement officials could not automatically incarcerate McDonald for his political beliefs, police in Worcester, Massachusetts arrested him for the utterance of the profanity used to introduce in concert his most famous antiwar song. When Country Joe and the Fish performed in Worcester, in March 1969, numerous police officers and the city’s mayor were in attendance. As had become standard in his performance of the “I- Feel-Like-I’m-Fixin’-to-Die-Rag” (and as it would be recorded just over four months later at Woodstock), McDonald began the song with the “Gimme an F, Gimme a U, Gimme a C, Gimme a K” cheer. Following both the concert and the band’s departure from Worcester, a warrant was issued for that city’s police officers to arrest the singer on the misdemeanor charge of “‘being a lewd person in speech and behavior’ for leading a cheer ‘considered by many as obscene.’”

McDonald learned about the warrant after returning to Massachusetts for a concert in Boston. He voluntarily turned himself in for arrest and was released on bail in time for the Boston concert. Despite his cooperation with the authorities, a large number of law enforcement officials met McDonald in Boston. Rolling Stone reported:

Two weeks later, at the preliminary hearing Joe pointed out the extent of ‘the absurdity of the paranoia of the Establishment.’: ‘We were met in Boston by one police captain, three lieutenants, 75 uniformed policemen with clubs, guns and mace, police squad cars, 25 plainclothes detectives and a paddy wagon.’

Such commentary demonstrated McDonald’s belief that the Boston police were trying to intimidate him and possibly by extension the larger communities of the rock counterculture and the antiwar movement, both of which had extensive followings in the Boston area. The only crime that the singer had committed was a nonviolent
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misdemeanor that arguably did not warrant the attention of so many armed law
enforcement officials. At the resulting trial, McDonald was deemed guilty and fined
$500.83

These actions neither deterred McDonald’s political rhetoric nor resulted in his
imprisonment; however, they did confirm that at least the vice squad officers in
Massachusetts were listening.84 The singer later articulated that police attention to him
resulted from the antiwar content of his “I’m-Fixin’-to-Die Rag.” The FBI did gather
some intelligence on McDonald, though their file on him was very miniscule.85 Yet,
McDonald also fantasized that other top federal officials, including President Richard
Nixon, wanted to suppress the song’s antiwar message. Referring to his performance of
the song in front of hundreds of thousands of people at the 1969 Woodstock Festival,
McDonald later stated:

I always thought, ‘Well listen, . . .’ (it was Richard Nixon in office, right?)
and he must have said ‘What the hell is going on up in New York?,’ you
know? And they said, ‘Oh, well, there's like, . . . they closed the freeway
down. . . .’ (This is stuff I imagine in my mind, because the FBI had been
watching my family and they were watching me, and I know they were
really aware of what the fuck I was doing, anti - war and all that.) There
must have been a point where they said, (voice Nixon-esque) ‘W-hell,
what happened? Tell me.’ ‘Well Mr. President, the whole audience just
yelled FUCK! And sang a song that essentially said, 'fuck you, we're not
going to Viet Nam.’

And I just always thought ‘Whoa, what did he say, 'Get that guy!' Or
something 'cause it must have made him really pissed. It must have made

84 To avoid a similar profanity arrest in Boston, McDonald substituted the “F-U-C-K cheer” with an “L-O-V-E” cheer; but, aside from this lyrical change, he performed an unaltered “I’m-Fixin’-to-Die Rag.” See
McDonald with Allen, “Country Joe McDonald remembering Woodstock,” 151.
85 See Country Joe McDonald, “My Complete FBI File,” Country Joe’s Place, the Website of Country Joe
McDonald, http://www.countryjoe.com/FBI.htm (accessed August 1, 2011). This webpage contains just
two pages constituting one FBI report. If these pages alone constituted what McDonald refers to as “My
Complete FBI File,” then the FBI was clearly not very concerned with him.
a lot of people really, really pissed off. You know? That that was in there.  

This account, though given to an interviewer years after the Vietnam War had ended, demonstrated how McDonald would later equate his antiwar activism with the intimidating acts of the Worcester and Boston police. While no evidence has been found suggesting that Nixon cared about either the song or McDonald’s appearance at Woodstock, the singer viewed the military, the President, and the FBI, as well as Worcester and Boston police officers as a monolithic repressive institution out to “get that guy!” Doing so, McDonald conflated the Nixon Administration, the FBI, and Boston and Worcester police as one monolithic apparatus of repression. Nonetheless, McDonald’s perception was not accurate, for after all, the FBI amassed only a two-page file on him, while the authorities in both Massachusetts cities monitored nothing but his language onstage.

Although the FBI’s surveillance of Country Joe was inconsequential, Bureau agents did monitor and record the June 1972 radio show of John P. Nesci, a disc jockey in Norfolk, Virginia. Nesci broadcasted a live recording of the “I’m Fixin’-to-Die” Rag” prefaced by the “F-U-C-K” cheer.” Although the FCC, the agency responsible for regulating the radio airwaves, rarely incriminated individual DJs, Nesci was charged “under the statute barring broadcast of ‘obscene, indecent and profane’ words [which] carries penalties of up to $10,000 or two years in prison, or both.” As Billboard reported, “Ostensibly brought for ‘obscenity,’ the charges appear to counsel to be aimed at ‘inhibiting the expression of protected speech,’ –i.e., at Nesci’s anti-war stand and his

87 Ibid.
88 “DJ’s Attorneys Demand Data,” Billboard, 4 November 1972, 30.
airing of license numbers of unmarked police cars in the Norfolk area.”89 Ultimately, the U.S. Justice Department, citing insufficient prosecutorial evidence, decided to drop all charges against Nesci once his station had removed him from broadcasting.90 Nonetheless, the minor coverage of Nesci’s predicament in *Billboard*, the publication catering to industry executives and radio programmers, as well as both *Rolling Stone* and *Creem*, magazines for rock listeners, reminded those associated with rock that the possibility of job loss, monetary fines, or arrests existed for those airing political (as well as allegedly obscene or profane) content.91 In this case, the FBI’s interest in Nesci also resulted from the DJ’s exposure of “unmarked police cars,” information which both berated police and potentially impeded their more secretive law enforcement activity.92

While the charges brought against Nesci resulted from his antagonism of the police, those rock musicians who confronted law enforcement officials on stage were also subjected to arrests resulting from their expression of profane language. Two such musicians, both of whom were arrested in Tampa, Florida, were Janis Joplin and Dino Valente (of the Quicksilver Messenger Service). In the words of a *Rolling Stone* reporter, “Janis Joplin . . . was busted November 15th [1969] for using ‘vulgar and indecent language’ during a performance at [Tampa, Florida’s] Curtis Hixon Hall punctuated by push-and-pull fights between enthusiastic fans and frightened authorities.”93 Joplin’s outburst resulted from unwieldy audience members dancing in the aisles, a trend that worried both theater management and police details. While the title of *Rolling Stone*’s
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89 Ibid.
90 “Random Notes,” *Rolling Stone*, 18 January 1973, 3. This article stated that the Country Joe and the Fish recording was “neither obscene nor indecent by current Supreme Court standards” (ibid).
92 “DJ’s Attorneys Demand Data.”
article emphasized that police had set up or “busted” Joplin for her choice of words, the
text addressed how the singer had directed her words towards the police, even threatening
backstage after the concert to kick one detective in the face.94 Although the article did
not make these connections, the reason for Joplin’s arrest on profanity charges differed
from those of her contemporaries. Joplin’s profanity, unlike Country Joe McDonald’s,
was not attached to an antiwar song. It was also unconnected to larger themes of political
revolt or revolution, a common trope expressed by Jim Morrison in Miami. Furthermore,
it contained no sexual implication or expression, distancing it from the over-the-top
pornographic language of some Fugs songs. Nevertheless, Rolling Stone’s editorial staff
likely believed that Joplin, like many of her industry peers, had been targeted for a “bust”
due to her countercultural celebrity. The singer’s arrest was also the result of her
physical threat to what Rolling Stone called “frightened authorities.”95

Such fear also led to the Tampa police to arrest the Quicksilver Messenger
Service’s Dino Valente in 1972 on similar charges of “inciting a riot and profanity.”96
This rocker’s arrest was initiated by his decision to yell “bullshit” into a microphone
before performing an encore song to an unruly audience after venue management
demanded the show’s cessation due to curfew ordinances. Valente’s choice of words and
disobedience of curfew laws demonstrated his lack of regard for local law and order, thus
leading to his arrest. Valente’s disrespect towards the local police in the same city where
Joplin had been arrested demonstrated the Tampa law enforcement’s detestation of rock
musicians who criticized the police and refused to concede to local curfew and crowd
behavioral mores.

94 Ibid.
95 Ibid.
The motives behind the arrests and prosecution of Jim Morrison were similar to those for Joplin and Valente. These three musicians, especially Morrison and Joplin, were far less connected to the political radicalism of Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, the Black Panther Party, and the antiwar movement than were the more politically visible Ed Sanders, John Lennon, and Country Joe McDonald. This did not mean, however, that the Doors did not implicitly criticize the Vietnam War; many viewed the band’s 1968 song, “Unknown Soldier” as a critique of the war. Although that song referred to an anonymous soldier who could have died in any war, the scholar Tony Magistrale has argued that it referred to Vietnam, as did the following line from Morrison’s poem, “An American Prayer”: “Do you know we are being led to/ slaughters by placid admirals / & that fat slow generals are getting / obscene on young blood.” Yet, in reference to the insertion of war and political footage throughout a 1968 concert film, “The Doors Are Open,” drummer John Densmore would later write: “All four of us felt the producers were reading a little too much into our lyrics, with their heavy intercutting of U.S. political turmoil in the middle of our songs, but the performances were dynamic.” It could be argued therefore that the Doors presented a far less acute criticism of the state’s presence in Vietnam than did the era’s radical activists. Nonetheless, the questioning of all forms of hegemonic authority remained a frequent trope of Doors lyrics, interviews, and concerts. Keyboardist Ray Manzarek later summarized the message of the Doors and

97 Though Joplin, Valente and the Doors, were associated more with the counterculture than the antiwar movement and political radicalism, Joplin did perform at an outdoor concert associated with the antiwar movement’s October 5, 1969 Moratorium in New York City. She also received mention in Abbie Hoffman’s books. See, Melvin Small, Covering Dissent: The Media and the Anti-Vietnam Movement (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 93.
98 The Doors, “Unknown Soldier,” Waiting for the Sun, Elektra 9 74024-2, compact disc.
its audience as “... the poets versus the manufacturers of crap... the dancers versus the bringers of war... the song makers, the earth tenders, the new gardeners of Eden versus the military/industrial complex.”\textsuperscript{101} While Manzarek’s words would imply the band’s antagonism to police (a part of the “military/industrial complex”), singer Jim Morrison often criticized political authorities onstage. For example, referring to President Richard Nixon, Morrison told a Phoenix, Arizona audience: “Four more years of mediocrity and h----s--- [sic.]. If he does wrong, we will get him.”\textsuperscript{102} Although Morrison was not arrested that night for his language, some of the performance’s attendees did accuse him of making obscene gestures.\textsuperscript{103} Yet, at other performances, Morrison was arrested for profane language – some of which he directed towards police.

In December 1967, six New Haven, Connecticut police officers ended a Doors concert by arresting Morrison onstage while the singer was telling the audience about a backstage encounter with a police officer that had occurred before the show. As reported by the \textit{New York Times}, the altercation happened when the officer, possibly not realizing who Morrison was, asked him to cease engaging in a romantic encounter with a young woman and leave the backstage area, which was off-limits to non-performers. The police suggested to the press that Morrison was almost arrested backstage; such an act would have cancelled the band’s set at a time when the crowd was already in the building. Once Morrison was onstage, “the police contended they had received complaints from audience members who did not like foul language that the performer allegedly used.”\textsuperscript{104} These complaints allegedly attuned them to the singer’s onstage performance, leading to their

\textsuperscript{102} Densmore, \textit{Riders on the Storm}, 180.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
arrest of Morrison and order to end the concert. As the Times reported, “Morrison, in addition to the indecent exhibition charge [related to his backstage acts with the young woman], was cited with a breech (sic.) of peace and resisting a policeman. He was released on a $1,500 bond.”

Although Morrison was technically not charged under profanity or obscenity statutes, his New Haven arrest demonstrated an instance in which local authorities appropriated a rock singer’s words as a reason for arrest. Apart from a $25 fine paid for the “breech of peace,” this arrest had almost no impact on Morrison personally, as the state chose to not pursue the additional charges. Yet, the police’s mention to the press of Morrison’s “foul language” confirmed a pattern inherent in other profanity and obscenity arrests; when criticizing law enforcement authorities, a rock musician’s political ideas could be either discouraged or even temporarily silenced through a minor arrest connected to profanity or obscenity statutes. While this arrest did not lead to Morrison’s incarceration, the rioting that resulted following the singer’s removal from the stage made some promoters hesitant to book the Doors. It also alerted local vice squads to Morrison’s rebellious commentary. According to the band’s drummer John Densmore, on the day following Morrison’s New Haven arrest, the Philadelphia vice squad appeared to record the concert as evidence against Morrison. Although the singer cursed onstage that night, the vice squad made no arrest. Densmore would come to believe that their inaction that night resulted from them not hearing Morrison’s exact words.
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Morrison’s most infamous arrest occurred due to his actions at a March 1969 concert in Miami, Florida. That night Morrison appeared onstage so inebriated that he could barely sing and instead rapped to the audience about “revolution” and coming onstage despite the warnings of the local police and safety officials. He upset local officials by his blatant intoxication, invitation of audience members onstage, removal of a police officer’s hat which he then tossed into the crowd, alleged act of pushing three police officers (as reported by the Miami press), and rumored exposure of his penis. Days later, the Dade County’s Sheriff Office charged him with “lewd and lascivious behavior,” “indecent exposure,” “drunkenness,” and “profanity,” charges that could have resultantly led to a multi-year prison sentence. Unlike the New Haven incident, Morrison was not arrested onstage; and police did not file charges for Morrison’s arrest until several days later, when the band had already left the state. The concert’s promoter claimed that the police had chosen to not arrest Morrison onstage, since “the way Morrison had revved up everybody’s emotions [...] could start some real trouble if cops came onstage to stop the show.”

108 The Doors, Concert at the Dinner Key Auditorium, Miami, FL, March 2, 1969. Unissued audio cassette of the performance in author’s collection. Also, nearly all, if not every, Doors-related biography and autobiography has discussed the event.

109 Jerry Hopkins and Danny Sugerman, No One Here Gets Out Alive (New York: Warner Books, 1980), 227-238. Whether Morrison actually exposed himself is one of the most notorious questions in rock history, mythology, and hagiography. Morrison’s keyboardist Ray Manzarek contends that Morrison never actually exposed himself, but persuaded the audience to believe that he had. See Manzarek, Light My Fire, 315, 318. Another of Morrison’s band mates, drummer John Densmore, believes that Morrison did not expose himself. See Densmore, Riders on the Storm, 220.

110 Hopkins and Sugerman, No One Here Gets Out Alive, 236-237.

officials – particularly those on assignment that night, sought Morrison’s arrest. John Densmore would later argue that political motives were behind the issuance of these charges: “some parents got curious about their kids coming home half clothed, called the local politicians, and they decided to use Jim as an example of moral decay. Or it was some right-wing bullshit plot.” Densmore’s perspective would underscore the extent to which many authorities viewed rock as dangerous to the stability of American society.

The FBI took an even more direct action against Morrison. Because the charges against Morrison were filed after the singer had departed from Florida, the felonious charge of “lewd and lascivious behavior,” made him a fugitive. After Morrison turned himself in to the FBI, an Assistant United States Attorney decided to decline prosecution on the federal level. Morrison, however, still faced such serious charges in the state of Florida, and eventually would feel threatened by a possible prison sentence. The FBI also conducted an investigation into a drunken Morrison’s misbehavior and harassment of flight officials on board a Continental Airlines plane in November 1969. That investigation, which could have resulted in charges resulting in up to twenty years of imprisonment, was completely unrelated to Morrison’s music, however. Any passenger engaging in such unruly behavior was subject to such arrest. A jury acquitted Morrison of all federal charges associated with this incident. He therefore suffered no more than a $600 fine and lawyer’s fees.

112 Manzarek, Light My Fire, 315-318.
113 Densmore, Riders on the Storm, 220.
114 Memorandum to Director, FBI (All Special Investigation Division from SAC, Miami, March 28, 1969, in FBI File on James Douglas Morrison (obtained on CD-Rom through the Freedom of Information Act).
116 The impact of these charges will be analyzed in Chapter Four of this study.
117 See documents in the FBI File on James Douglas Morrison.
118 Hopkins and Sugerman, No One Here Gets Out Alive, 284-285, 292.
Chapter Four of this study will address how the various arrests of Morrison, particularly the prison sentence he faced from the Miami trial eventually had a drastic effect on the singer’s professional career and psychological wellbeing. The concern that local and federal authorities had with Morrison’s rebelliousness and condemnation of police officers explained why officials used his language as a means to arrest him. Such an attempt to silence Morrison paralleled the similar arrests taken against such publically notorious radicals as Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, and the various publishers of underground newspapers; however, unlike Rubin and Hoffman, Morrison’s life offstage was largely unbothered by surveillance. The FBI watched Rubin and Hoffman regularly; their attention towards Morrison was cursory and limited to one drunken incident on an airplane and the Miami incident.\textsuperscript{119} Clearly, the FBI viewed Rubin and Hoffman as an ongoing threat, and Morrison as a nuisance only onstage. As law enforcement officials paid attention to Morrison onstage, they extended their harassing states towards concert audiences as well.

**IV. The Surveillance and Harassment of Concert and Festival Audiences:**

As the FBI and local law enforcement officers across the country sought to either discourage or silence political radicals (and some musicians) through methods of harassment such as surveillance or arrests on charges of drug possession or public obscenity, police officials took similar actions against concert and festival audiences. John Sinclair believed that the intensity of this repression varied geographically. He argued that just as the rock bands of Detroit and San Francisco differed in both sound and political direction, with the Michigan groups offering a heavier, more metallic sound and

\textsuperscript{119} See the James Douglas Morrison FBI File.
being connected to radical activists like the White Panther Party, Detroit police were far more repressive towards the city youth’s attempts to host an outdoor “love-in.”\textsuperscript{120}

Evidence of the prejudice that some police officials in the greater Detroit region held towards rock audiences was apparent in the internal correspondence of the Michigan State Police. One memo from October 18, 1968, warned that a MC5 concert scheduled for Michigan State University “should draw all the hippies from all the counties around the Lansing area.”\textsuperscript{121} Although the memo’s detective author did not elaborate on why the department should express concern over these “hippies,” his drafting of such a letter confirmed an anti-counterculture bias within the Michigan State Police. Sinclair’s viewpoint ignored both the political nature of San Francisco’s Jefferson Airplane (examined in Chapter One of this study), and the 1967 drug bust at the Grateful Dead’s communal home (analyzed in the same chapter). Unlike Sinclair, no member of the Jefferson Airplane or Grateful Dead served prison time. That fact, however, did not deny the existence of at least some repression in the San Francisco that Sinclair viewed as counter-culturally friendly. Perhaps the level of repression in Michigan alluded to by Sinclair resulted from the fears generated by the 1967 Detroit race riots (a violent event the magnitude of which was unseen in San Francisco). Just as the intensity of police surveillance taken against Sinclair and the Grateful Dead differed, police varied in their actions against rock audiences. Concertgoers found themselves susceptible to such police acts as surveillance photography, the issuance of traffic and parking citations, and drug arrests.


\textsuperscript{121} Michigan State Police Inter-Office Correspondence to Det. Capt. Daniel Myre from Det. R. Schave, October 18, 1968, Red Squad and Surveillance Files – Detroit Police, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 3.
The FBI and local police departments frequently observed, photographed, and took surveillance films at political rallies and concerts. For instance, knowledge of a January 1970 benefit concert for a then-imprisoned John Sinclair and Black Panther leader Huey Newton led the Port Huron, Michigan police department to ask the Michigan State Police for “assistance on the night of the Rock Concert, such as undercover agents to attend the dance, picture taking and help with surveillance, and to keep Port Huron officials appraised of what is taking place in an attempt to avoid any problems.” In response, the Michigan State Police Department’s Special Investigation Unit and Narcotics Unit planned to offer such aid, ensuring that “Arrests are to be made if narcotics are observed.” While their plan for that particular event demonstrated an intention to make arrests for illegal drug use, police also used surveillance footage to identify and establish grounds for the further investigation of audience members, many of whom were not actually guilty of any criminal activity. For similar reasons, in Austin, Texas, vice squad agents filmed outdoor footage of the Thirteenth Floor Elevators, a group renowned for its psychedelic drug use. Some concert and festival attendees may have detested or even feared being photographed, recorded, or watched. For example, one scene in the documentary film of the 1969 Woodstock Festival featured two unnamed individuals claiming to have seen overhead planes belonging to “the fascist pigs.” Their use of the term “fascist pigs” to describe these planes conveyed their detestation for being watched. While these two individuals expressed only their dismay

122 Michigan State Police Inter-Office Correspondence to Captain Lawrence Hoffman – Intelligence Section from Special Investigation Unit Detective Staff Sergeant Paul Radashaw, January 26, 1970, Red Squad and Surveillance Files – Detroit Police, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 3.
123 Ibid.
125 Woodstock: 3 Days of Peace & Music (The Director’s Cut), dir. Michael Wadleigh.
for the plane’s presence, it is probable that a fear of police surveillance would have
dissuaded some casual fans from attending concerts.

Although police observation, photography, and filming would have upset some
concertgoers, preventing some of them from making return visits, local police
departments also added a sense of discomfort and inconvenience by issuing parking
tickets and citations at concerts and festivals. An estimated 200,000 people attended the
August 7-9, 1970 Goose Lake International Music Festival in Michigan. The county
sheriff believed that nearly three quarters of the attendees were using illegal substances,
including: heroin, amphetamines, and LSD. Due to the large number of attendees, the
sheriff, fearing that riots might result, did not arrest people inside the festival grounds.
However, just outside the festival grounds, police towed cars and issued citations.¹²⁶
Such ticketing would have irritated the recipients of these fines, particularly if they were
not among the large number of people whom the sheriff and authorities believed were
taking illicit drugs. The revenue generated from these tickets was more than a means of
making money for the county; it was a form of harassment.

Besides the issuance of traffic tickets and vehicle towing outside of some venues,
police also made frequent onsite arrests as a means of truncating illicit drug distribution
and use in public space. Some police officials stopped cars and watched over parking
lots to such a degree that many concertgoers never heard any music before they were
arrested.¹²⁷ When interviewed by Rolling Stone about county police officers in Long
Island, New York, one teenager stated that “the police state atmosphere is so heavy that

University of Michigan Press, 2006), 243-245.
¹²⁷ “Police Light Show a Bust at Nassau R&R Shows,” Rolling Stone, 19 July 1973, 16.
you get bummed out before you even get in the hall.” At times, the number of people arrested for drug possession or use seemed staggering. For instance, as noted in a *Rolling Stone* report about a free, outdoor festival held in Los Angeles’s Elysian Park in February 1972, “there were 17 felony arrests and 83 misdemeanor arrests” out of a crowd estimated at 400 to 1,500 people. For such a small number of attendees, “approximately 160 police were on hand for the bust.” The presence of such a large percentage of police officers in comparison to the crowd’s tiny size suggested that in this instance, officers had intended to make arrests. While *Rolling Stone* pointed out that “mass arrests such as this one occur[ed] infrequently,” the headline of this article declared that it was nonetheless “Festival Busting Season in L.A.” As concerts and festivals in general remained an issue of law enforcement concern, the followers of certain bands like the Grateful Dead attracted spot car searches and parking lot drug arrests. For the Dead’s fans (the Deadheads), this persisted throughout the 1970s and until the band’s 1995 demise. Scholars David Fraser and Vaughan Black have contended that this trend resulted from the phenomenon of the parking lot outside of these shows as an unrestricted public space which its inhabitants viewed as situated outside the law. This outlaw nature was clearly antagonistic to the police, who in turn, exerted repression.

In addition to onsite arrests, there were times when the large number of present concertgoers, and therefore, potential rioters, forced police to make arrests only on the roads and highways surrounding the venue. The most famous example of this was the
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1969 Woodstock Festival attended by an audience numbered in the hundreds of thousands. An FBI report drafted by the New York branch and based on the reports of an undercover informant stated, “During the entire festival, no arrests were made [on] the 600 acre site, but many arrests mainly for drug-related offences were made on the roads leading to the site.”

Although these arrests were made by local or state police (and not federal agents), the FBI’s attention to the issue demonstrated its disdain for the concertgoers whom the same report described as “the bizarre people present.”

Besides engaging in surveillance and making arrests for innocuous acts like improper parking and marijuana possession, police, in some instances, exerted physical violence on concertgoers. Often, this violence resulted from rioting, property destruction, and gate-crashing by the ticketless. As described in a short 1970 *Rolling Stone* article about three Los Angeles-area concerts that ended with the police’s subdual of rioters and property damage, “Rock and roll concerts around these parts are getting to be as consistent as rock and roll festivals ever were—and that means regular hassle with gate-crashers, cops, and ignorant promoters. And it could mean the kind of crackdown that killed so many festivals.”

Several documentary films about the rock festivals of this era would contain footage of this violence, demonstrating the heated contention between police officers committed to the protection of property, promoters interested in making money, and concert audiences and gate-crashers, many of whom believed that their access to the music should be free. As the scholar Michael J. Kramer writes about the
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136 For the footage from the 1970 concert in Toronto, Canada, see *Festival Express*, dir. Bob Smeaton and Frank Cvitonovich, 1970 New Line Home Video, 2004, DVD. Similar footage from England would also
fighting between the mounted police officers hired by a festival promoter and gate-crashers at a 1970 festival in Toronto, Canada, featuring such noted performers as the Grateful Dead and Janis Joplin (and documented in Festival Express), “rock music as a commercial transaction also generated confrontations with state power. Rock became not only commercial, but also a generator of civil society, especially when political groups such as the M4M movement demanded that festivals should be free.” This violence was sometimes generated by committed revolutionaries holding views similar to politically radical groups like the Weather Underground and Black Panther Party. Other times, it resulted from young kids hoping to get a price break on a sold commodity. Regardless of their origin, such tensions, in addition to law enforcement officials and city councils’ fears about drugs and crowd appearance, contributed to government acts initiated to suppress festivals.

V. Imposition of Increased Civic Pressures and Demands on Promoters:

Whereas police officers harassed festival and concertgoers through surveillance, citations, and arrests, local municipal, county, and state governments increasingly placed restrictions upon promoters, thus limiting the number of festivals across post-Woodstock America. Scholars like James Kirkpatrick Davis have noted that the increased number of violent actions (such as bombings) or threats which radical groups like the

---

137 Michael J. Kramer, “The Psychedelic Public and Its Problems: Rock Music Festivals and Civil Society in the Sixties Counterculture,” in Media and Public Spheres, ed. Richard Butsch (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2007), 154-155. The M4M movement was a group of Canadian political radicals who posited that rock music was a revolutionary force that belonged to the counterculture and should not be appropriated for the commercial gain of capitalist, and therefore non-revolutionary, promoters.

138 For more on this subject, see, Martin and Segrave, Anti-Rock, 129-144. While most of the anti-festival legislation passed in the U.S. was on a very local level, the British government debated, but failed to pass, a bill that would have restricted festivals across their entire country. See Jerry Hopkins, “Britain Debates Anti-Festival Bill,” Rolling Stone, 11 May 1972, 14.
Weathermen and Black Panther Party undertook corresponded with intensified surveillance and repression.\textsuperscript{139} Law enforcement’s efforts against such revolutionaries peaked between 1968 and President Nixon’s resignation due to the Watergate crisis, years coinciding with the pinnacle of anti-festival legislation. The denial of festival permits and the increased difficulty of procuring them cheaply served as a backlash against the counterculture’s values (including promiscuous, extramarital sex and illegal drug use) at a time when both the antiwar movement was expanding and the July 1969 Woodstock Festival had drawn a crowd estimated to have been in the hundreds of thousands.

Two years before Woodstock, officials in California had complained about the 1967 Monterey International Pop Music Festival (commonly remembered as the first large rock festival as well as the concert which introduced Janis Joplin and Jimi Hendrix to mass audiences). Seeking to prevent a return festival in 1968, city officials forced promoters to concede to what \textit{Rolling Stone} interpreted as “fatally stringent demands.”\textsuperscript{140} As the magazine enumerated:

\begin{quote}
Among them were the demand that the Festival take out an enormous insurance policy for the city of Monterey protecting them from false arrest suits (a provision that would have, in effect, given the cops a carte blanche billy-club;) that the Festival post a huge bond for all sorts of virtually unheard of damages to the city; that the Festival, under threat of police action, shut off the shows and amplification before 1:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights, and before midnight Sunday; that the Festival conduct religious services at the Festival; that campgrounds be set up for visitors segregated by sex. The city also demanded such things as money towards anti-narcotics drives and other bizarre schemes.\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{139} Davis, \textit{Assault on the Left, passim}.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid.
Such demands clearly demonstrated the city’s aversion to the drug use and sexual interaction common at such festivals. Hoping to discourage a return festival, Monterey increased the cost of acquiring a permit. This cost was a major reason why the promoters of the 1967 festival chose not to operate in 1968.\footnote{Another reason or why there was not a 1968 festival in Monterey was that the promoters’ bookkeeper allegedly stole $52,000. See, ibid.} In forthcoming years, other municipal and county governments followed this practice. For instance, in 1970, Kenneth Hahn, a supervisor for the county of Los Angeles, California, stated, “I predict they [rock festivals] won’t be here in Los Angeles County because promoters will find out the restrictions will cost them so much money.”\footnote{“Up Against the Wall, Festivals,” \textit{Rolling Stone}, 21 February 1970, 16.}

The 1970 \textit{Rolling Stone} article which addressed Hahn’s anti-festival intent related the county’s restrictions to the “media accounts of the violence” at the December 1969 free festival headlined by the Rolling Stones at the Altamont Speedway in Northern California.\footnote{Ibid.} Because the Stones’ Mick Jagger demanded that the event promoters provide band security guards who were not police officers, promoters hired the notorious Hell’s Angels motorcycle gang in exchange for $500 worth of beer.\footnote{“December 7, 1969: KSAN Radio Broadcast,” DVD Extra on \textit{Gimme Shelter}, dir David Maysles, Albert Maysles, and Charlotte Zwerin, 1970, The Criterion Collection, 2000, DVD.} The bikers brandished pool cues, assaulted the Jefferson Airplane’s Marty Balin (as his band was performing), and fatally stabbed a young, black concertgoer named Meredith Hunter for flashing a pistol. Such violence led to mourning as film footage of the festival permeated throughout the nation’s movie theaters as scenes from the Stones’ concert tour documentary, \textit{Gimme Shelter}.\footnote{\textit{Gimme Shelter}, dir. David Maysles, Albert Maysles, and Charlotte Zwerin, 1970, The Criterion Collection, 2000, DVD.} Some leftist radicals and the counterculture decried the festival as evidence that rock was becoming too large of a corporate force to remain true
to the spirit of the counterculture; California officials who had condemned the counterculture all along viewed the incident as yet another reason to ban festivals. Officials and the rock counterculture both realized the dangerousness of the Hell’s Angels – a group that despite expressing some support for the Vietnam War, ultimately had little respect for law enforcement or government officials. If such government officials in California (or elsewhere) had little regard for rock festivals in the first place, then they would have been doubly upset about any setting in which the outlaw Angels and subversive counterculture could mingle. Thus, for these California authorities, festivals were a breeding ground for trouble where different groups opposed by law enforcement officials could meet – ultimately increasing the likelihood of danger for all. Such concern contributed to the increasing cost and growing difficulty of acquiring a permit for a legal festival.

Besides seeking to prevent violence following the Altamont stabbing, local authorities in the early 1970s remained upset about the sex, drugs, and overall behavior at festivals. Some, like Michigan Governor William Milliken ordered police to investigate festival promoters as a means of curbing such activity. Milliken’s command resulted in
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147 For a summary of how the mainstream press, political radicals such as Todd Gitlin, and Rolling Stone interpreted the meaning of the violence at Altamont, see Abe Peck, Uncovering the Sixties: The Life and Times of the Underground Press (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), 225-226. Gitlin referred to the event as “The End of the Age of Aquarius” (ibid.). Also see Doggett, There’s A Riot Going On, 309-314.

148 One important primary source and early analysis of the Hell’s Angels was written by the countercultural journalist, Hunter S. Thompson. His sociological journalism addressed amongst other issues, the criminal records of individual Angels, the fact that the Angels’ hatred for law enforcement officials in Southern California led the group’s leadership to migrate north to Oakland, and various incidents in which the Angels confronted law enforcement authorities or threatened anyone else who questioned the gang’s autonomy. Hunter S. Thompson, Hell’s Angels (New York: Ballantine Books, 1967), 15, 20, 101, 136-142, 322-323. The FBI’s file on the Hell’s Angels demonstrated their concern with the motorcycle gang’s clashes with police officers. Sonny Barger, the founder of the Oakland Hell’s Angels chapter, provides his own perspective on Altamont and the Angels’ ongoing struggles against government and law enforcement officials in his memoir. See Ralph “Sonny” Barger with Keith Zimmerman and Kent Zimmerman, Hell’s Angel: The Life and Times of Sonny Barger and the Hell’s Angels Motorcycle Club (New York: William Morrow Paperbacks, 2001), passim.
the State of Michigan’s decision to charge the promoter of the August 1970 Goose Lake International Music Festival with creating an environment in which dangerous, illicit drugs were sold. Others sought to prevent festivals by denying permits and seeking court injunctions.

Throughout the early 1970s, various articles in *Rolling Stone* delineated how the suppression of festivals by local state, county, or municipal governments had become a national trend. In June 1970, the magazine noted “Twenty counties in Florida have passed local legislation banning rock festivals or setting absurd regulations imposing unmeetable demands on festival promoters.” Not only did the State of Connecticut place an injunction prohibiting the August 1970 Powder Ridge Festival, but the Connecticut Supreme Court waited so long to deny the promoters’ appeal of the injunction that 30,000 concertgoers arrived at the ski resort expecting to hear music. Their presence led the State’s Attorney General to order the venue’s power cut. In 1971, New Jersey passed legislation requiring not just a permit, but also measures which *Rolling Stone* summarized as a demonstration to a review board “that adequate provisions had been made for food and water, sanitation, transportation, parking, security and medical care. In addition, if the festival area is not totally deserted and spotlessly clean within two days after the event ends, the promoter would have his costly ‘performance bond’ revoked.” Editorializing that such requirements “may effectively ban all rock
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151 Funneling electricity from an ice cream truck, a few local artists performed for the crowd, which a judge reluctantly permitted to stay. Fearing arrest, none of the more famous, allegedly-booked musicians arrived to perform, excluding the folk-pop singer, Melanie. See “Powder Ridge: Making Do, Sorta,” *Rolling Stone*, 3 September 1970, 17.

152 “Festivals Take Gas in New Jersey,” *Rolling Stone*, 1 April 1971, 16.
festivals in New Jersey,” the article confirmed the state’s drafting of stringent restrictions that would have deterred all but the wealthiest promoters. Additional examples of festival suppression were noted in 1973 after judges in Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, and Minnesota prohibited four different Labor Day weekend festivals from occurring. Rolling Stone cited the officials who advocated the shutdown of these festivals as being concerned with “anticipated traffic jams, drug abuse, nudity and general health problems.” Such fears paralleled those expressed by the Monterey County officials in 1968, suggesting that throughout the era, the legal reaction against festivals was rooted in a detestation of countercultural mores, some of which were illegal.

Evidence that many local authorities were continuously upset by the countercultural acts and message of rock festivals appeared through the increasing cost and difficulty of acquiring the permit necessary for a legal festival that would not result in consequent action against the promoter. Consequently, rock industry insiders, including the writers of Rolling Stone, realized that such regulations prevented many festivals from occurring. This platform of repression also helped to shut down larger-sized dance halls in cities like San Francisco and Chicago. As Scott Doneen, the manager of the Aragon in Chicago, told Rolling Stone following his decision to close the ballroom, the payment of graft was a necessary part of running a business in that city: “Just by even asking that question [how much Doneen had to pay the Chicago Police Department to prevent a vice squad raid] you know where Chicago’s at. There’s (sic.) plenty of people on the take.” Common across the nation, festival and club repression
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was directed by local authorities. Yet, such efforts paled in comparison to the repression on a federal level of the political radicalism and antiwar activism espoused by some musicians.

VI: Direct Imposition on the Lives and Acts of Musicians:

Directed towards black nationalist organizations from 1967 to 1971 and the New Left from 1968-1971, the FBI’s Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) aimed to “expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit or otherwise neutralize” groups and activists, such as the Black Panther and Students for a Democratic Society, whose politics and values were anathema to the FBI. While COINTELPRO itself constituted only a portion of state repression, federal and local law enforcement agents engaged in COINTELPRO-like activities ranging from the surveillance and photography of activists to the interviewing of their employers and associates. Even without making arrests, police and FBI agents had a detrimental effect on the lives and families of these activists. For example, in 1968 the FBI instigated the removal of a (Boy Scout) scoutmaster whose wife was a known socialist. They also sought the termination of several schoolteachers and professors affiliated with the antiwar movement.

Although COINTELPRO itself was not directed towards popular musicians, the FBI and local law enforcement officials nonetheless chose to watch, and, in some instances, directly affect the lives and careers of those closely connected to radical
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antiwar, anti-imperialist or psychedelic politics. Even before she achieved national fame as a singer, Janis Joplin appeared on several lists of politically active or drug using students kept by the University of Texas’s Police Department (even when she was no longer a student at the school). Additionally, Tom Hayden, himself a target of government surveillance as a founder of Students of a Democratic Society and member of the Chicago Seven, has noted how documents confirming the FBI’s disruption of John Lennon’s plans to create a concert tour intended to dissuade potential voters from reelecting Richard Nixon as President in 1972 (as referred to several times in this study) echoed COINTELPRO. As Hayden would later write, “On May 21 the Bureau pledged to ‘neutralize any disruptive activities of subject’ (emphasis added [by Hayden]), in the chilling vocabulary of the FBI’s counterintelligence (COINTEL) program.”

While Lennon informed radio and television audiences that the FBI was tapping his phone, the Bureau hoped to ensnare him with a drug arrest, providing a legal means for deporting the singer back to his native England. Although the FBI’s interest in Lennon surpassed their surveillance of most musicians, law enforcement officials regularly recorded and photographed musicians and concert audiences. Moreover, outside of the clubs, theaters, and parks that hosted live concerts, FBI agents tapped telephones and engaged in drug busts (as examined elsewhere in this chapter). In their examination of Jim Morrison, the

159 Thorne Dreyer, “The Spies of Texas: Newfound files detail how UT-Austin police tracked the lives of Sixties dissidents,” Texas Observer.org, November 16, 2006, http://www.texasobserver.org/archives/item/14940-2343-the-spies-of-texas-newfound-files-detail-how-ut-austin-police-tracked-the-lives-of-sixties-dissidents (accessed July 11, 2012). Uploaded scans of the documents discussed by Dreyer (and taken from the files of the UT-Austin Police Department) are found at The Spies of Texas Observer Special Web Archive, Texas Observer.org, http://www.texasobserver.org/hamilton_files.php (accessed July 11, 2012). However, all of the important details regarding the police department’s interest in Joplin are summarized in Dreyer’s article. As Dreyer and the documents demonstrate, the UT-Police were most concerned about drug use and the radical politics of groups like the Students for a Democratic Society.


161 Wiener, Come Together, 229-231.
FBI went so far as to interview his college friends, many of whom had probably not seen the singer for years. The FBI’s surveillance of Lennon included their tapping into the home telephone and recording studio of Gary Van Scyoc, the bassist of Elephant’s Memory, Lennon’s backup band during his March 1972 recording sessions – a practice which Van Scyoc has since described as “unnerving” and able to make his wife “paranoid.” They also followed Bob Gruen, a photographer who frequently shot Lennon. Realizing the extensiveness of this surveillance, both Phil Ochs and Joan Baez believed that the CIA had deliberately interfered with their travels.

Surveillance and any consequential actions against musicians resulted from the musicians’ political activism and expression – and not necessarily because of their chosen artistic genre. Similarly, the FBI attacked other entertainers, particularly Hollywood actors and actresses favorable of leftist causes. According to the sociologist Tom Wells, actress Eartha Kitt criticized America’s role in the Vietnam War at a 1967 luncheon attended by Lady Bird Johnson, the wife of then-President Lyndon B. Johnson. Resultantly, “President Johnson was furious at Kitt’s insolence and reportedly sicked (sic.) the FBI and CIA on her. Soon stories appeared in the press claiming Kitt was a sadistic nymphomaniac; many of her performance contracts were canceled. Kitt says Johnson’s vendetta against her derailed her career for years.”

Addressing J. Edgar Hoover’s aversion to Hollywood entertainers who offered monetary donations to the Black Panther Party, the historian Richard Gid Powers has argued that the FBI was at
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least partially responsible for the psychological breakdown that led to the eventual suicide of actress Jean Seberg in 1979. Powers believes that the FBI wanted to embarrass Seberg due to her monetary support of the Black Panthers and acquaintanceship with one of their national leaders, Bobby Seale. Powers has strongly suspected that sometime in April or May of 1970 it was the FBI that first introduced the rumors that the pregnant Seberg was carrying a child created by a man other than her husband. The psychological stress resultant from the media’s coverage of Seberg’s pregnancy and possible adultery contributed to her failed suicide attempt and the premature birth and death of her child. Never fully recovering, Seberg died in 1979, three years after learning about the FBI’s actions. Allegedly, the FBI publicized these rumors in order to discourage Seberg’s further support for the Panthers. Similarly, as part of COINTELPRO, the New York branch of the FBI mailed a memorandum to the wealthy attendees of a fundraising party hosted by the esteemed composer Leonard Bernstein, alleging that their financial contributions would support an organization that was strongly anti-Semitic. Such claims would have besmirched both the Panthers and Bernstein within the minds of the letter’s recipients. They also paralleled the actions of FBI agents who planted a false story that John Lennon was donating money to protect SDS members supposedly connected to illegal bombings.

Even when law enforcement officials, ranging from the FBI to local red squads, failed to make arrests or discredit musicians, they sometimes recorded and photographed performances, and tapped telephone lines. Musicians and concert audiences commonly

---
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knew about such surveillance. For instance, as the Jefferson Airplane’s Marty Balin
would later describe an incident in which the performers had offered LSD to its audience,
“I remember one time when we were throwing it out like M&M’s. I’d say, ‘Look, It’s
the FBI,’ and you’d see guys with binoculars watching this whole scene.” While no
mention of Balin’s comments or LSD distribution appeared in the FBI’s file on Jefferson
Airplane, the musician’s words nonetheless demonstrated the band’s realization of
Bureau surveillance regardless of whether in this instance the “guys with binoculars”
were actual FBI agents. The MC5 also found themselves under surveillance at their
concerts and in their homes. FBI agents or informers filmed their short performance held
in conjunction with the protests surrounding the 1968 DNC. Referring to the Detroit
Police Department, singer Robin Tyner claimed: “I would be sitting up, trying to write
music and the cops would come and park in front of my house and shine the light in my
eyes.” Although arrests or violence did not always accompany this surveillance, band
members, as discussed in previous chapters of this study, were arrested somewhat
regularly. Moreover, MC5 guitarist Wayne Kramer would come to believe that the
Detroit Police Department was responsible for the firebombing of the band’s van.
Similar to Wayne Kramer and the MC5, Phil Ochs’s realization that he was under FBI
surveillance (particularly phone tapping) prompted his belief that federal government
officials were also engaging in physical acts of repression. First undertaking surveillance
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of Ochs in 1963, the FBI tapped the folksinger’s phone until his 1976 suicide. Ochs’s biographer and former friend Marc Eliot has interpreted the 1969 song, “My Life,” as the singer’s response to the FBI’s presence. For Eliot, the lyrics “Take everything I own / Take your tap from my phone / And leave my life alone,” demonstrated within Ochs a psychological weariness instilled by FBI surveillance. Aware of government agents, Ochs also believed that the CIA had intentionally robbed him overseas in order to impede the possibility of him visiting Vietnam. Although no documentation would arise to confirm Ochs’s assertions about the CIA, the fact that Ochs believed they had robbed him confirmed that he equated repression with additional repressive activities. Eliot believes that Ochs’s ongoing thoughts about FBI or CIA presence contributed to the deterioration of Ochs’s mental health that eventually culminated in his suicide.

Folksinger Joan Baez and her one-time husband, the antiwar, draft resister David Harris, discovered the undertaking of both government surveillance and alleged FBI and CIA efforts to complicate their travels and live performances. To cite one instance, Harris claimed that just following a public demonstration headlined by the illegal returning of draft cards, the FBI coerced the Hertz car rental company into refusing to rent to the couple. A more famous incident ostensibly occurred during Baez’s 1967 concert tour of Japan. During that tour, Baez, who did not speak Japanese, received professional assistance from Ichiro Takasaki, an interpreter who translated Baez’s onstage remarks at concerts and offstage statements at press conferences. As Baez later
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recounted, “I couldn’t seem to get points across to the people when I wanted to and I was beginning to think there was a cultural gap between myself and the Japanese people. The problem was most acute during concerts.” Onstage, Baez gradually discovered that Takasaki was not relaying any commentary regarding her antiwar activism and decision to withhold her income taxes (as described in earlier chapters). Confirming Takasaki’s omission of Baez’s comments, a friend informed the singer that her interpreter was also telling her audiences:

This girl has a lovely voice. You should listen to her sing, but as far as her politics goes, she doesn’t know what she’s talking about. She’s innocent and young, and she came here to sing to the people, not to talk. So, simply ignore what she might have to say.

Weeks later Baez discovered a *New York Times* report regarding an alleged CIA operative named Harold Cooper who had supposedly instructed Takasaki to mistranslate Baez’s political statements. Takasaki ostensibly complied so that he would not have any subsequent trouble visiting the United States for his work as an interpreter. Writing about this tour and the *New York Times* report in her 1987 memoir, Baez also quoted this excerpt from the *New York Post*: “The U.S. Embassy in Tokyo denied that any U.S. government employee had approached Takasaki, and said it had no employee named Harold Cooper.” The CIA’s adherence to secrecy would naturally have prevented their confirmation of these reports, thus increasing the academic difficulty of proving them. Nonetheless, Baez’s remembrance and recitation of the interpreter’s behavior and its subsequent newspaper reports suggested that she did believe that Takasaki’s deliberate mistranslation of her political statements could have resulted from CIA pressure.
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Baez, similar to Wayne Kramer and Phil Ochs, was not only aware of government surveillance, but also believed that those government agents engaged in more direct forms of repression that paralleled the actions of the FBI’s COINTELPRO. Such efforts paralleled the FBI’s efforts to place John Lennon under surveillance in hope of preventing the antiwar musician from campaigning against President Richard Nixon. In conjunction with drug and obscenity arrests, FBI agents and law enforcement officials intended for surveillance and imposition upon the regular livelihood of musicians to discourage these entertainers’ political rhetoric and support for activists like the antiwar movement and Black Panther Party. With similar intent, some government officials, such as FBI agents, also approached record labels and radio stations.

VII. The Imposition of Pressure on Record Labels and Radio Stations:

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, government efforts to subdue counter-hegemonic, countercultural, antiwar, and ethnic nationalist messages sometimes led officials to contact media executives who they believed would be supportive of the state out of either respect or fear. The CIA, for instance, worked with certain book publishers, newspaper reporters, and television broadcasters to disseminate agency-drafted propaganda that favored governmental decisions such as the military’s presence in Vietnam.  

Many protestors and radicals of the period, including the antiwar activist and Chicago Seven “conspirator” David Dellinger would contend that agencies like the FBI influenced how the media covered or addressed certain topics such as the Vietnam War or the actions of law enforcement authorities. For example, Dellinger claimed that Vice President Spiro Agnew’s public censure of the November 15, 1969 National Mobilization
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caused television networks to refrain from broadcasting the antiwar protest live.\textsuperscript{184}

Dellinger’s beliefs paralleled the findings of the historian Melvin Small, who later argued that the mainstream news media, such as the Associated Press, sided with the Johnson and Nixon Administrations more than the antiwar movement.\textsuperscript{185} Such instances demonstrated close political ties between the government and corporate media. This relationship contributed to the FBI’s alleged contacting of Columbia Records and the FCC’s issuance of a directive warning radio executives about their accountability for the broadcasting of song lyrics which advocated drug use.

Some former radicals involved with the underground press have suggested that pressure from the FBI and CIA may have influenced the advertising choices of larger record labels, particularly, industry leader Columbia Records. Underground publishers reported that in April, 1969, Columbia Broadcasting System President Frank Stanton had ordered Columbia Records, a CBS subsidiary (and label to such popular artists as Janis Joplin and Sly and the Family Stone), to stop purchasing advertising in the counterculture’s underground publications. They attributed Stanton’s decision to FBI and CIA rhetoric denouncing the revolutionary content of the underground papers. Abe Peck, an editor of the countercultural paper, the Chicago \textit{Seed}, and was himself watched by the FBI, later alleged the possibility of either the FBI or CIA contacting Stanton. In corresponding with Peck, however, the executive denied having any communication with state agencies in regard to Columbia’s musical product and advertising methods.\textsuperscript{186} After
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Rolling Stone questioned why the label had stopped advertising in the underground press but continued its relationship with the aforesaid publication, Columbia Records’ president, Clive Davis, sent Rolling Stone a letter attesting that this decision resulted from market research suggesting that the placing of advertisements only in magazines devoted solely to music generated revenue.  Although neither Peck nor Mackenzie addressed Davis’s letter, it is possible that both that letter and Stanton’s much later rebuttal to Peck resulted from the label’s corporate interest in not alienating Columbia’s consumers who may have been averse to the CIA and FBI. The absence of solid documentation of this issue has resulted in Peck’s suggestions regarding the FBI’s supposed communication with Columbia Records remaining speculative.

More evident than any communication the FBI may have had with Columbia Records was the state’s imposition on rock radio stations, via directives of the FCC, the federal agency responsible for broadcasting licensing and regulation. In October 1970, U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell headed a day-long conference regarding the advocacy of drugs in rock lyrics. Speaking to seventy radio station executives called to the White House, Mitchell, along with top federal officials like President Richard Nixon and FCC Chairman Dean Burch, discussed the consequences of airing such songs. Weeks later, Rolling Stone quoted one conference attendee as stating: “Nixon said the Government wouldn’t interfere in programming, but he implied ‘After all, you do get

Stone. Peck has argued that Rolling Stone’s interest in monetary profit ideologically distanced the publication from the underground press; nonetheless, state authorities most likely did not view Rolling Stone with approval. For Peck’s reading of Rolling Stone’s politics, see ibid., 167.


your licenses from the Federal Government.”189 The same magazine article contended that in the months prior to the conference, many radio executives had ordered their DJs to refrain from all songs with drug content. Even if the FCC did not issue any fines, these executives wanted to avoid all potential clashes with the government, particularly if they were later to seek additional radio licenses.190 Regardless of this voluntary, self-censoring action undertaken by many fearful radio stations, in April 1971 the FCC issued a public directive, which Rolling Stone interpreted as a warning. As the rock publication later summarized, “The FCC directives . . . required that licensees know when they played records ‘promoting’ or ‘glorifying’ drug usage and make a judgment whether they should continue to do so. Implied was a message: Get drug songs off the air or face loss of license at renewal time.”191 Towards the end of 1973, a federal appeals court judge finally decreed that the FCC’s directive constituted unconstitutional censorship. Such a ruling, however, did not prevent radio executives from removing all songs with potential drug allusions from their stations’ playlists or relieve those DJs whose decision to air such material may have led to workplace troubles.192

The caution exercised by some radio stations could also have paralleled the attitudes of those television executives wary of alienating a wide audience through the transmission of controversial content. Occasionally, irate viewers mailed complaint letters to both television networks and government officials. To cite one example, a letter sent to ABC television talk show host Dick Cavett criticized a March 1970 episode during which the Jefferson Airplane performed “Volunteers.” Expressing concern over
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the song’s insistence on “revolution in the streets,” the letter’s author scolded Cavett and his show’s producers for “allowing this thoroughly disgusting and anti-American type of performance.”

Though addressed directly to Cavett, copies of the letter were also forwarded to the President of ABC television as well as the following government officials: President Richard Nixon, Vice President Spiro Agnew, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and FCC Chairman Dean Birch. While apart from filing this letter these government officials evidently (through a reading of the FBI Files) did not act upon this viewer’s complaint, some ABC television executives could have worried about similar letters leading to a government inquiry into their programming content. In the context of the blacklisting of folk singer Pete Seeger from many national television broadcasts (as explained earlier in this study), such corporate fears discouraged the network’s booking of certain musicians – and even explained the CBS network’s cancellation of the Smothers Brothers television series, one of the few programs to have broadcasted a Pete Seeger performance.

The FBI’s alleged correspondence with record labels and the FCC’s imposition on radio stations constituted yet another layer of efforts taken against rock and folk music during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Neither the FBI nor the FCC was intrinsically anti-music; instead, their officials were concerned with some of the more politically subversive messages within rock lyrics. Consequently, they sought to limit the dissemination of this rhetoric for the same reason they wanted to curtail antiwar protests,
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dissent within the armed forces, revolutionary organizations like the Black Panther Party, and the publication of underground newspapers. By placing pressure on record labels and radio stations, the FBI and FCC demonstrated their concern with the distribution of any message viewed as counter-hegemonic.

**VIII. The U.S. Military’s Repression of Folk and Rock:**

In January 1965, *Billboard* reported that in West Germany, the U.S. military was working to prevent stationed soldiers from obtaining records containing “the musing of folk singers about the atomic bomb and the war in Vietnam.” Asserting that such music was “inimical to [the] military morale” of U.S. soldiers on a base stocked with nuclear weapons at a time when their country was became more involved in Vietnam, the military forbade both the sale of these records at its trading posts and the broadcasting of such songs on the Armed Forces (Radio) Network. Although when leaving their military bases soldiers were able to purchase whatever records they wanted, the price that independent record stores had to pay for importing these American-manufactured records made them cost prohibitive for many soldiers. Such acts demonstrated the military’s interest in curtailing access to such music. Representing the interests of record companies who could benefit economically from the availability of this music to U.S. troops worldwide, *Billboard* deemed the military’s undertaking as “skating on the thin ice of censorship.” In this instance, the military was not objecting to the aesthetic sound of folk and rock styles of music, but instead to the political meaning of such records.
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Throughout the Vietnam War era, the military’s repression of folk and rock music followed this logic.

The *Billboard* article demonstrated how even in the earlier years of the Vietnam War, several years before the antiwar movement peaked around decade’s end, military brass sought to limit the average soldier’s exposure to the messages of certain musicians. Such efforts at censorship and repression did not extend to all rock and folk artists, however. In 1968, the British hard-rock band, the Who performed on a domestic U.S. Air Force base. That same year, their guitarist Pete Townshend recorded a radio commercial on behalf of Air Force recruitment.\(^{199}\) Both events were interrelated in that the Who’s usefulness to the Air Force likely ensured them a concert permit. Conversely, those musicians known for delivering antiwar rhetoric were either harassed on military bases or forbidden from performing there, especially as antiwar activity escalated. David Crosby, notorious for his onstage criticism of the U.S. government, would later claim that while visiting a barroom on an Army base situated near the Panama Canal, an FBI agent assigned there for security purposes said to him: “Goddamn hippie son of a bitch. Why aren’t you in Vietnam?”\(^{200}\) Although Crosby walked away from this man without inviting further provocation, any harsh or violent reaction by the musician would have resulted in his arrest.

Military authorities were not only aware of musicians’ identities; they also excluded many of them such as the members of the early 1970s FTA (Free the Army) Tour, organized by, amongst others, the actress Jane Fonda and actor Donald Sutherland, from
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appearing on bases.\textsuperscript{201} As remembered by Holly Near, a performer of piano-driven folk with a hint of cabaret music and blatantly politically-tinged lyrics, “The FTA show (it also stood for Fun, Travel, and Adventure, or Fuck the Army) made soldiers laugh and cry at material that objected to war, racism, and sexism rather than perpetuating them.”\textsuperscript{202} Their politicized form of entertainment provided more than just music, although Country Joe McDonald appeared at select dates, and John Lennon and Yoko Ono offered their talent.\textsuperscript{203} Due to the tour’s blatantly antiwar agenda, the military sought its suppression. The Pentagon forbade the tour’s entrance into Vietnam and onto domestic U.S. military bases.\textsuperscript{204} In Japan, the performers had problems with their visas, as they once again found themselves banned from military bases.\textsuperscript{205} Consequently, the FTA tour was relegated to performing just outside of these bases. Near later claimed that despite the Pentagon’s ban of the tour from military bases both domestically and in Vietnam, approximately 15,000 troops witnessed an FTA concert.\textsuperscript{206} Yet, military officials also worked to prevent troops from attending these off base events. As Near later summarized:

The tour attracted not only GIs who wanted to see the show but the nervous attention of the military authorities as well. They made bumbling attempts to disrupt the performances. They would advertise our show at the wrong place and the wrong time to confuse the men. But we would wait. Someone would direct the crowd to where we were. The show went on late, but it went on. In Manila, two GIs from Clark Air Force Base were discharged within seventy-two hours of meeting the FTA at a press conference. In Subic Bay, home of the Seventh Fleet, the USS Coral Sea, due to sail in on the day FTA arrived, was kept outside the
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bay, and the USS Chicago sailed out twenty-four hours ahead of schedule so that the men couldn’t meet with us.\textsuperscript{207}

The military’s actions addressed in Near’s remembrance of the tour paralleled its practice of forbidding the sale and broadcast of antiwar recordings as noted by \textit{Billboard}. Both instances confirmed the military’s general fear of antiwar rhetoric, especially in the form of sonic entertainment, as well as their attempt to subdue it. Such repression extended to numerous rock festivals and civilian coffeehouses too.

As both the antiwar movement and Vietnam War escalated, coffee houses located just outside of domestic U.S. military bases became a place of contention between peace activists and military officials.\textsuperscript{208} Such venues hosted live music and comedy, besides serving as libraries and distribution centers for underground publications, some of which were published by soldiers belonging to the antiwar, G.I. movement.\textsuperscript{209} To quote the scholar Matthew Rinaldi, “The coffeehouses represented the first significant step by the civilian movement to reach GIs.”\textsuperscript{210} Though forbidding many troops from entering some civilian coffeehouses, the military remained careful to not arrest citizens themselves, lest the press publicize the attending soldiers’ and civilians’ discontent. Yet, sometimes the local police and legal authorities that supported the military helped to shut down coffeehouses such as the UFO located near Fort Jackson, South Carolina.\textsuperscript{211} As another means of preventing soldiers from attending these coffeehouses, authorities at several military bases forbade all troops in basic training from leaving their assigned bases.\textsuperscript{212}
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These decisions by military commanders demonstrated their concern that any exposure to antiwar rhetoric or entertainment could have a detrimental effect on their troops’ morale or obedience. In his memoir, Leon Hendrix, the brother of guitarist Jimi Hendrix, remembered how while undergoing basic training, a one-star general castigated him upon realizing that the troops in Leon’s platoon were impressed by Leon’s relation to Jimi, whose music they revered. Hendrix quoted the general as saying: “We’ve got only one general at this base, and his name sure as hell ain’t Hendrix! Jimi Hendrix disrespects the American flag and has desecrated our great national anthem by playing it the way he does!”\(^{213}\) Not only did the general’s words demonstrate his fear that Leon’s relationship to Jimi would distract Leon’s platoon, but they also described Hendrix’s amplified (and thus rock-oriented) music as being unpatriotic and dangerous.

Other military officers had a similar fear of rock festivals. As Joe Urgo, a soldier who would become a member of the anti-war activist group, the Vietnam Veterans against the War (VVAW), later described in an oral history interview:

> The same time in August of 1969, Woodstock was happening. I was thinking about going up there, but then I didn’t. But the Atlantic City rock festival had Janis Joplin. So I said, ‘Gee, this sounds interesting. I’m young. This is where the young people are. I want to check this out.’ I bought these tickets to the Atlantic City rock festival.

> Well, wouldn’t you know it, we go to post one night and this master sergeant comes to post and tells us that he’s getting ready to cancel all vacations and leaves because the Atlantic City rock festival is coming and he thinks the communists are organizing it. The thinking was that we were going to put out people with shotguns to protect the perimeter of the base so that the communists don’t come there.

> I’m standing there. [Laughs.] Absurdity wasn’t even the word. What zoo am I in? What circus is this? This is insane. I said to him, ‘Sarge, I just
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want you to know that I’m going to that rock festival, and if they make one move toward this base, I’m going to get out in front and lead them here.’ I didn’t give a shit.\textsuperscript{214}

Urgo’s comments revealed how his master sergeant equated rock with Communism, a fear that dated back to parental, preachers’, and political concerns regarding rock and roll in the 1950s through the rise of the Beatles in the 1960s (and analyzed in Chapter Two of this study). They also demonstrated a vast remoteness between this master sergeant and Urgo. The relationship between both men served as a metonym for the larger tensions between the military brass seeking to restrict soldiers’ access to rock and folk music, and the numerous troops demanding the freedom of self-expression, and a personal choice of sonic preferences and political opinion, even if such forms were blatantly antiwar and counter to the authority demanded by military leadership.

The harsh opinion that many military officials had towards rock and folk musicians was also shared by some soldiers of lower rank. In 1968, Country Joe McDonald was assaulted in a Chicago hotel lobby by a group of soldiers he later described as “some irate drunkards-ex-GI’s I think, because the guy said something about ‘I fought in Vietnam for creeps like you.’”\textsuperscript{215} Yet, in contrast to this violent incident, as demonstrated in the case of the Who’s Air Force concert and commercial, there were some times, when despite its general efforts to restrict its soldiers from listening to certain rock songs, the military brass utilized the music for its own purposes. This example of the military’s appropriation of rock for hegemonic purposes was also undertaken by various police departments.


IX. Rock’s Appropriation by Politicians, the U.S. State Department, and Police Officials:

A common FBI and red squad tactic used to neutralize political organizations was infiltration. Undercover agents tried to undermine the effectiveness of their enemies by joining them. Such efforts embodied FBI and red squad attempts to disrupt, co-opt, and consequently silence such groups. Similarly, while many Americans (including musicians, counterculture participants, and law enforcement officials) viewed rock as subversive, other politicians and police officials on both the federal and local levels used rock to gain the support of young, potential voters, promote state or police interests, or establish respect among young people.

While numerous antiwar songs criticized the government’s role in perpetuating the Vietnam War, the antiwar, Democratic, Presidential candidates Hubert Humphrey (in 1968) and George McGovern (in 1972) realized that rock could help generate votes. For this reason, Humphrey’s campaign provided Phil Ochs’s hotel arrangements during the 1968 Chicago Democratic National Convention.216 Humphrey also received campaign support from his friend, Tommy James (of Tommy James and the Shondells), whom the Presidential candidate, if elected, hoped to nominate as the President’s Advisor on Youth Affairs.217 Four years later, McGovern invited Grace Slick and her Jefferson Airplane band mates to a public speaking appearance.218 The candidate also impressed the noted radicals Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, and the Fugs’ Ed Sanders by referencing in public lyrics from Woody Guthrie’s “This Land Is Your Land.” Writing about this experience,

the radicals, after mentioning Guthrie’s historical relationship to Communism, praised McGovern’s allusion to the singer. They also suggested: “In 1976 [the year of the next Presidential election, politicians] they’ll be quoting Street Fighting Man and Volunteers of America.”²¹⁹ Neither Humphrey nor McGovern had aspirations of overthrowing the American state or destroying its society; they merely wanted to end the Vietnam War through the legally proper channels of the U.S. Government. Nevertheless, their relationship with rock demonstrated that not all state officials sought the suppression of rock.²²⁰ This interest in co-opting or utilizing rock for hegemonic purposes, despite the close ties between rock and radical politics and such illicit activities as drug use, was also manifested by the U.S. State Department.

Between 1956 and the mid-1970s, the State Department sponsored American jazz musicians on tours throughout Asian, African, and Eastern European countries. The historian Penny M. Von Eschen has examined how “this hitherto disreputable music—routinely associated in the mass media with drugs and crime—suddenly became America’s music.”²²¹ Through these tours, Von Eschen argues, “U.S. officials pursued a self-conscious campaign against worldwide criticism of U.S. racism, striving to build cordial relations with new African and Asian states.”²²² Although many of these musicians, such as Dizzy Gillespie and Louis Armstrong, regularly criticized American politicians and race relations, the State Department nonetheless viewed their concerts as a crucial means of promoting American (as opposed to Soviet) culture, in order to attain

²¹⁹ Ed Sanders, Abbie Hoffman, and Jerry Rubin, Vote (New York: Warner Paperback, 1972), 132. The respective songs mentioned in this passage were performed by the Rolling Stones and the Jefferson Airplane.
²²⁰ Richard Nixon allegedly asked soul singer James Brown to campaign for him in Memphis. Brown declined. See Peter Doggett, There’s A Revolution Going On, 335.
²²² Ibid., 4.
both cultural and political respect. Briefly, rock interested the State Department as well. In 1970, they sponsored a tour of several Eastern Bloc countries by the jazz-rock band, Blood, Sweat, and Tears, a Grammy-award winning group most known for performing at the 1969 Woodstock festival. At a time when tensions existed between the Soviet Union and the satellite Communist states, the State Department believed that its sponsorship of a Blood, Sweat, and Tears tour could generate among the Eastern European youth a sense of appreciation for the United States and a feeling of rebellion (against the pervasive Communism in Eastern Europe). Interestingly, after the tour’s conclusion, one State Department official claimed that by witnessing how people lived in these Eastern bloc countries, the band members had themselves developed a greater respect for American culture and government. Although Von Eschen does not explore the meanings of this tour within the context of the domestic policing of rock by law enforcement agencies or the FBI, her research indicates that in the case of Blood, Sweat, and Tears, a potentially subversive countercultural act was utilized to promote hegemonic interests in the area of international relations. Consequently, this tour served as an example of how an ostensibly counter-hegemonic art form was appropriated by the State Department. Von Eschen never addresses why more rock groups were not sent on such tours; however, she does explain that the State Department’s sponsorship of almost all cultural tours ended once the federal government had to address the fallout from America’s withdrawal from the Vietnam War and President Nixon’s resignation over the Watergate scandal.

---

223 Ibid., passim.
224 Ibid., 195-196.
225 Ibid.
226 Ibid., 223-225.
Although many politicians and law enforcement authorities viewed rock as either politically threatening or culturally subversive, not all held the same interpretation. Otherwise, Humphrey, McGovern, and the State Department would have abstained from all association with it. Their idea that rock was acceptable, enjoyable, and even useful was also shared by some local police officials. For example, as one police chief told a television reporter in a scene from the documentary film of the 1969 Woodstock Festival, “We think the people of this country should be proud of these kids . . . their self-demeanor cannot be questioned as good American citizens.”

This chief clearly expressed no problem with the audience at Woodstock. A Miami, Florida police officer allegedly said to Abbie Hoffman: “Don’t kid yourself, I hate pigs as much as you, but I see a need for cops. Me and my old lady went to the Winterfest Rock Festival last year and there were problems. Bad drugs, rip-offs, the women were hassled. Somebody had to deal with that mess.” That officer’s commentary suggested both the necessity of the police and the right of this individual (and his partner) to attend and enjoy a rock festival sans problems like drug abuse, theft, and sexual harassment. It simultaneously demonstrated the officer’s animus towards the problems resultant from such gatherings and his desire to be present for the auditory attraction of rock music. This officer was a rock fan; others actually performed the music or referenced its lexicon.

On at least two occasions, *Rolling Stone* mentioned police officers forming rock bands as public relations stunts intended to impress the youth in their local communities. A 1969 news clip stated, “Four policemen and one tactical unit cop in Kansas City have
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227 *Woodstock: 3 Days of Peace & Music (The Director’s Cut)*, dir. Michael Wadleigh.
formed a rock band called The Enforcers in an attempt to bridge the Fuzz Gap.”

The humor in the magazine’s remarks underscored the alleged rift between the police and counterculture. That same year, another article addressed the founding of the Southside Fuzz, a rock band assembled by police officers in Worth, Illinois. The police department claimed that the group’s performance was organized to show “that teens have something in common with the police.”

Performing just outside of Chicago, a hotbed of antiwar and Black Panther Party activism, only months after the riots surrounding the 1968 DNC, the police department needed to procure the respect of local youths. As *Rolling Stone* quipped, “Police work must come first, after all.”

The police department’s sponsorship of the Southside Fuzz paralleled the State Department’s reasons for sending Blood, Sweat, and Tears on an Eastern European tour, as well as the relations established between two Democratic Presidential candidates and their supporters from the rock community. Such law enforcement, diplomatic, and Presidential authorities wished to appropriate rock for their own promotional purposes.

**Conclusion:**

This chapter has argued that law enforcement officials ranging from J. Edgar Hoover to anonymous local police officers denounced rock and folk musicians for both being supportive of counter-hegemonic political causes like the antiwar movement and advocating such subversive behavior as illegal drug use, seen as synonymous with the counterculture. Although many musicians were placed under surveillance, denounced, or even arrested for either drug possession or an expression of alleged profanity or obscenity, those with blatant ties to revolutionary political groups, such as John Lennon,
Phil Ochs, and Joan Baez, evoked an even greater proportion of concern from federal authorities. Acts taken against the former musicians constituted harassment; Lennon, Ochs, and Baez were the recipients of a more hardened surveillance and repression. Harassment affected rock audiences through the forms of club closures, festival cancellations, surveillance and photography, and arrests at concerts. Some of these repressive measures would have dissuaded some potential concertgoers from attending these events. In sum, the varied efforts against rock affected more than just musicians, radio broadcasters, and concert promoters; they also confirmed how such different law enforcement and political institution as vice squads, the FBI, the FCC, and the U.S. Military, tried to stop the counter-hegemonic expressions of rock and folk from reaching the music’s youthful audience. Yet, while seeking to curb the countercultural and political implications of folk and rock, authorities also realized the importance of appropriating its performance in order to promote the interests of the U.S. State Department and local police departments. Although musicians were not assassinated as was the Black Panther Fred Hampton, and bands such as the Doors were not infiltrated by government informants unlike many revolutionary or antiwar organizations, numerous musicians saw their lives and careers affected by court dates and the potential psychological and economic effects that such repression generated. Harassment and repression helped to destroy both the underground press and its association with radical political organizations ranging from the Students for a Democratic Society to the Black Panther Party. Police and political actions taken against the music industry and individual musicians were far less severe than those imposed upon groups like the Black
Panthers; nonetheless, the effects of such acts were noticeable within the economic sphere of the music industry and the emotional wellbeing of some musicians.
A full contextualization of the effects of repression on the folk and rock musicians of the late 1960s and early 1970s must be situated alongside an understanding of how policing and repression affected the period’s radical and revolutionary organizations. Similar to the Black Panther Party, the American Indian Movement (AIM) was an organization that promoted Native American autonomy, sovereignty, and culture. Kenneth S. Stern, a lawyer who represented AIM, would later summarize its goals: “It challenged the regular killings of Indians by whites, spoke about treaty rights, and reconnected Indian people to their heritage and religion through survival schools and religious ceremonies.”¹ Moreover, AIM represented Native Americans as a people demanding both an autonomous space and a sovereignty guaranteed by treaties signed earlier with the U.S. government. This helped situate AIM within the category of “radical ethnic nationalists” who viewed themselves as ideologically distinct from the American government, and were not averse to possessing guns (either legally or illegally).² AIM’s 1973 occupation of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, which included armed shootouts with federal agents and the U.S. military, resulted in a series of trials. In his monograph about the Wounded Knee Trials, the legal historian, John Sayer has argued:

... Wounded Knee [w]as perhaps the last militant mass protest of the ‘sixties,’ and AIM [w]as the last mass-movement national group still engaging in confrontational politics. Many argued that the subsequent

prosecutions were aimed at silencing or discrediting the Indian movement’s most articulate and militant voices, rather than upholding the law.\(^3\)

Pointing out that “the government’s overall conviction rate for the cases was less than ten percent,” Sayer explains that the plan of the FBI and federal prosecutors during the Wounded Knee Trials, particularly when evidence was flimsy, was not necessarily to incarcerate every AIM leader or member.\(^4\) Instead, the FBI intended for the trials to create financial and political difficulty for AIM, as the organization would be forced to defend itself in court.\(^5\) The FBI and other law enforcement agencies had used similar methods against the Black Panther Party, and antiwar organizations, such as the Students for a Democratic Society.\(^6\) The stress of undergoing a criminal trial and facing possible incarceration disrupted the cohesion of many radical groups and political revolutionaries. As the radical poet and spoken word artist, Gil Scott-Heron would later write in his memoir: “But divide and conquer was the aim of programs like COINTELPRO. And even though it ended up working damn near backward, it worked.”\(^7\)

To avoid imprisonment, many radicals such as Cathy Wilkerson of the Weather Underground went

\(^4\) Ibid., 4.
\(^5\) Ibid., 9.
\(^6\) Ibid., 9, 201.
\(^7\) Gil Scott-Heron, *The Last Holiday: A Memoir* (New York: Grove Press, 2012), 291. For an analysis of the radicalism of Scott-Heron’s work and how it inspired the politicized rap music of the 1980s and 1990s, much of which concerned law enforcement officials during its own period, see Daniel Simmons, “His Revolution Is Continued: Gil Scott-Heron’s Relationship to Rap Music,” *The Griot: The Journal of African-American Studies* 26 (Spring 2007): 55-64. As Scott-Heron’s sentence implied, while COINTELPRO was largely responsible for the demise of many Sixties movements, it was not the sole reason for their decline. To further this argument, in his 1987 memoir, Todd Gitlin, a leader of Students for a Democratic Society, would write, “Repression was damaging, painful, limiting, but not decisive . . . What shruved the late movement . . . was not so much repression as the movement itself. . . .” Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), 416.
into hiding by adopting secret identities; the Black Panther Party’s Eldridge Cleaver expatriated to Algeria.  

Amidst a discussion of other means through which repression affected rock and folk musicians besides forcing them to avoid law enforcement authorities, this chapter will address how in 1971 Jim Morrison of the Doors left his band mates and moved to Paris, as a means of avoiding a potential six-month imprisonment on a conviction (related to his arrest on obscenity charges at a March 1969 concert in Miami, Florida – discussed in Chapter Three) that at the time of his departure was undergoing an appeals process.

Like Wilkerson and Cleaver, Morrison’s decision to flee was motivated by the judicial system’s imposition of limits on his mobility. If, as scholars like Sayer have addressed, the government intended for such trials to hinder the pursuits of political radicals, then Morrison’s trial was equally detrimental to the Doors.

As the lives of Morrison, Cleaver, and Wilkerson, and therefore the direction of the Doors, the Black Panther Party, and the Weather Underground were affected by their need to avoid law enforcement officials, it became evident that some parallels existed between the prosecution (or persecution) of political revolutionaries and musicians. Despite these similarities, however, scholars must remember that most musicians were never charged with serious federal crimes; thus, unlike members of the Weather Underground, they, for the most part, did not hide.

Vice squad officials and police
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10 Sayer, *Ghost Dancing the Law*, 3.
11 As detailed by the White Panther Party scholar, Jeff A. Hale, in October 1969, John Sinclair, the first manager of the MC5, a music critic, and the founder of the White Panther Party, was indicted along with Panther Pun Plamondon, on charges of conspiring the late September 1969 bombing of a CIA building in Ann Arbor, Michigan. During the time of both the bombing and the indictment, Sinclair was serving a
officers frequently arrested musicians on obscenity or drug possession charges, while law enforcement officials, ranging from the campus police department at the University of Texas to the FBI, engaged in surveillance.\footnote{See Chapter Three and its footnotes for discussion and citations of these files.} Such acts paralleled surveillance measures taken against countercultural radicals and political revolutionaries. However, this author’s realization that the FBI files of political organizations and radicals far exceeded in pagination and volume those of musicians, suggests that the FBI’s repression of political organizations, radicals, and movements greatly surpassed their attack on musicians.\footnote{To cite some examples from the FBI Files (made available to this researcher on CD-Rom discs requested via the Freedom of Information Act): the file on the Jefferson Airplane was 14 pages; that on James Douglas Morrison (Jim Morrison of the Doors) was 89 pages; and Phil Ochs’s was 429 pages. The FBI’s file on the Weathermen Underground was just under 11,000 pages.} Clearly, those agents were concerned more with suppressing political subversion than with steering the direction of music. A similar trend in support of this argument would be that while undercover agents commonly infiltrated groups like the American Indian Movement and the Black Panther Party, no evidence has appeared to suggest that FBI agents actually joined rock bands or folk groups.\footnote{The White Panther Party, which before 1969, considered the MC5 its “house band,” before the Up acquired that position in the early 1970s, was infiltrated by an FBI agent working as an “agent provocateur.” Yet, the infiltrator focused on the Panthers and not their musical supporters. Jeff A. Hale, \textit{Wiretapping and National Security: Nixon, the Mitchell Doctrine, and the White Panthers}, Ph.D.}
Fugs, however, has written that in 1965 a New York City police informant (in answer to an advertisement placed by the Fugs in the Village Voice) tried out for the band as a touring guitarist, but failed to get hired. Nonetheless, state and municipal police officers were regularly present at many concerts. The effects of repressive government and law enforcement officials between the mid-1960s and early 1970s underscored how different persons within the music industry reacted in divergent ways. Although very few musicians went to jail for long periods of time, arrests, fines, and trials led to psychological hardship for such musicians as Phil Ochs and Jim Morrison. While they exhibited signs of paranoia generated by their fear of the police or the FBI, others, like the folksinger Joan Baez and the rock manager and critic John Sinclair demonstrated a continuous resistance against the law and government. Besides triggering these varied psychological responses, repression often had an economic effect on the careers of some musicians. Festival promoters were denied...
permits; clubs shut down; and even some of the bestselling bands like the Doors suffered a loss of bookings, thus limiting their economic opportunities. Arrests and government concern about certain groups also exacerbated tensions between certain performers, as well as with their record labels and radio stations at a time when these business owners wished to avoid government interference with their economic livelihood. Yet, as these bands, record labels, and radio stations made certain decisions in order to distance themselves from the possibility of invoking government repression, other groups like the Grateful Dead sought to appropriate their struggles with the police for promotional gain which they believed would result in additional fame, publicity, and profit.

I. The Triggering of Psychological Unease, Fear, and Paranoia:

In 1970 Franklin Bach of the Ann Arbor, Michigan hard rock band, the Up, wrote:

The musicians are bullied and shoved around, harassed from every possible angle, and the ones that don’t go along end up starving or in jail. A lot of musicians that have played the pig’s game just so that they could go on playing their music ended up doing stuff they never wanted to do in the first place – the music ended up sounding shitty as a result of all the hassle.  

Although the Up never received a national recording contract or much attention outside of the greater Ann Arbor area, (thus distinguishing the group from other, more famous musicians examined in this study), Bach’s argument demonstrated how politically radical musicians realized the detrimental effect which the police could have on their careers: they could have either faced harassment and little commercial fame or compromised themselves and their politics for fame and industry support. The Up, by promoting itself
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17 Franklin Bach, “Rock Around the Clock and Seize the Time!” mimeographed pamphlet reprinted from Berkeley Tribe, 10-17 April, 1970. John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 15, Folder 35.
as the official band of the White Panther Party in the early 1970s (following the MC5’s 1969 disassociation with Sinclair - in an incident discussed below), never compromised their music or politics to the degree that they tempered their revolutionary rhetoric or brash sonic attack. This meant that they would never in Bach’s mind, have “end[ed] up sounding shitty as a result of the hassle.”18 Sinclair would remember the Up as fearlessly “taking the Party’s message to rock & roll venues throughout Michigan and the Midwest until the band’s demise in 1973.” 19 As both a revolutionary associate of Sinclair and an active member of the White Panthers, Bach clearly would have realized the extent of police presence. Yet, apart from suggesting that repression could change a band’s sonic and political direction, he commented little on whether the police impacted him on a more personal, psychological level. Although rock journalism and scholarship would largely ignore the Up, thus making it unclear as to why the group disbanded in 1973, a reading of the primary and secondary literature associated with other musicians harassed by the state suggests a variety of psychological responses and reactions. 20 Some musicians, like Jim Morrison of the Doors or the folksinger Phil Ochs, became paranoid, scared, or worn down.

Similar to Jim Morrison (who died in July 1971), the comedian Lenny Bruce, arrested several times on obscenity charges, perished from a morphine overdose in 1966. Years later, Bruce’s lawyer, William Kunstler (who in later trials, defended amongst others: Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin and their cohorts in the Chicago Seven; John Sinclair
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18 Ibid.
20 One of the few studies to have mentioned the Up, albeit in scattered sentences, is Doggett, There’s A Riot Going On, 225-226, 318, 407, 421, 465-466.
and the White Panther Party, when they were accused of conspiring to bomb a CIA building in Ann Arbor; and the American Indian Movement during the Wounded Knee Trials), argued in his memoir that Bruce’s death was the comedian’s psychological response to the stress of arrests and trials. Kunstler wrote: “I believe Lenny OD’d deliberately. Six years earlier, he was at the height of his career. But after the government’s persecution he became so obsessed with his legal struggles that he lost his perspective and brilliant sense of humor.” 21 Implying a connection between the fates of Bruce and Morrison, Kunstler, on the next page of his memoir, noted that when he appeared as a lawyer in the Miami trial scenes during the Oliver Stone-directed movie, *The Doors* (released in 1991), he recited some of the exact lines from his defense of Bruce. 22 For Kunstler, both entertainers simulated masturbation, thereby mocking the ostensibly prude hegemonic state, before suffering arrests and trials of debilitating, deadly consequence.

As addressed earlier in this study, the Doors’ Jim Morrison was frequently targeted for arrest by police officials and vice squad agents. Morrison reacted to his December 1967 arrest in New Haven, Connecticut with facial expressions of surprise and what could be interpreted as a sense of absurd amusement. 23 Yet, as time passed and the number of arrests increased, Morrison’s band mates and associates would suggest that the singer had become deeply upset about his trial and potential imprisonment for his alleged
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21 William M. Kunstler with Sheila Isenberg, *My Life as a Radical Lawyer* (New York: Birch Lane Press, 1994), 168. In this book Kunstler also referred to the other trials noted above. As Bruce lamented in his autobiography, the negative publicity surrounding his arrests and trials led him to lose numerous bookings, resulting in personal financial woes as of 1965. Lenny Bruce, *How to Talk Dirty and Influence People: An Autobiography by Lenny Bruce* (New York: Fireside, 1992), 183-184. His fear of subsequent harassment and arrests for drug possession also led him to “carry . . . at all times a small bound booklet consisting of photostats of statements made by physicians, and prescriptions and bottle labels” (ibid., 141).

22 Kunstler, *My Life as a Radical Lawyer*, 169.

acts during the infamous March 1969 concert in Miami, Florida. Biographers Jerry Hopkins and Danny Sugerman, the latter of whom knew Morrison personally and became the Doors’ manager after the singer’s death, suggested that the Miami trial depressed Morrison. The singer never served prison time, for in July 1971 he died in a bathtub in Paris, France, where he had expatriated while his conviction was in the process of being appealed. Although the librarian and Doors scholar Melissa Ursula Dawn Goldsmith has recently reminded Doors researchers to not forget that “creativity” and poetic inspiration were important reasons for Morrison’s departure, many of the singer’s contemporaries connected the ongoing stress of the Miami trial and appeals to their discussion of Morrison’s expatriation. To cite one example, the band’s manager Bill Siddons would later offer this interpretation of the trial’s impact on Morrison’s psychological condition: “It almost killed the band, and it probably killed Jim. It completely destroyed that thing that an artist has when they (sic.) know they’re (sic.) making a difference and they’re (sic.) doing something. And then all of a sudden he’s on the defensive.” Siddons’s commentary, “it probably killed Jim,” could support Goldsmith’s interpretation that Morrison wanted to revivify himself as a poet; however, it could also be read as an evidence for why Morrison engaged in heavy drinking and drug use between 1969 and his sudden death in July 1971. Morrison could have been worn down, depressed, or even

scared by the stress of a trial and jail sentence. Making this contention is biographer Stephen Davis, who has written: “When his spiritual drive was exhausted, sapped by addiction, dementia, and legal battles, Jim’s body followed soon after.”

Whereas Davis never knew Morrison personally, others who actually had a professional connection to Morrison also made similar suggestions of a scared singer. Bill Belmont, the artist coordinator for the July 1969 Woodstock Festival, would later claim in oral history interviews that the Doors’ absence from Woodstock resulted from Morrison’s belief in a possible assassination attempt. If Morrison really had such a belief, then his struggle with state authorities did generate a degree of internal fear.

Biographers of Phil Ochs have noted that the folksinger’s depression, paranoia, and mental illness developed over a period beginning with the confrontation between police and antiwar activists outside the 1968 DNC and culminating with his 1976 suicide. Simultaneously, from 1963 to his death, Ochs was under FBI surveillance. In the early 1970s Ochs manifested obvious signs of untreated mental illness and paranoia, going so far as to proclaim that he was a CIA agent. Such an off-base assertion could have
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27 Ibid.
28 Davis, Jim Morrison, xii.
30 Regarding the possibility of an assassination attempt on Morrison, biographer Stephen Davis has claimed that an anonymous lawyer who would later know Morrison’s lawyer, Max Fink, would later claim that Fink had allegedly received a warning from a third lawyer with connections to the Nixon Administration that Morrison would not physically survive his incarceration. Davis points out that if such a discussion was to have occurred, then Fink could also have received advice to save Morrison’s life by sending him to France, a country from which he would not have been extradited. Davis does admit that this claim is “unverifiable.” Davis, Jim Morrison, 410-411.
32 Eliot, Death of a Rebel, 295-296.
arisen from Ochs’s belief that during an earlier overseas trip the CIA had robbed him so that he would no longer have the papers necessary to visit Vietnam. At times during his period of mental illness, Ochs carried knives and behaved violently and self-destructively. He was arrested for assaulting a woman, for driving drunk, and for possessing weapons. His brother, the renowned rock photographer Michael Ochs, believed that the folksinger’s aesthetic decline (which would have been connected to his mental condition) was caused by an inability to write introspective (as opposed to topical) lyrics, leaving him with little to write about following the end of America’s presence in the Vietnam War and the resignation of a disgraced Richard Nixon after the Watergate scandal. Yet, the biographer Michael Schumacher has argued that Ochs’s decision to commit suicide could have resulted from both the folksinger’s sense of commercial failure as an artist (who ultimately sold few records despite being somewhat popular in a few Eastern markets like New York City and Boston) and belief that the social movements of the long sixties had failed to attain true democracy for America. Ochs attributed the “movement’s” failures to amongst other things, the violence of a police state personified by the Chicago Police Department as witnessed outside the 1968 DNC in Chicago, for he had described those events as “the formal death of democracy in America.” Consequently, the folksinger’s experiences with a state which he equated with both violence and surveillance could have depressed him significantly, and likely contributed to his decision to commit suicide. Ochs’s brother, Michael, has provided

33 Ibid., 235.
34 Ibid., 287-293.
37 Ochs as quoted in ibid., 201.
support for this interpretation by stating an in interview with Peter Doggett: “Phil was definitely under surveillance by the FBI. . . . It was none too subtle. . . . It helped to add to Phil’s paranoia. . .”  

Whereas contemporaries and scholars would attempt to gauge how law enforcement officials, including the FBI, affected the psychological state of Jim Morrison and Phil Ochs, other musicians subjected to harassment or surveillance, including Yoko Ono (the wife of John Lennon), realized that the FBI deliberately intended to invoke fear. As Ono later asserted: “They wanted to make it obvious, so that we [would] get scared.”  

As documented by the historian Jon Wiener, Lennon and Ono persisted to criticize the FBI and Nixon Administration, thus demonstrating that such feelings did not completely deter their activism. For example, during radio and television interviews Lennon publicized his realization that the FBI was tapping his phone and argued that the American government was intending to deport him back to his native England because of his anti-Vietnam War stance.  

Despite making these claims publically, however, Lennon also announced his decision to cancel a 1972 concert tour which he and political radicals such as Jerry Rubin were planning as a means of discouraging potential voters from reelecting Richard Nixon as President. Lennon admitted that the tour’s cancellation resulted from his belief that U.S. immigration authorities would argue that his rhetoric on such a tour was potential grounds for his deportation.  
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38 Michael Ochs as quoted in Doggett, *There’s A Revolution Going On*, 234.
39 Yoko Ono quoted in *LENNONYC, American Masters*, NHPTV, New Hampshire Public Television (Durham, NH: NHPTV, November 2010).
41 Ibid., xix, 239.
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demonstrated that while Lennon could discuss state repression in public, he simultaneously realized the effect it could have on his choice of residence.

While the tour’s cancellation did not suggest that the FBI’s targeting of Lennon depressed the musician to the severity of expatriating to a lifestyle of alcoholism and drug abuse in Paris (like Jim Morrison) or committing suicide (as did Phil Ochs), it demonstrated how the Bureau nonetheless had a psychological effect on his professional decisions. It was because the FBI was making his life and effort to stay in the U.S. difficult that Lennon cancelled the tour. Similarly, authors like Fred Goodman and Don McLeese have attributed the MC5’s decision to break away professionally from their manager John Sinclair just prior to the White Panther Party founder’s 1969 incarceration as evidence that the group wanted to jettison their association with radical politics in order to concentrate wholly on their aesthetic interest as rockers. Since their combination of activism and rock was leading to hassles with federal and local (Michigan) law enforcement officials, the MC5 strictly chose to rock, hence distancing themselves from the revolutionary ideas of the White Panther Party, which continued to draw attention from the FBI and law enforcement agencies in Michigan. Though Lennon curtailed his touring while the MC5 distanced themselves from revolutionary ideologists, all of these musicians directed their careers in a manner that allowed their survival.

II: Musicians’ Resistance:

If after breaking professional ties with their manager John Sinclair, the MC5’s band members tried to distance themselves from police attention, then other musicians acted as if their confrontation with police authorities inspired them to remain antagonistic. For these musicians, fear of the FBI or the police was neither a source of great emotional affliction nor an effective deterrent. Some bands, such as the Jefferson Airplane, expressed little concern or even a sense of mild amusement; others, in particular, John Sinclair and Joan Baez, testified to their arrests as a galvanizing force behind their political activism and outlook.

Explaining that most arrests of her and her band mates in the Jefferson Airplane resulted in no more punishment than the imposition of monetary fines, which such a band of international stature could clearly afford to pay, Grace Slick would later write: “The members of Airplane went to jail, and relatively often, but never for long. The lawyers would converge, the bail would be paid, and we would walk—usually within twenty-four hours.” \(^4^4\) Such words demonstrated the singer’s dismissal of the potential seriousness of these arrests by implying that they were no more than a nuisance resulting in no ongoing sense of fear. Slick and her band mates henceforth continued their advocacy for the usage of illegal psychedelic drugs and profane language. This in many ways was possible because of the band’s corporate backing, which allowed the group to escape from too much legal trouble by having sufficient money to provide a strong legal defense. The Airplane’s little jail time did not reveal the absence of harassment by law

enforcement officials; instead, it suggested that the band had an economic means of protecting itself and the emotional ability to cope with arrests, fines, and court dates.

Feeling somewhat unscathed as were the Airplane, Ed Sanders of the Fugs (aided by the pro bono legal assistance of the American Civil Liberties Union), reacted to his arrest in a manner expressive of ongoing antagonism and animus towards the law enforcement officials that arrested him. In 1967, after judges had dismissed all pornographic distribution and obscenity charges arising from his proprietorship of the Peace Eye Bookstore and Gallery which New York City police officers had confiscated in a January 2, 1966 raid (addressed in Chapter One of this study), Ed Sanders proudly announced the reopening of his store and continuing sale of *Fuck You / a magazine of the Arts*, the publication which police had found most offensive. Confirming that he was not cowering from the potential of a subsequent arrest over what a vice squad might consider as pornographic language, Sanders referred to *Fuck You* using the semen-inspired metaphor “outspew” (*sic.*), and announced that his gallery would soon display the prurient “ejaculata” (*sic.*) of a sculptor named Steve Weber. Thus, in the aftermath of his arrest, Sanders’s intentional choice of sexualized wording demonstrated his commitment to presenting sexually explicit literature, art, and through the Fugs, music, with which vice squad officials would have taken additional offense.

Sanders’s use of hypersexual metaphors could also be read as a playful censure of a prude society that excoriated the overt sexuality and drug use associated with the counterculture and political radicalism. Undeterred by the New York Police Department,
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45 “Ed Sanders Wins Obscenity Case,” found in Ed Sanders Papers. Archives and Special Collections at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut Libraries, Box 17, Folder 439. Also see Sanders, *Fug You*, 247-258.
46 “Ed Sanders Wins Obscenity Case.”
Sanders, by using language the state detested, mocked hegemonic values and exhibited a playful amusement initiated by police repression. Similarly, as analyzed in Chapter One of this study, Arlo Guthrie lampooned police authorities in “Alice’s Restaurant.” Likewise suggesting that his relationship with the police was like a game of “cat and mouse,” the Jefferson Airplane’s Paul Kantner humorously responded to an obscenity arrest in Florida by slipping LSD into a police officer’s bourbon bottle after making bail. In a similar incident, Bob Weir of the Grateful Dead playfully handcuffed a police officer to his desk following the band’s 1970 drug bust in New Orleans. Such incidents revealed that some musicians unafraid to fool around with the police.

In 1969, John Sinclair, the founder of the White Panther Party, music critic, and original manager of the MC5 received a ten-year prison sentence for selling a marijuana “joint” to an under-cover police officer. Instead of going quietly and cowering in fear, Sinclair profusely wrote and published articles in the underground press that criticized the state and extolled revolution and marijuana use. He also lobbied the Michigan State Legislature to reduce the penalty for marijuana possession and erase the laws responsible for his sentence. Such petitioning led the Michigan Supreme Court to release Sinclair from jail in December 1971, just two-and-a-half (as opposed to ten)-years into his
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47 Slick with Cagan, Somebody to Love, 196.
48 Dennis McNally, A Long Strange Trip: The Inside History of the Grateful Dead (New York: Broadway Books, 2002), 354. The Dead’s reference to their New Orleans bust for promotional purposes is addressed later in this chapter. As mentioned in Chapter One of this study, Augustus Owsley Stanley III (infamously known as Owsley), was a close associate of the Grateful Dead and also one of the largest manufacturers of LSD in the mid-1960s. Arrested in 1967, Owsley received a three-year jail sentence. Although other associates of the Grateful Dead were arrested on several occasions, Owsley remained the only one to receive a long jail sentence. Of course, the laws for drug manufacturing and distribution were more severe than those for possession. See Lee and Shlain, Acid Dreams, 240.
49 As noted in Chapter One, at the time of this arrest, Sinclair had already been arrested more than once on drug charges.
50 Many of these writings were collected in John Sinclair, Guitar Army: Street Writings/Prison Writings (New York: Douglas Books, 1972), and John Sinclair and Robert Levin, Music and Politics (New York: World Publishing, 1971). Some of these articles are quoted elsewhere in this study.
sentence. In an introduction to a recent reprint of Sinclair’s *Guitar Army*, author Michael Simmons interpreted Sinclair as someone who “. . . proceeded to live freely.”

Although more critical readers might initially suspect Simmons to have resorted to hagiographical praise for Sinclair (lest his introduction not get published), readers of this collection should realize the revolutionary sentiments continuously expressed by Sinclair. For instance, two of Sinclair’s essays compiled in *Guitar Army* were titled: “The Penitentiary Ain’t Shit To Be Afraid Of” and “Long Live the Black Panther Party.” Both titles were emblematic of Sinclair’s commitment to maintain and profess his revolutionary political beliefs. Following his release from prison, Sinclair, despite being watched closely by the Michigan State Police and the FBI, remained politically active with the White Panther Party which transitioned into the Rainbow Peoples’ Party until Sinclair disbanded it in 1975 due to the end of the Vietnam War. As of 2012, he has continued to advocate the use and decriminalization of marijuana. In sum, the author Peter Doggett was correct when he argued that “Sinclair’s history of dope busts exposed him as an easy target for harassment, which in turn hardened his revolutionary invective.”

Like John Sinclair, others, particularly, the folksinger Joan Baez, used their arrests or very short imprisonment to galvanize their political rhetoric and direction. As
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52 “John Sinclair Biography,” The Official John Sinclair Website, [http://johnsinclair.us/bio/912-john-sinclair-biography.html](http://johnsinclair.us/bio/912-john-sinclair-biography.html) (accessed August 1, 2012). The FBI shared its surveillance notes with the U.S. Secret Service, demonstrating that other federal agencies were also concerned with Sinclair and the White Panthers. See letter from J. Edgar Hoover (with enclosures) to United States Secret Service Director, April 6, 1972. Red Squad and Surveillance Files – FBI, John and Leni Sinclair Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Box 46, Folder 5.
53 Sinclair’s crusade for marijuana has recently led him to market blends of synthetic marijuana, a controversial product that most likely concerns some parental and state authorities. See John Sinclair Seeds, [http://ceresseeds.com/online/en/jo...(accessed August 1, 2012).
54 Doggett, *There’s A Riot Going On*, 226.
addressed earlier in this study, Baez was arrested on two separate occasions in late 1967, for helping a group of antiwar protestors block the entranceway to the Oakland, California Armed Forces Induction Center. For participating in both illegal acts of protest, Baez spent a combined forty days in jail (but had been sentenced for longer).\textsuperscript{55} Demonstrating that the likelihood of imprisonment would not dissuade her from engaging in additional acts of protest on behalf of the antiwar and draft resistance movements, Baez told reporters covering her release from prison, “It was one of the best things I’ve done in my life. I will probably do it again.”\textsuperscript{56}

In July 1969 Baez’s then-husband David Harris was imprisoned for ten months because of his advocacy of draft resistance. Baez spoke about Harris’s incarceration during her concerts, including Woodstock.\textsuperscript{57} In a letter transcribed within a 1970 \textit{Rolling Stone} advertisement for her album \textit{One Day at a Time}, Baez told Harris: “Your spirit is strong here on Struggle Mountain. It seems that keeping us apart is much trickier than Uncle Sam ever counted on.”\textsuperscript{58} Although the letter’s inclusion of the sentence, “I miss you,” demonstrated that some degree of longing resulted from Harris’s imprisonment, the rest of Baez’s letter emphasized how the couple was surviving “Uncle Sam’s” efforts to keep them apart through the incarceration.\textsuperscript{59} In other words, the state’s efforts to subdue Baez and Harris’s antiwar activism, which was closely connected to Baez’s career as a

\begin{footnotes}
\item[58] Advertisement for Joan Baez, \textit{One Day at a Time}, \textit{Rolling Stone}, 19 March 1970, 5. Struggle Mountain was a small California commune in which Harris and Baez lived with fellow antiwar resisters. See Baez, \textit{And a Voice to Sing with}, 151-152.
\item[59] Advertisement for Baez, \textit{One Day at a Time}.
\end{footnotes}
folsinger, intensified Baez’s public denunciation of the war and government.\textsuperscript{60}

Although the couple’s marriage did not survive long after Harris’s release from prison in 1970, Baez would imply that it was her own infidelity and personal feelings—not “politics” or government repression—that broke up their marriage.\textsuperscript{61} Undeterred by a fear of the American state, Baez visited Hanoi during December 1972, and collected audio recordings of the “Christmas bombings” conducted by the U.S. military (and at the time unbeknownst to the majority of America’s populace). To promote peace (while condemning American war interests in Vietnam), Baez mixed sound bites from these recordings into her album, \textit{Where Are You Now My Son}.\textsuperscript{62} She remained active in the anti-Vietnam War movement until the war’s conclusion, and then afterwards into the first decade of the twenty-first century was a stalwart proselytizer of pacifism and critic of American imperialism, as evidenced by her criticism of the bellicose foreign policy of President George W. Bush.\textsuperscript{63}

Baez’s continuous promotion of pacifism in connection with her career as a folksinger demonstrated how thoughts of being arrested or imprisoned did not compromise her political rhetoric, artistic direction, or emotional wellbeing.

Nonetheless, other musicians, particularly Phil Ochs and Jim Morrison, have been

\textsuperscript{60} Indicative of the close relationship between Baez’s music and activism is her donation of much of her concert revenue and record sales residual to the draft resistance movement. See Baez, \textit{And a Voice to Sing with}, 167.

\textsuperscript{61} As Baez explained the reason for her divorce: “We didn’t split up over politics. We split up, when we did, because I couldn’t breathe, and I couldn’t try anymore to be a wife, and because I belonged alone . . .” ibid., 160.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 193-225.

\textsuperscript{63} Daniel Brockman, “Forever Young,” The Boston Phoenix, 28 October 2008 \url{http://thephoenix.com/boston/music/70852-forever-young/} (accessed December 1, 2010). Of her musical peers, Baez was not the lone sixties musician to upbraid the Bush Administration. In August 2006, the author of this study attended a concert during which Country Joe McDonald performed a reworked version of “Superbird” which substituted mention of Lyndon B. Johnson with the name of George W. Bush. Approximately four decades later, McDonald was still criticizing the bellicose foreign policy of U.S. Presidents. Country Joe McDonald, Performance at Hippiefest, August 25, 2006, Dodge Music Center, Hartford, Connecticut.
interpreted as demonstrating signs of emotional affliction, paranoia, or fear in reaction to instances of oppressive surveillance and court trials. As some musicians were deeply affected, others laughed and even benefitted. A similar dichotomy appeared in the economic trajectory of musicians’ careers: some musicians experienced financial loss, while others tried to appropriate their battles with law enforcement officials for commercial and promotional gain.

II. The Correlation between Repression and Economic Loss:

Chapter Three of this study detailed how civic authorities across the U.S. used legislation, monetary fines, and court injunctions to derail numerous rock festivals and discourage some promoters from booking rock shows in smaller halls and theaters. The obvious effect of such cancellations was that fewer festivals and venues – particularly dancehalls – lessened the number of opportunities through which musicians could perform and get paid. Moreover, some artists experienced occasional trouble arranging bookings, particularly when promoters wished to avoid controversy or state action. Additionally, in the case of some British rockers who tried to enter the U.S., travel became complicated.

Among the musicians who encountered visa and travel difficulties were the British musicians John Lennon (whose troubles with U.S. immigration authorities and the FBI are documented in earlier chapters of this study), the Rolling Stones, and Donovan Leitch. Regarding the Stones, in a June 1967 article in *Crawdaddy* the rock critic Paul Williams wrote:

Mick Jagger and Keith Richards have been convicted in England of possession of narcotics (meth and hash)—Mick received a three-month sentence, Keith a full year. They’re appealing the convictions; meanwhile, Brian Jones is being tried on similar charges. This means that
you’re unlikely to see the Stones in the U.S. any more, even after they’re out of jail. (Donovan has been out of the States for the same reason.).

Williams’s use of the phrase “unlikely to see the Stones in the U.S. any more” implied the detrimental effect that narcotics convictions had on the touring aspirations of some bands. Although the Rolling Stones’ cases never resulted in the group’s permanent exclusion from the U.S. and even predated their monumental tours of American arenas between 1969 and the early twenty-first century, this article confirmed how those within the rock community, ranging from musicians to critics, feared that narcotics arrests could result in permanent travel restrictions and gig cancellations. Donovan’s narcotics arrest denied him entry into the U.S. for the 1967 Monterey International Pop Music Festival, the forum that helped solidify fame for amongst others, Jimi Hendrix and Janis Joplin. Nonetheless, Donovan later obtained special papers permitting him into the States. In reference to Donovan and the Stones, Williams’s predictions thus overstated the permanency of travel restrictions resulting from narcotics arrests, but simultaneously underscored the possibility of great financial loss.

Occasionally, some promoters refused to book certain “politcized” performers. For example, Pete Seeger’s ties with communism prevented him from obtaining lucrative club gigs during the 1950s. Seeger nonetheless found the means to support himself by
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65 Ibid.
67 The Rolling Stones and Donovan were British citizens who encountered travel difficulty because of their drug arrests. Yet, drug arrests also derailed the domestic travel and touring of some U.S. citizens. As he had prior drug convictions, Augustus Owsley Stanley, LSD manufacturer and designer of the Grateful Dead’s unique sound system, could not travel freely with the band after the Dead’s 1971 drug bust in their New Orleans hotel. See McNally, A Long Strange Trip, 354. Will Sheff has noted that after Austin, TX police arrested members of the Thirteenth Floor Elevators in early 1966, “Judge Mace Thurman . . . put [electric jug player] Tommy Hall and guitarist Stacy Sutherland on a probation that prohibited them from entering Texas bars or rock clubs. . . ” Will Sheff, Liner Notes to Roky Erickson with Okkervil River, True Love Cast Out All Evil, Anti 87078-2, compact disc, 12-13.
providing music instruction to kids and performing for civil rights groups and student organizations at colleges nationwide.\textsuperscript{68} Seeger’s biographer, David Dunaway has argued that by forcing Seeger to perform at colleges (instead of clubs), the blacklisting of Seeger generated by FBI efforts actually helped to increase the singer’s popularity amongst the college students whose interest in folk music led to the Folk Revival era of the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{69} Nonetheless, during the 1950s and throughout the 1960s, such blacklisting caused Seeger to never acquire the same high paying festival and arena bookings as did groups like the Doors.

Although the Doors were never nationally blacklisted from television to the same degree as Pete Seeger, the group nonetheless believed they were the victims of major revenue losses in 1969 following the onstage arrests of its singer Jim Morrison. Biographers Jerry Hopkins and Jerry Sugerman have suggested that a Concert Hall Managers Association newsletter condemning Jim Morrison’s illicit actions onstage led to the band’s blacklisting from financially lucrative music venues.\textsuperscript{70} Band members and management soon calculated an estimated loss of one million dollars of revenue following the cancellation of many concerts scheduled to follow the infamous March 1969 show in Miami.\textsuperscript{71} In 1969, Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Dallas, and Toronto (Canada) were among the cities to have cancelled Doors concerts. Also, some

\textsuperscript{69} Dunaway suggests this in ibid. His biography on Seeger is one of the best and most extensive. See David King Dunaway, \textit{How Can I Keep from Singing? The Ballad of Pete Seeger} (New York: Villard / Random House, 2008).
\textsuperscript{70} Hopkins and Sugerman, \textit{No One Here Gets Out Alive}, 237.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 247. John Densmore, \textit{Riders on the Storm: My Life with Jim Morrison and the Doors} (New York: Dell Publishing, 1990), 259. Interestingly, less than three weeks after the filing of charges regarding Morrison’s Miami concert, a Grateful Dead concert scheduled for the same venue, the Dinner Key Auditorium, was cancelled. For more on that incident, see McNally, \textit{A Long Strange Trip}, 305.
radio stations refused to broadcast Doors music. As the initial controversy surrounding Morrison’s arrest subsided, the Doors did perform in some of the cities mentioned above during 1970. Yet, according to the band’s calculations, by that time they had lost over a million dollars. Moreover, their contracts came to include an obscenity clause forbidding them from receiving payment for any concert in which Morrison or another band member used profanity onstage. Discussing this issue, keyboardist Ray Manzarek would later claim to have repeatedly seen narcotics agents and vice squad officers holding warrants with the band member’s names. In Morrison’s case, such concern did not always deter him from making statements like, “would anyone like to see my genitals?,” and, “those cocksuckers,” as he did during the April 10, 1970 concert in Boston. Yet, Morrison’s nonchalance towards the financial repercussion of his behavior that night distressed Manzarek who, according to Rolling Stone, “reacted to Morrison’s words by clapping the singer’s mouth shut with one hand and then lifting and carrying him across the stage like a microphone stand.” While some might suggest that Morrison’s antics were designed to invoke audience excitement about the Doors’ product of rebellion, Manzarek perceived that such a controversial means of promotion amidst the watch of vice squads and police detail could also backfire into unwanted financial loss.

As a top-selling, internationally-renowned group with a catalogue of radio hits, the Doors retained promotional support from their label, Elektra Records. Such corporate provision was not offered to the 13th Floor Elevators. Will Sheff, who would later
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74 Manzarek, Light My Fire, 331-332.
75 “‘Anyone Like to See My Genitals?’” Rolling Stone, 14 May 1970, 22.
76 Ibid.
perform on and produce [the former Elevators singer] Roky Erickson’s 2010 album *True Love Cast out All Evil*, has noted that the Austin, Texas Police Department’s 1966 arrest of the Thirteenth Floor Elevators on drug charges led International Artists, the group’s record label to not promote the band:

Inexperienced with large-scale distribution of an album—fearful of bad press linked to the Elevators’ Texas drug bust—International Artists took out no ads for the record, set up no interviews for the band, and did nothing to promote *The Psychedelic Sounds of the 13th Floor Elevators*. Now [in 2010] recognized as a defining album of the psychedelic [rock] genre, the record flopped shortly after its release in November 1966.  

This lack of support from the Elevators’ label came at a time when their radio single, “She’s Gonna Miss Me” had charted nationally. Although drug abuse and the consequential arrests and 1968 incarceration of Roky Erickson were most responsible for the band’s demise, International Artists’ failure to promote the band after their 1966 arrest prevented the Elevators from attaining widespread fame and wealth at a time when radio programmers were paying some attention to them. As indicated by Sheff, International Artists’ failure to market the Elevators partially resulted from the smallness of the label’s operation and budget; nonetheless, realization of the band’s problems with the Austin police also dissuaded the label from thinking that album promotion would be entirely safe and successful. Some larger labels such as Warner Brothers or Columbia
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77 Sheff, Liner Notes to Erickson, *True Love Cast Out All Evil*, 12.
78 Ibid.
79 After a 1969 arrest for marijuana possession, Erickson’s defense lawyer (assigned to the case by the State of Texas) helped convince the court system that his client should receive sentencing in a state psychiatric institution for schizophrenia instead of being sent to a prison. Consequently, until a jury deemed Erickson as “sane” in late-1972, resulting in his release, he spent a little more than three years in the Rusk Maximum Security Prison for the Criminally Insane (Sheff, Liner Notes to Erickson, *True Love Cast Out All Evil*, 10-16). As documented in the documentary, *You’re Gonna Miss Me*, Erickson afterwards suffered from severe and untreated mental illnesses (partly attributable to his profuse use of psychedelic drugs during the 1960s; partially caused by his experiences at the Rusk Prison), which kept him in a state of mental confusion and financial impoverishment until the early twenty-first century. Erickson eventually received proper mental treatment and began playing concerts again (one of which the author of this study attended in Boston during the fall of 2010). See *You’re Gonna Miss Me: A Film about Roky Erickson*, dir. Keven McAlester, 2005, Palm Pictures/Umvd, 2007, DVD.
Records did possess the financial clout necessary to defend artists in court; smaller independents like International Artists lacked such funds.

Suggesting that her political expressions worried record company executives, the folksinger and antiwar activist Holly Near would later claim that industry insiders had informed her that she would have been more famous if not for her politics: “There would be generalized comments like ‘I think you could really make it if you would choose not to be a political singer.’ . . . Both industry people and friends would say that. They’d say, ‘You’ve got so much talent. Why are you undermining it [?].’” 80 Such evidence suggested that artists like the 13th Floor Elevators and Holly Near were denied valuable promotion by record labels, whenever such businesses viewed these musicians’ countercultural activities or radical politics as a financial risk. If law enforcement officials targeted musicians or audiences shared differing opinions, then potential sales could be lost.

While these examples affected individual artists, Bernard Stollman, the founder of the independent record label, ESP-Disk, (which specialized in avant-garde jazz associated with black nationalist politics but also released folk-rock albums by the antiwar groups, Pearls Before Swine, and the Fugs), would come to believe that independent record labels which released political content, particularly his own, also fell victim to government repression. Stollman would later claim in an oral history interview that in 1968 the FBI, the CIA, and members of the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson conspired to

80 Holly Near as quoted in Gillian G. Gaar, She’s A Rebel: The History of Women in Rock & Roll (Seattle: Seal Press, 1992), 152.
put his label out of business due to their discomfort with antiwar recordings such as the Fugs’ satirical “Kill for Peace” (analyzed earlier in this study).\textsuperscript{81} Stollman would also allege that Peter Edmiston, who signed on to manage Pearls before Swine and the Fugs, directing them towards contracts with the more profit-oriented Warner Brothers, was secretly a CIA agent committed to subjecting both groups to corporate censorship and causing the antiwar ESP-Disk to lose its best-selling artists.\textsuperscript{82} Stollman contended that as a result, “Both groups no longer wrote or recorded songs that challenged the war, so they had been effectively silenced.”\textsuperscript{83} Further research and evidence is needed to confirm the veracity of whether Edmiston had connections to the CIA. Stollman’s suggestion that the Fugs ceased to release antiwar material was completely wrong, however. While signed to Reprise (a Warner Brothers subsidiary), the Fugs and their label placed an advertisement in \textit{Rolling Stone} stating:

\begin{quote}
There comes a time when 
you have to take a stand 
for peace, against war 
for love, against hate 
for freedom, against blind force 
for sex, against puritanical fascism 
for me, against you.\textsuperscript{84}
\end{quote}

By contrasting the countercultural values of “peace,” “freedom,” and “sex,” with the “war” (Vietnam) and “puritanical fascism” (which was timely pointed language in the aftermath of the violence imposed by the Chicago Police Department at the 1968 DNC), the Fugs clearly did not desist from offering antiwar commentary once signed to

\textsuperscript{81} Jason Weiss, \textit{Always in Trouble: An Oral History of ESP-Disk, the Most Outrageous Record Label in America} (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2012), 38-42.
\textsuperscript{82} Weiss, \textit{Always in Trouble}, 39, 53.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{84} Advertisement for the Fugs, \textit{It Crawled into My Hand, Honest, Rolling Stone}, 12 October 1968, 5.
Reprise.\textsuperscript{85} This was obvious to anyone who in 1969 purchased the Fugs album, \textit{The Belle of Avenue A}, which included “Chicago,” a song “originally written for the soundtrack of the Yippie movie about the police riots in Chicago at the Democratic Convention.”\textsuperscript{86} Despite Stollman’s failure to notice the Fugs’ continuous release of antiwar commentary, his statements would nonetheless suggest his personal belief that the CIA and FBI wanted to obstruct the commercial issuance of such rhetoric (regardless of whether the CIA or FBI actually did so).

Although Reprise did not censor the antiwar offerings of the Fugs, it could be argued in other cases that the firing of some controversial artists by their record labels was the manifestation of the popular music industry’s interest in protecting itself from the ire of government agencies like the CIA or FBI. Writing about congressional hearings regarding the violence and sexuality of comic books in the 1950s (as opposed to rock music during the long sixties), the journalist David Hajdu has argued, “The history of censorship in twentieth-century America is largely a story of self-regulation in the name of self-preservation—voluntary restraint enacted on the assumption that governmental restriction would be worse.”\textsuperscript{87} Examples of this trend were also found in television, in which Lenny Bruce quickly lost a lucrative writing contract due to a network’s “morality clause.”\textsuperscript{88} One notable example from the music industry was Elektra’s 1969 severance of its association with the MC5. Even though estimates indicated that the band had sold 100,000 copies of its debut album, \textit{Kick Out the Jams}, Elektra decided that the potential

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{85} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Quotation from liner notes for The Fugs, \textit{The Belle of Avenue A}, Reprise RS 6359, long-playing record, reprinted in Sanders \textit{Fug You}, 375.
\item \textsuperscript{87} David Hajdu, \textit{The Ten Cent Plague: The Comic Book Scare and How It Changed America} (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008), 127.
\item \textsuperscript{88} Bruce, \textit{How to Talk Dirty and Influence People}, 181-182.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
reaction to the band’s radical politics and lyrics outweighed the chances of profitability.\(^{89}\) Though afterwards signing with another label, the MC5 never reached the same level of profitability and popularity as did their Elektra label-mates, the Doors.\(^{90}\)

Much discussion in the rock press, particularly *Billboard* and *Rolling Stone*, and from scholars later examining the correlation between drug advocacy and the repressive reaction it spawned, would address how in 1970 MGM Records executive Mike Curb announced that his label was firing eighteen bands that allegedly promoted drug use through their behaviors or music.\(^{91}\) Controversy resulted, particularly since Curb never announced which groups MGM was firing. Moreover, the top-selling Eric Burdon (a drug user whose 1967 song “A Girl Named Sandoz” – recorded with the Animals — had blatantly referenced LSD as Sandoz was the pharmaceutical firm that had invented the psychedelic solution in the late 1930s) remained on the label. Realizing this, other industry executives claimed that Curb was taking this anti-drug position to curry the favor of anti-narcotics government officials, and actually firing these bands for not selling enough albums – and not because he actually cared whether his bands promoted

---

\(^{89}\) McLeese, *Kick Out the Jams*, 66-67. Despite being dropped by Elektra, the band remained both visible and audible in the Midwest after signing to another label and disassociating itself from White Panther Party founder John Sinclair, who, as discussed elsewhere in this study, continued to attract repression and the ire of state authorities well into the seventies. Peter Doggett has pointed out that another reason for Elektra’s decision was the MC5’s alleged theft of sound equipment. See Doggett, *There’s A Riot Going On*, 228.

\(^{90}\) To demonstrate the contrast in popularity between the Doors and the MC5, in 2011 the rock critic Greil Marcus published a collection of essays regarding the widespread presence of the Doors on classic rock radio stations and within popular culture—thus suggesting their enduring mainstream importance. Greil Marcus, *The Doors: A Lifetime of Listening to Five Mean Years* (New York: Public Affairs, 2011), passim. Months later, rock journalist Andy Greene wrote in his tribute to the recently deceased MC5 bassist, Michael Davis that the “band scored a cult hit with the influential *Kick Out the Jams*, but never found a mainstream audience.” Andy Greene, “MC5 Bassist Michael Davis, Punk Pioneer, Dies at 68,” *Rolling Stone*, 15 March 2012, 18. This disparity in fame during the years 2011 and 2012 could have resulted from the Doors’ music being more accessible (and at times quite pop-oriented) to the average listener. Simultaneously, it might also be related to how the bands were marketed during the height of their careers.

drug use. This led MGM into admitting that its decision was economic and not necessarily censorial or anti-drug. Nonetheless, the incident implied that some additional record label executives would have considered censoring or firing groups that advocated drugs.

In early 1971, Ralph J. Gleason, one of Rolling Stone’s founding editors, opined that while President Nixon’s warnings to radio broadcasters about the potential ramifications of playing drug-oriented rock lyrics proliferated throughout the industry in 1970, not everyone within the rock community succumbed to the government’s position:

Look the man tried to bust our music. He did, you know, with his [October 1970] White House conference and his rap about drug songs and danger and the rest. And the only convert that he got was little Mike Curb, hell bent on proving you can’t trust everyone under 30, making his frightened businessman’s pitch for publicity with an empty gesture suspect on every level.

Berating Curb and Nixon, Gleason also suggested that rock’s tropes would survive. Optimistically, he concluded: “But we made it through and at the end of one year there is still more music than at the beginning and there is more to come. It will change the world.”

Gleason’s editorializing about rock’s survival from such adversity as President Nixon’s meeting with radio station programmers (and the sudden deaths in 1970 of the legendary Jimi Hendrix and Janis Joplin) demonstrated his abiding faith in the political and aesthetic purpose of rock. For him, the music was more than a mere entertainment genre; it was a cultural movement that would transcend the contrary opinions of Nixon.

92 Martin and Segrave, Anti-Rock, 206-208. Shapiro, Waiting for the Man, 142. Both sources also note that in 1973, Curb became the Lieutenant Governor of California – working alongside Governor Ronald Reagan, who, like President Nixon, was known for his anti-drug pronouncements.
93 Ralph J. Gleason, “Perspectives: We Made It. We Survived,” Rolling Stone, 4 February 1971, 35. Discussion of the October 1970 conference regarding the promotion of drug use in rock lyrics appears in Chapter Three of this study.
94 Ibid.
Although Gleason’s article did not fully explicate on the economics of the music industry, it conveyed its author’s belief in rock’s survival amidst repression. Looking at the music industry of the late sixties and early seventies within the framework of historical hindsight, it is evident that Gleason was correct. Repressive comments and acts undertaken by the likes of government officials such as President Nixon and law enforcement authorities did not fully undermine rock, as there was evidence of numerous incidents in which the music industry followed the changing economic wants of its consumers instead of the demands of elected officials and law enforcement agencies.95 Furthermore, some musicians referenced and appropriated their troubles with law enforcement officials for purposes of marketing and publicity. The next section of this chapter will examine both the secondary and primary literature detailing these two trends.

IV: How Criticism, Harassment, or Repression Led to Marketing Opportunities:

In a 1989 article written to challenge the strong nostalgic connections between sixties rock and the antiwar movement which permeated the landscape of late eighties popular culture, the historians Kenneth J. Bindas and Craig Houston argued that “While a few antiwar rock songs became popular hits, when placed in the broad context of rock music’s anti-Establishment stance from 1965 to 1974, the attention given to the Vietnam War by the rock ‘n’ roll industry was minimal.”96 The authors conceded that while prior to 1968, folk (but not rock) musicians like Joan Baez and Phil Ochs recorded antiwar material, only a limited number of consumers (considering the entire U.S. population)

96 Ibid., 1.
purchased their records. However, as the number of Americans opposed to the Vietnam War rose between 1969 and 1971, so did the number of antiwar rock songs, many of which attained high rankings on industry sales and radio charts. Simultaneously, in business terms, the profitability of rock eclipsed that of other popular music genres, for rock record sales in 1971 alone generated $1.8 billion. The growing number of antiwar rock songs recorded and played on radio stations coincided with the genre’s commercial viability. Thus, “By 1972 protest rock had become so mainstream that middle-of-the-road pop performers [who may have been viewed condescendingly by discerning rock listeners] capitalized on the publics’ disenchantment with the Vietnam adventure and questioned the war on A.M. radio.” While the perimeters of Bindas and Houston’s study caused them to never mention any instance of elected officials or law enforcement agencies demanding rock’s censorship, their findings implied that as antiwar sentiment magnified, the music industry primarily produced what listeners (as opposed to elected officials or law enforcement agencies) wanted. Arguing that “Like all corporations, record companies . . . always gave consumers the product they desired,” Bindas and Houston ultimately suggested how during a period in which some elected officials and law enforcement authorities (which the authors never examined) maligned rock, the industry increasingly put forth an antiwar message that echoed the beliefs of its audience (more than those of its critics). Bindas and Houston’s economic interpretation does not automatically indicate that record companies were wholly unconcerned by any criticism which elected officials or law enforcement authorities offered about such music’s antiwar

97 Ibid., 6.
98 Ibid., 14-15.
99 Ibid., 14.
100 Ibid., 18.
101 Ibid., 23.
content; however, not underscoring the fact that such antiwar rhetoric offended said authorities confirmed that the industry did not automatically advocate the self-censorship of controversial messages, especially if they were selling as product.

As the rock industry sought the continuation of its profitability, the political mindset of the American youth changed. The signing of the Paris Peace Accords in January 1973 and the August 1974 resignation of President Richard Nixon, disgraced by the Watergate crisis, correlated with the dispersion of the antiwar movement. New movements committed to environmentalism, women’s liberation, and gay and lesbian rights arose in the early seventies; however, these movements were arguably not as commonly associated with the rock industry as were the antiwar movement and sixties counterculture. ¹⁰² Some musicians, particularly those considered singer-songwriters from the folk genre, spoke for the women’s, gay and lesbian, and environmentalist movements. However, as described by the popular music textbook author, Katherine Charlton, these “Singer/songwriters of the seventies tended less toward political issues and more toward the expression of personal thoughts and interests. . .”¹⁰³ Charlton’s realization that this genre of the early 1970s was more apolitical or personal than were the popular rock and folk styles (such as folk-rock and psychedelic rock) of the middle-to-late 1960s would parallel the argument of many sixties revolutionaries and later scholars that the hyper-political paradigm of popular music was losing definition.

The rock industry of the early 1970s transitioned away from the communal values associated with the more political messages of late sixties activists. Rock gatherings in community dancehalls and parks were increasingly replaced by pricier concerts in civic or corporate arenas. Rock historian Steve Waksman argues that “the scale of arena rock marked a corruption of the desires that went into the making of rock and represented an artificial form of community that was based solely on the capacity for profit.” 104 Thus, as the antiwar movement dissipated and other radical activists went underground, the values and motifs of the rock industry were changing.

Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, and Ed Sanders testified to such a transition in Vote, their 1972 exhortation to the American youth to vote in that year’s Presidential election for George McGovern, whom they viewed as the antiwar, progressive opponent to the incumbent Richard Nixon’s hawkish, anti-countercultural positions. Despite recognizing the allusions to rock and folk music by candidates, including McGovern, at the 1972 Democratic National Committee Convention, suggesting that these genres were becoming acceptable within mainstream politics, the authors argued that “Alice Cooper is a long way from Alice’s Restaurant.” 105 Whereas Arlo Guthrie’s “Alice Restaurant” (as analyzed elsewhere in this study) criticized institutions ranging from the Stockbridge, Massachusetts Police Department to the U.S. military - strongly situating the song (and its corresponding motion picture) within the antiwar movement, the hard rock singer Alice Cooper performed in costume makeup amidst a backdrop of stage blood,

104 Steve Waksman, This Ain’t the Summer of Love: Conflict and Crossover in Heavy Metal and Punk (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 11.
105 Ed Sanders, Abbie Hoffman, and Jerry Rubin, Vote (New York: Warner Paperback, 1972). See pages 132-134 for their discussion of music’s presence at the DNC, and page 150 for the chapter titled “Alice Cooper is a long way from Alice’s Restaurant.”
guillotines, and other props symbolic of violence and horror. In terms of popularity and profitability, Cooper had already begun to personify the commercialized (as opposed to the counterculture-based) arena rockers later analyzed by historians like Waksman. As Sanders, Hoffman, and Rubin wrote about Cooper and his contemporaries:

The mode of music has changed dramatically. The early groups, the Jefferson Airplane, the Grateful Dead, the Beatles, Bob Dylan and others, exuded hope and energy. There was a morality in their message. There was a sense of community. There is a new sound on the scene today.

Expostulating on Cooper’s sound and stage show as being devoid of purposeful, radical political content, Sanders et al. nonetheless suggested that America’s youth and rock consumers should instead work on promoting “a more humanistic society along socialist principles.” As of 1972, these three radicals had not abandoned the communal values expostulated by themselves and the counterculture. Sanders et al. did not fully believe that rock’s association with radical politics was completely gone; after all, at the time they were writing, the three had a close relationship with John Lennon (addressed elsewhere in this study).

Nonetheless, their discussion of Cooper, an apolitical hard rock performer, indicates the shift away from the counterculture and its political overtones to the commercialized arena rock of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

---

106 Detailed analysis of Alice Cooper’s performance appears in Steve Waksman, “Death Trip: Alice Cooper, Iggy Pop and Rock Theatricality,” in This Ain’t the Summer of Love: Conflict and Crossover in Heavy Metal and Punk (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 70-103. Waksman’s chapter also addresses Iggy Pop (who as a member of the Ann Arbor band the Stooges), associated with the MC5, despite not having any of that band’s political overtones.

107 Ibid. Despite contrasting the “commercial” with the “countercultural,” one must not overlook that while some musicians like the Fugs never commanded much money or audience, others, like the Doors generated much attention and profit. John Sinclair believed that had she not died, Janis Joplin might have spurned her status as one of rock’s wealthiest (thus read as capitalist) performers. Asserting that profit-driven promoters and record company executives had co-opted Joplin, Sinclair wrote: “she will still come back to her people as soon as the pigs lose interest in her and she comes to see that they have just been exploiting her, because she’s a righteous sister and she sure can sing, and we need her too bad to let her stay away like that [in collusion with capitalists interested in selling a product to youth consumers]—and she needs us too!” John Sinclair, “Self-Determination Music,” in Music and Politics, eds. John Sinclair and Robert Levin (New York: World Publishing, 1971), 59.

108 Sanders, et al., Vote, 150.

109 Ibid., 151.

110 Referring to the government’s attempts to deport the radically political John Lennon and Yoko Ono, in Vote, Sanders et al. expressed their wish that the Democratic Party would “go on record as being against their expulsion” (ibid., 116-117).
rocker whose tropes of violent horror were increasing in popularity, demonstrated their belief that the rock industry was parting from its association with political or cultural revolutions.

Although rock’s marketing and aesthetic motifs changed in the early 1970s, diverting much of the music away from radical politics at a time such movements were disintegrating, other musicians used their antagonistic relationship with law enforcement officials to benefit their careers. This trend also existed in the sixties. As Rolling Stone noted about the 1968 arrest of the Strawberry Alarm Clock:

The Strawberry Alarm Clock, one of those one-hit Top-40 groups whose only meaning is their meaninglessness, got busted two weeks ago on dope charges in East Peoria, Illinois. . . . Sensing that a dope bust is a real publicity break, their record company (UNI) hires a flamboyant lawyer, Melvin Belli, flies in some reporters, and holds a press conference for television cameras. . . .

Although the countercultural Rolling Stone scorned the Strawberry Alarm Clock’s actions as a means to be “co-opted into the establishment,” the incident nonetheless confirmed that some musicians publicized their arrests for purposes of generating audience attention. In their minds, controversy bred publicity; a point previously articulated by the Beat poet and publisher Lawrence Ferlinghetti, who in 1957 publically thanked the San Francisco Collector of Customs Chester MacPhee for confiscating imported copies of Allen Ginsberg’s Howl on obscenity charges, since the seizure of the book and the trial that resulted generated the attention of inquisitive book buyers and promotional mention of Ferlinghetti’s City Lights bookstore and publishing imprint.

112 Ibid.
While the Strawberry Alarm Clock and Ferlinghetti both publicized their battles with the state, the Grateful Dead joked about such hassles in a commercial recorded to promote their 1970 album, American Beauty. By fall 1970, the Dead’s audience was quite familiar with the band members’ arrests for drug possession following the police’s 1967 incursion on the group’s communal house in San Francisco and a 1971 raid of their hotel rooms in New Orleans. The former incident birthed a press conference in which band representatives promoted their advocacy of marijuana use – a position that would have impressed their peers and audiences participating in the psychedelic counterculture. Thus, by the time of American Beauty’s 1970 release, the band was defining itself as a target of state narcotics authorities. Playing on this idea, the Dead, along with their record label, Warner Brothers, released a radio advertisement telling the story of “Tricia” (most likely a metonym for Tricia Nixon, the daughter of President Richard Nixon) who “feared long hair . . . had no fun . . . and didn’t neck.” After introducing this character, who represented the “straight” society associated with the state, the advertisement’s narrator joked:

Now I’d like to tell you that Tricia heard the Grateful Dead, and left home, and joined Fanny, and now can be seen skinny dipping at the Tropicana motor hotel pool in your town. But you’re no fool. You’d complain. We’d get in trouble. Jerry Garcia probably would get busted again. . . .

---

114 Chapter One of this study provides a detailed analysis of these incidents.
117 The Grateful Dead, untitled radio commercial for American Beauty.
In this advertisement, the narrator contrasted the straight-laced “Tricia,” described as “senile,” with a band that induced “pleasure,” promoted illicit leisure activities like public nudity, and featured a guitarist possibly subject to arrest. The advertisement’s mention of Garcia’s potential for arrest demonstrated the group’s utilization of its outlaw reputation for marketing purposes. This confirmed how in some cases, the arrest of musicians for illegal activities did not always serve as a deterrent; instead, such acts could be appropriated by said musicians as methods of self-promotion. In the case of the Dead, whose steady following continued throughout the seventies and into the 1990s, the consequences of such arrests were far from punishing, proving that the acts of law enforcement officials did not always result in negative economic effects.

**Conclusion:**

This dissertation has examined the repression, surveillance, or harassment of folk and rock musicians often associated with the counterculture and political radicalism during the “Long Sixties,” with a particular focus on the mid-1960s to mid-1970s. Scholars have argued that the repressive acts of the FBI and law enforcement agencies subsided during the early 1970s when such groups as the Black Panther Party and the antiwar movement disbanded. Simultaneously, to quote the journalist Peter Doggett:

[F]or a complex variety of reasons, dissent simply disappeared [circa 1972]. Student riots ceased, the black power movement imploded, revolutionary organizations turned on their own members, and the revolution ran out of energy, passion and joy. Predictably slow to receive the message, rock’s radical superstars continued to spout incendiary rhetoric for a few months, and then turned about face. Suddenly there was no more talk about revolution; no more anthems designed for the barricades.\(^{118}\)

---

\(^{118}\) Doggett, *There’s a Riot Going on*, 5.
Doggett’s study ends with the year 1972; however, it is difficult to determine exactly when the period and its resultant repression ended. For example, the author James Kirkpatrick Davis has emphasized that after peaking during the late 1960s, the FBI terminated COINTELPRO operations per the instructions of Director J. Edgar Hoover in the spring of 1971 after mainstream media outlets began publicizing that the government agency was engaging in illegal acts of surveillance against U.S. citizens with opposing political beliefs.\textsuperscript{119} However, activist authors like Ward Churchill and Jim Vanderwall have documented that the FBI exerted COINTELPRO-like operations against the American Indian Movement as late as 1976.\textsuperscript{120} In terms of musicians, the FBI closed its file on Phil Ochs until his death in 1976, although by that time, the folksinger had succumbed to a lack of political activity, particularly since the Vietnam War had ended.\textsuperscript{121} Historians such as Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin have cited the Vietnam War’s cessation and the resignation of President Richard Nixon as the end of the “Long Sixties.”\textsuperscript{122}

In terms of framing the antagonistic relationship which some law enforcement officials and certain elected politicians had with select musicians during this time period, scholars must remember that the music industry itself was changing during the early 1970s. As noted earlier in this chapter, writers ranging from the political revolutionaries Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, and Ed Sanders in 1972 to the historian Steve Waksman in 2009 addressed how the early 1970s marked the ascent of a hard rock or arena rock (i.e.

\textsuperscript{119} James Kirkpatrick Davis, \textit{Assault on the Left: The FBI and the Sixties Antirwar Movement} (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997), 1-17.

\textsuperscript{120} Ward Churchill and Jim Vanderwall, \textit{Agents of Repression: The FBI’s Secret War against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement} (Boston: South End Press, 1991), 273-279. Also see Sayer, \textit{Ghost Dancing the Law}, 207-208. Both sources discuss the acts of an FBI agent named Douglas Durham who had infiltrated AIM.

\textsuperscript{121} The FBI File on Philip David Ochs (available on CD-Rom through the Freedom of Information Act).

\textsuperscript{122} Isserman and Kazin, “Critical Events During the Long Sixties,” 317.
Alice Cooper) that was more corporate and profit-driven than were many of the groups of the mid-to-late 1960s. Describing this shift, Todd Gitlin, the former SDS leader who later became one of the era’s more famous popular chroniclers, would note how in the early 1970s, such hard rock coincided with a softer blend of acoustic-based, singer-songwriter music, that in Gitlin’s words, focused on “private consolation” in which “[t]he personal and rooted was more appealing than the political and outré.” If, as the historians Kenneth J. Bindas and Craig Houston have argued, the music industry provided its audience with the message it wished to hear and purchase, then its audience was also becoming less politicized, especially as the Vietnam War came to its end.

Author Dennis McNally’s biography on the Grateful Dead includes two examples which further illustrate how the rock industry was becoming more “acceptable” as a whole during the mid-1970s, even though as McNally’s book references, many local police departments throughout the U.S. continued watching the Grateful Dead and their avid followers, the Deadheads, many of whom advocated the use and distribution of illegal drugs, well until the band’s disintegration following the 1995 death of guitarist Jerry Garcia. First, in late 1973, the Dead requested the FBI’s assistance in its effort to stop a bootlegger from illegally producing copies of the band’s latest album. Then, in 1976, as McNally writes:

The gonzo drug king himself, Hunter Thompson [most famous for his writings in *Rolling Stone*], and Phil Walden, the head of Capricorn Records, were to be significant players in the nomination of Jimmy Carter as Democratic candidate for president, while the social event of the

---
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Democratic convention in Manhattan that bicentennial summer was the *Rolling Stone* party. Rock had come of age.\(^{128}\)

Highlighting the connection between *Rolling Stone* and Carter’s nomination, McNally demonstrated how rock had become acceptable within mainstream politics, thus distancing the genre from its more subversive connotations during the late 1960s.

To summarize this chapter’s argument, the impact that the acts of law enforcement authorities and civic officials had on different persons within the music industry led to a variety of reactions. Although very few musicians went to jail for long periods of time and were subjected mostly to monetary fines, primarily because they were usually arrested for nothing but misdemeanors, arrests and trials did lead to noted emotional hardship for Phil Ochs and Jim Morrison. As these singers exhibited signs of paranoia and a general fear of institutions like the FBI, the CIA, or the prison system, others, like the folksinger Joan Baez maintained ties with antiwar movements, while John Sinclair resisted and petitioned against drug laws and what he viewed as imperialist oppression. In addition to these varied emotional responses, instances of surveillance, harassment, or repression detrimentally affected the economic trajectory of some musical careers. Festival promoters were denied permits; clubs were shut down by city councils and police departments; and even some of the most profitable bands like the Doors suffered a loss of booking as promoters realized that working with such controversial artists would generate untoward police or vice squad attention. Arrests and government surveillance of certain groups also exacerbated tensions among band members, particularly in their interaction with their record labels, and radio stations, most of whom had owners wanting to avoid government interference with their businesses. Yet, as

\(^{128}\) Ibid., 494.
these bands, record labels, and radio stations made certain decisions in order to distance
themselves from the possibility of invoking the attention or reaction of civic authorities
or law enforcement officials, some groups like the Grateful Dead chose to appropriate
their uneasy relationship with the police for a promotional gain which they equated with
beneficial publicity and profit.

In sum, such struggles demonstrated how at times despite often manifesting their
own ideological and cultural variations, musicians interacted with radical or
revolutionary activists and countercultural practitioners. Though such activists and
countercultural practitioners themselves differed in belief, practice, and degree to which
they concerned law enforcement or political officials, all attracted the attention of such
officials enough to warrant varying degrees of surveillance, harassment, or repression.
This was not a narrative of monolithic institutions always acting in concert with or
reaction against one another. Nonetheless, this did demonstrate an ongoing trend of
surveillance, harassment, and/or repression against musicians, that while usually less
severe than the efforts taken against many political revolutionaries (and varying in its
own right), ultimately had some degree of emotional and economic effect on the
livelihood, careers, and craft of such musicians. At times, these effects were visible;
other times they were merely perceived or imagined. Furthermore, such acts of
harassment or repression demonstrated how despite the nuances of this historical era’s
cultural and political tensions, these incidents and the manner in which they were
interpreted confirmed the centrality of music’s discursive role within the dialogue
between law enforcement institutions and their antagonists.
Conclusion and Afterword:

The direction of both government attention and police action towards the genres of folk and rock music oftentimes led those favorable to such music to perceive that repressive authorities were concertedly disparaging or suppressing the rhetoric, aesthetics and performance of such music. One manifestation of the perceived tensions between rock culture and government authority during the late 1960s was the November 1969 issue of the Marvel comic book *Nick Fury: Agent of Shield*. That issue depicted the fictional government secret agent Nick Fury as attending a Country Joe and the Fish concert in an attempt to impress a younger romantic interest. Outdoors in New York City’s Central Park and surrounded by “hippies,” Fury cringed, while muttering to himself: “Who knows . . . Maybe an old goat like me could even get to ROCK, . . . if he LIVED long enough!” Lamponing the contrast between Fury’s condescension towards rock and the carefree attitude of the much younger, counterculture-friendly concertgoers, such humor demonstrated the comic book’s perception of a major distance between the aesthetics and interests of rock audiences and government authorities.

Scholar Bradford W. Wright has contested that Marvel Comics was a politically-centrist corporation that sought to co-opt some countercultural elements and beliefs in order to increase sales figures among American teenagers and college students (trends that paralleled the development of the music industry’s increasing co-option of folk and rock). Examining the stories and metaphors within Marvel comic books published

---

between the later 1960s and early 1970s, however, Wright has written, “While comic books were careful to sympathize with the cause, if not the members of leftist groups, they simply vilified those on the right.” Wright’s argument about this thematic trend is crucial to understanding how some Marvel readers would have perceived Country Joe McDonald as a countercultural hero and Nick Fury (symbolic of government authority) as oppositional to the values and presentation of rock. In this story, Nick Fury represented the government authorities who many within the rock counterculture viewed as an enemy able to exert condescension, or even worse, harassing or oppressing attitudes and acts towards rock. Although the fictional story of a comic book should not be confused with real historical events, this issue of Nick Fury nonetheless demonstrated the perception held by many within the counterculture as well as the folk and rock communities that the culture of this music and the values of government officials were in opposition to each other.132

Realizing that neither the countercultural actors associated with folk or rock music, nor the authorities (governmental and police) seen as antagonistic or repressive to such music were monolithic entities, this dissertation has examined the cultural and political implications of folk and rock music within an era of increasing corporate co-optation and numerous instances of harassment and repression. It has ultimately argued that in an era of notable surveillance and harsh repression directed towards leftist political movements and organizations ranging from antiwar activists to the Black Panther Party, similar, though much less severe, efforts of surveillance, harassment, and sometimes, more serious repression affected individual musicians and the music industry.

131 Ibid., 238.
132 Of course, the counterculture, the rock industry, and the government were never homogeneous entities.
Concurrently, many musicians commented on political or police authorities, while sometimes over-perceiving these government agents as being more repressive than they actually were.

Chapter One argues how (before but) especially during the 1960s and early 1970s, folk and rock music were closely intertwined with counter-hegemonic political and cultural traditions that often disrupted the interests of parental, civic, or law enforcement authorities, many of whom varied in their own attitudes and beliefs towards each other as well as the music. This music often interpreted and supported many progressive movements, including the civil rights and antiwar movements. Consequently, though far from exclusively subversive or leftist in nature, folk and rock were important elements to participants in both the New Left and the counterculture (both of which in their own right were diverse and heterogeneous entities). The performance of this music in public space also demonstrated tensions related to the question of amplified volume as a public disturbance, the increasing use of psychedelic drugs and marijuana, and the changing standards regarding sexuality initiated by the Sexual Revolution. Lyrically, folk and rock songs often challenged the authority or values of many law enforcement officials, including the FBI, the CIA, and vice squads. Even though some of rock and folk’s connotations of violence and resistance were more metaphorical than actual, various authorities were seen to have policed certain musicians for their politically or culturally subversive content. Such patterns of surveillance, harassment, or repression bore some similarities to the attack on political activists, radicals and revolutionaries; however, most authorities cared more about suppressing certain political ideas and behaviors (like drug use) than about the music itself.
Chapter Two illustrates how many political activists and revolutionaries used folk and rock music as support for their acts of protest and resistance. From the cultural subversives Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, to the weapon-wielding revolutionaries in the Black Panther Party and Weather Underground, many of the era’s most visible revolutionaries and activists turned to folk and rock for inspirational support and a means of political expression and interpretation. Besides offering support for these countercultural and radical political luminaries, folk and rock remained instrumental to the more anonymous protestors of the Vietnam War, including civilian draft resisters and enlisted soldiers.

Chapter Three examines how such diverse law enforcement officials as J. Edgar Hoover and anonymous vice squad officers denounced musicians’ ties to varied political causes, including antiwar protests, and countercultural behaviors like illegal drug use. Throughout the country, particularly on a county or municipal level, numerous musicians encountered surveillance, denouncement, or even arrests for drug possession and or the onstage expression of profanity or obscenity. Although such government or police action constituted harassment, a much greater degree of repression was extended towards musicians with strong ties to visible political organizations. These musicians included John Lennon, Phil Ochs, and Joan Baez. Besides targeting these musicians, police and civic officials harassed rock audiences via club closures, festival cancellations, surveillance and photography, and the issuing of arrests and citations near concert sites. Civic and police officials intended these acts to reduce the number of attendees at similar events. Such attacks, although varied and issued by law enforcement officials who themselves differed in geographical position, political affiliation, approach and belief,
were more than just examples of the targeting of musicians, radio broadcasters, concert promoters and audiences. They also demonstrated how such diverse government and police institutions as the FBI, the FCC, the U.S. Military, and numerous vice squads sought to prevent the most subversive or revolutionary expressions of folk and rock culture from reaching the nation’s youth. Consequently, they were more concerned by the message than by the medium. Thinking in such terms about the centrality of the political message (as opposed to the music), employees of the U.S. State Department and some police departments appropriated the performance of rock in order to promote their own hegemonic interests.

Leading up to Chapter Four’s fuller address of the effects of the surveillance, harassment, and repression of folk and rock music, Chapter Three addresses the similarities and differences that either connected or separated musicians from their non-musician contemporaries who were associated with radical politics, revolutionary acts, or antiwar sentiments. Unlike the Black Panther Party leader, Fred Hampton, musicians were never assassinated. Also, most musicians never experienced the same level of repression as did such political actors as draft resistance groups and the Weather Underground. Nonetheless, numerous musicians saw their lives and careers affected by court dates and the disruptive emotional and economic effects that such harassment generated. Law enforcement officials were integral to the dissolution of many revolutionary groups such as the Black Panthers, the Weather Underground, and the staff of many countercultural newspapers. Such officials, although they did not necessarily destroy folk or rock, also created emotional distress and economic loss for some
musicians and business associates (such as small-scale concert promoters or label owners) within the folk and rock community.

Chapter Four also analyzes the divergent ways in which various persons within the music industry perceived or reacted to the acts and threats personified by civic and law enforcement authorities. Notably, almost no musicians went to jail for long periods of time; however, monetary fines were frequently imposed. Although such fines were often minimal in denomination (and thus somewhat inconsequential), contemporaries and later biographers of Phil Ochs and Jim Morrison believed that the surveillance of Phil Ochs and the arrests and trials of Jim Morrison led to emotional hardship, signs of paranoia, and expressions of concern over the perceived (as well as actual) presence of law enforcement officials.\(^{133}\) In contrast to Ochs and Morrison, however, the folksinger Joan Baez and the rock manager and critic John Sinclair viewed their struggles with political and law enforcement officials as ongoing, essential, and galvanizing products of their political activity. Consequently, musicians and their associates perceived and reacted differently to the potential threats of surveillance, harassment, and repression.

The acts of civic authorities and law enforcement personnel also resulted in some economic effects perceived as detrimental to those within the folk and rock cultures. Festival promoters were denied permits; clubs lost their licenses and generated unwanted police attention; and even some of the most profitable bands like the Doors witnessed a loss of lucrative bookings. Arrests and government surveillance of certain musicians also exacerbated tensions among band members and created problems between these

musicians and their record labels. At a time when the music industry generated increasing revenue from the co-optation and commercialization of folk and rock, some of these labels, as well as the radio stations which played folk and rock records, had corporate management wishing to avoid possible government concern with their businesses. Although many bands, record labels, and radio stations attempted to distance themselves from the possibility of invoking government repression, a few others, such as the Grateful Dead, chose to appropriate their strained relationship with law enforcement authorities for the generation of publicity and financial profit.

This examination of the surveillance, harassment, and repression of folk and rock musicians and audiences as generated by a myriad of often isolated government and law enforcement officials does not suggest that these entities were monolithic institutions acting in concert with one another. Nor does this study argue that everyone within the folk and rock industries and communities were unanimous in their perception of the threat of opposition by such authorities. Instead, this dissertation analyzes how such acts of surveillance, harassment, or repression demonstrated how despite the nuances of this historical era’s cultural and political tensions, these incidents and the manner in which they were perceived confirmed the centrality of folk and rock music’s discursive, often-confrontational role within the dialogue extended between law enforcement institutions and their antagonists.
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Bob Dylan
The Electric Flag
Roky Erickson
The Fugs
Marvin Gaye
Grand Funk Railroad  
Arlo Guthrie  
Woody Guthrie  
Richie Havens  
Jimi Hendrix  
Janis Ian  
The Jefferson Airplane  
Janis Joplin  
The Kingsmen  
The Last Poets  
Led Zeppelin  
JB Lenoir  
John Lennon  
Country Joe McDonald  
The MC5  
Melanie  
Joni Mitchell  
The Monkees  
The Mothers of Invention  
Mountain  
Holly Near  
Phil Ochs  
Odetta  
Tom Paxton  
Peter, Paul, and Mary  
Elvis Presley  
Quicksilver Messenger Service  
The Rolling Stones  
Buffy Sainte-Marie  
Gil Scott-Heron  
Pete Seeger  
Archie Shepp  
Sly and the Family Stone  
Edwin Starr  
Steppenwolf  
The Strawberry Alarm Clock  
The 13th Floor Elevators  
The Up  
The Velvet Underground  
The Weavers  
The Who  
Neil Young
Live Performances:

Erickson, Roky with Okkervil River. Concert. Royale, Boston, Massachusetts, 13 November 2010.