



The Flowering of the Hippie Movement

Author(s): John Robert Howard

Source: *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Mar., 1969, Vol. 382, Protest in the Sixties (Mar., 1969), pp. 43-55

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1037113>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

and Sage Publications, Inc. are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*

The Flowering of the Hippie Movement

By JOHN ROBERT HOWARD

ABSTRACT: The following article focuses on three aspects of the hippie phenomenon: Who are the hippies? What are the defining characteristics of their movement? And what impact have they had on the larger society? Four hippie types are discussed: the visionaries, the freaks and heads, the midnight hippies, and the plastic hippies. The visionaries are utopians who pose an alternative to existing society. They repudiate conventional values on the grounds that they induce status anxiety and a fetish for material acquisition. The community that they developed in Haight-Asbury can be viewed as a kind of experiment in social organization. Freaks and heads are the more drug-oriented hippies. They surround the use of drugs with an elaborate mythology suggesting a variety of benefits to be derived from "going out of one's mind." Midnight hippies are older people, mostly in their thirties, who, having become integrated into straight society, cannot adopt the hippie style of life, but, who are, nevertheless, sympathetic to it. They articulate and rationalize the hippie perspective to the straight world. Plastic hippies are young people who wear the paraphernalia of hippies (baubles, bangles, and beads) as a kind of costume. They have entered into it as a fad, and have only the most superficial understanding of the ideology. The visionaries sought over a two-year period in Haight-Asbury to implement their view of the good society. External pressure and certain internal contradictions in their social system led to a breakdown of the experiment. By the summer of 1968, many had left the city to set up rural communes, with the hope of being able to survive in a less hostile environment. It is argued here that it is slick and superficial to dismiss the phenomenon as simply the latest version of youth's rebellion against authority. Unlike previous celebrated generations of young rebels—the "lost generation," for example, and the beatniks—the hippies posed a fairly well thought-out alternative to conventional society. They assumed, implicitly, that the example which they set in their own communities would induce change in the rest of society.

John Robert Howard, Ph.D., New York City, is currently teaching sociology at the City College of New York. His recent research and publications deal with social movements and with urban violence.

The greatest fool in history was Christ. This great fool was crucified by the commercial pharisees, by the authority of the respectable, and by the mediocre official culture of the philistines. And has not the church crucified Christ more deeply and subtly by its hypocrisy than any pagan? This Divine Fool, whose immortal compassion and holy folly placed a light in the dark hands of the world.*

The Vision of the Fool, CECIL COLLINS

THIS article is written for people who, in future years, may want to understand something of the hippie movement. To that end, I have (1) described the hippie scene as an anthropologist might describe the culture of a South Sea island tribe, (2) reviewed some of the more prominent "explanations" for the movement, and (3) advanced what seems to me to be a useful theory of the hippie phenomenon.

The data for this article were drawn from literature by and about hippies and other Bohemians in American society, and from extensive informal participation in the hippie movement.

THE HIPPIE SCENE

I first heard the term "hippie" in the Fall of 1966. I had gone to the Fillmore Auditorium in San Francisco to hear a rock musical group, one of a number which had formed as a result of the smashing impact of the Beatles upon youth culture. The Fillmore previously had presented mostly black performers, but, increasingly, white rock groups were being featured.

A new cultural style was evolving and was on display that evening. The rock group blasted its sound out through multiple amplifiers, the decibels beating in on the room like angry waves. Above and behind them, a melange of colors and images played upon a huge movie screen. Muted reds and somber blues spilled across the screen, shifting and blending, suddenly exploding like a burst of sunlight let into a dark room, then

* Cecil Collins, *The Vision of the Fool* (London: Grey Walls Press, n.d.).

receding slowly like a gentle tide. Bright images and jagged shapes leaped out from the screen, only to be washed away by the colors before appearing again. Image and color fused and swirled, then melted apart. Film-clips of old serials played on two smaller screens suspended high on the walls, of either side of the hall, while shifting multi-colored lights illuminated the dancers, the shafts of yellow and blue and red seeming to leap and bounce off the frenetic dance floor. The total effect was that sought by the Dadaists in the early 1920's, a breaking up of traditional linear habits of thought, a disconnection of the sensory apparatus from traditional categories of perception.

Late in the evening, I fell into conversation with a gaily dressed couple, and, in the course of an exchange of remarks, the girl referred to the persons at the dance as "hippies." I had not heard the term before and asked them of its derivation but they had no idea how it had originated.¹ As we parted, neither they nor I realized that within nine months, there would be no hamlet or haven in the United States that would not have heard of hippies. Within a year, young people by the thousands were to stream to San Francisco—hippie heaven—while little old ladies in Des Moines

¹ During the 1950's the term "hipster" was used by beatniks and those familiar with the beat scene. It had several meanings. The hipster was an individual whose attitude toward the square world (a steady job, material acquisitions, and the like) was one of contempt. He shared with beats an appreciation of jazz-cum-poetry, drugs, and casual sex. The hipster might also be a kind of confidence man, sustaining his participation in the beat scene by some hustle practiced on squares. The word "hip" identified these orientations. "Hip" and "hep" were common words in the jive-talk of the 1940's; both indicated familiarity with the world of jazz musicians, hustlers, and other colorful but often disreputable types. I suspect that the word "hippie" derives from "hipster" which, in turn, probably derived from "hip" or "hep."

trembled at this new evidence that the foundations of the Republic were crumbling.

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF HAIGHT-ASBURY

Before the rise of Haight-Asbury, the aspiring writer or artist from the Midwest fled to Greenwich Village. By the summer of 1967, Haight-Asbury had replaced the Village as the place to go, and, indeed, people were leaving the Village to move to San Francisco. The words of Horace Greeley, "Go west, young man," had rarely been so diligently heeded.

The Haight-Asbury area was for many years an upper-middle-class neighborhood. Haight Street was named for Henry Haight, a conservative former governor of California, who would be appalled could he have foreseen that his name was to be associated with the "love generation."

As the city grew and the residents of the area prospered, they moved out and rented their property. Eventually, the expanding black population began to move in and, in the late 1950's and early 1960's, were joined by beatnik refugees from the North Beach area of the city. Eventually, in this relatively tolerant community, a small homosexual colony formed. Even before the hippies appeared, then, Haight-Asbury had become a kind of quiet Bohemia.

"Hippie" is a generic term. It refers to a general orientation of which there are a number of somewhat different manifestations. In the following section, I shall discuss four character types commonly found on the hippie scene: (1) the visionaries, (2) the freaks and heads, (3) the midnight hippies, and (4) the plastic hippies.

The visionaries

The visionaries gave birth to the movement. It lived and died with them

in Haight-Asbury. Let us attempt here to understand what happened.

The hippies offered, in 1966 and 1967, a serious, though not well-articulated, alternative to the conventional social system. To the extent that there was theory of change implicit in their actions, it might be summed up by the phrase "transformation by example."² Unlike political revolutionaries, they attempted no seizure of power. Rather, they asked for the freedom to "do their thing," that is, to create their own social system. They assumed, implicitly, that what they created would be so joyous, so dazzling, so "groovy" that the "straight"³ would abandon his own "up-tight" life and come over to their side. A kind of anti-intellectualism pervades hippie thinking; thus, their theory of change was never made explicit.

The essential elements in the hippie ethic are based on some very old notions—the mind-body dichotomy, condemnation of the worship of "things," the estrangement of people from each other, and so on. Drastically collapsed, the hippie critique of society runs roughly as follows: Success in this society is defined largely in terms of having money and a certain standard of living. The

² Interestingly, Martin Buber, in *Paths in Utopia*, suggested that the example of the *kibbutz* might transform the rest of society. The values of the *kibbutzim* and those of the hippie movement are not dissimilar.

³ We shall have occasion to speak frequently of "straights." The derivation of the word is even more obscure than that of "hippie." At one time, it had positive connotations, meaning a person who was honest or forthright. "He's straight, man" meant that the referent was a person to be trusted. As used in the hippie world, "straight" has a variety of mildly to strongly negative connotations. In its mildest form, it simply means an individual who does not partake of the behavior of a given subculture (such as that of homosexuals or marijuana users). In its strongest form, it refers to the individual who does not participate and who is also very hostile to the subculture.

work roles which yield the income and the standard of living are, for the most part, either meaningless or intrinsically demeaning. Paul Goodman, a favored writer among the young estranged, has caught the essence of this indictment.

Consider the men and women in TV advertisements demonstrating the product and singing the jingle. They are clowns and mannequins, in grimace, speech, and action. . . . What I want to call to attention in this advertising is not the economic problem of synthetic demand . . . but the human problem that these are human beings working as clowns; and the writers and designers of it are human beings thinking like idiots. . . .

“Juicily glubbily
Blubber is dubbily
delicious and nutritious
—eat it, kitty, it’s good.”⁴

Further, the rewards of the system, the accouterments of the standard of living, are not intrinsically satisfying. Once one has the split-level ranch-type house, the swimming pool, the barbecue, and the color-television set—then what? Does one, then, measure his progress in life by moving from a twenty-one-inch set to a twenty-four-inch set? The American tragedy, according to the hippies, is that the “normal” American evaluates himself and others in terms of these dehumanizing standards.

The hippies, in a sense, invert traditional values. Rather than making “good” use of their time, they “waste” it; rather than striving for upward mobility, they live in voluntary poverty.

The dimensions of the experiment first came to public attention in terms of a number of hippie actions which ran directly counter to some of the most cherished values of the society. A group called the Diggers came into existence and began to feed people free in Golden Gate Park in San Francisco and in Con-

stitution Park in Berkeley. They themselves begged for the food that they prepared. They repudiated the notion that the right of people to satisfy their basic needs must be mediated by money. If they had food, one could share it with them, no questions asked. Unlike the Salvation Army, they did not require prayers as a condition of being fed; unlike the Welfare Department, they did not demand proof of being without means. If a person needed lodgings, they attempted to make space available. They repudiated the cash nexus and sought to relate to people in terms of their needs.

Free stores were opened in Berkeley and San Francisco, stores where a person could come and take what he needed. Rock groups such as Country Joe and the Fish gave free concerts in the park.

On the personal level, a rejection of the conventional social system involved dropping out. Given the logic of the hippie ethic, dropping out made sense. The school system prepares a person for an occupational role. The occupational role yields money and allows the person to buy the things which society says are necessary for the “good life.” If society’s definition of the good life is rejected, then dropping out becomes a sensible action, in that one does not want the money with which to purchase such a life. By dropping out, a person can “do his own thing.” And that might entail making beads or sandals, or exploring various levels of consciousness, or working in the soil to raise the food that he eats.

They had a vision of people grooving together, and they attempted to remove those things which posed barriers—property, prejudice, and preconceptions about what is moral and immoral.

By the summer of 1968, it was generally felt by those who remained that Haight-Asbury was no longer a good place. “It’s pretty heavy out there on

⁴ Paul Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 25–26.

the street," a former methedrine addict remarked to me as we talked of changes in the community, and his sentiments were echoed in one of the underground newspapers, *The San Francisco Express Times*: "For at least a year now . . . the community as a common commitment of its parts, has deteriorated steadily. Most of the old crowd is gone. Some say they haven't actually left but are staying away from the street because of bad vibrations."

In those streets, in the summer of 1968, one sensed despair. Significantly, the agencies and facilities dealing with problems and disasters were still very much in evidence, while those which had expressed the *élan* and hope of the community either no longer existed, or were difficult to find. The Free Clinic was still there, as was the shelter for run-aways, and the refuge for persons on bad trips; but free food was no longer served in the parks, and I looked for several days before finding the Diggers.

Both external pressures (coercion from the police and various agencies of city government) and internal contradictions brought about the disintegration of the experiment. Toward the end of this paper, I shall discuss external pressures and why they were mounted. At this point, I am analyzing only the internal contradictions of the hippie ethic.

Stated simply, the argument is as follows. The hippies assumed that voluntarism (every man doing his thing) was compatible with satisfying essential group and individual needs and with the maintenance of a social system in which there was an absence of power differentials and invidious distinctions based on, for example, wealth, sex, or race. That assumption is open to question. Voluntarism can work only where the participants in a social system have a sufficient understanding of the needs of the system to be willing to do things which

they do not want to do in order for the system to persist. Put somewhat differently, every system has its own needs, and where voluntarism prevails, one must assume that the participants will both understand what needs to be done and be willing to do it.

Let me clarify by way of illustration. I asked one of the Diggers why they were no longer distributing food in the park.

Well, man, it took a lot of organization to get that done. We had to scuffle to get the food. Then the chicks or somebody had to prepare it. Then we got to serve it. A lot of people got to do a lot of things at the right time or it doesn't come off. Well, it got so that people weren't doing it. I mean a cat wouldn't let us have his truck when we needed it or some chick is grooving somewhere and can't help out. Now you hate to get into a power bag and start telling people what to do but without that, man, well.

By refusing to introduce explicit rules designed to prevent invidious power distinctions from arising, such distinctions inevitably began to appear. Don S., a former student of mine who had moved to Haight-Asbury, commented on the decline of the communal house in which he had lived.

We had all kinds of people there at first and anybody could stay if there was room. Anybody could crash out there. Some of the motorcycle types began to congregate in the kitchen. That became *their* room, and if you wanted to get something to eat or a beer you had to step over them. Pretty soon, in a way, people were cut off from the food. I don't mean that they wouldn't give it to you, but you had to go on their "turf" to get it. It was like they had begun, in some very quiet and subtle way, to run things.

In the absence of external pressures, the internal contradictions of the hippie ethic would probably have led to a splintering of the experiment. Signifi-

cantly, many of the visionaries are trying it again outside the city. There are rural communes throughout California. In at least some of them, allocation of task and responsibility is fairly specific. There is the attempt within the framework of their core values—freedom from hang-ups about property, status, sex, race, and the other furies which pursue the normal American—to establish the degree of order necessary to ensure the persistence of the system within which these values are expressed.

The visionaries used drugs, but that was not at the core of their behavior. For that reason, a distinction between them and more heavily drug-oriented hippies is legitimate. The public stereotype of the hippie is actually a composite of these two somewhat different types.

Let us now discuss the heavy drug users.

Freaks and heads

Drugs are a common element on the hip scene. The most frequently used are marijuana and hashish, which are derived from plants, and Lysergic Acid Diethylamine (LSD) and methedrine, which are chemical derivatives. Much less commonly used are opium and heroin. The plant derivatives are smoked, while the chemicals are taken orally, "mainlined" (shot into a vein), or "skin-popped" (injected under the skin). To account for the use of drugs among hippies, one must understand something of the mythology and ideology surrounding their use.

Marijuana is almost universally used by the hip and by hippies.⁵ For some,

⁵ Marijuana, also known as "weed," "pot," "grass," "maryjane," and "reefers," has not been proven to be physically addictive. It is one of a number of "natural" hallucinogens, some of which are found growing around any home: Jimson weed, Hawaiian wood roses, common sage and nutmeg, and morning-glory seeds. There are claims in Haight-Asbury that

it is simply a matter of being "in"; others find it a mild euphoriant. A subgroup places the use of drugs within a religious or ideological context.

Both freaks and heads are frequent users of one or more psychedelic agents; the term "freak," however, has negative connotations, suggesting either that the user is compulsive in his drug-taking, and therefore in a "bag," or that his behavior has become odd and vaguely objectionable as a result of sustained drug use. The mild nature of marijuana is suggested by the fact that, among drug users, one hears frequent mention of "pot heads" but never of "pot freaks." LSD and methedrine, on the other hand, seem to have the capacity to induce freakiness, the "acid freak" and the "speed freak" being frequently mentioned.

In 1966 and 1967 in Haight-Asbury, the drug of choice for those who wanted to go beyond marijuana was LSD. An elaborate ideology surrounded its use, and something of a cult developed around the figure of Dr. Timothy Leary, the former Harvard professor who advocated it as the answer to the world's problems.

The LSD ideology

The major tenets of the ideology may be summed up as follows.

(1) LSD introduces the user to levels of reality which are ordinarily not perceived.

The straight might speak of "hallucinations," suggesting that the "acid" user is seeing things which are not real. The user admits that part of his trip consists of images and visions, but insists that part also consists of an apprecia-

the dried seeds of the bluebonnet, the state flower of Texas, have the same property. In California, the bluebonnet is called "Lupin" and grows wild along the highways, as does the Scotch broom, another highly praised drug source.

tion of new and more basic levels of reality. To make the straight understand, some users argue that if a microscope had been placed under the eyes of a person during the Middle Ages, that person would have seen a level of reality for which there was no accounting within the framework of his belief system. He possibly would have spoken of "hallucinations" and demanded that microscopes be banned as dangerous.

Some users speak of being able, while on a trip, to feel the rhythm and pulse of the earth and to see the life within a tree. They contend that the trip leaves them with a capacity to experience reality with greater intensity and greater subtlety even when not high.

(2) LSD develops a certain sense of fusion with all living things.

The tripper speaks of the "collapse of ego," by which he means a breakdown of the fears, anxieties, rationalizations, and phobias which have kept him from relating to others in a human way. He also speaks of sensing the life process in leaves, in flowers, in the earth, in himself. This process links all things, makes all things one.

The ideology can be expanded, but these are some of its essential elements.

Three things account for the decline of "acid" use in Haight-Asbury: (1) personal disillusionment on the part of many people with Timothy Leary, (2) a rise in the frequency of "acid burns" (the sale of fake LSD), and (3) the rise of methedrine use.

Let us deal with the decline and fall of Timothy Leary. Leary was, in a sense, the Johnny Appleseed of LSD. He was hailed by some as a new Christ. When the unbelievers began to persecute him, however, he had need of money to fight various charges of violation of drug laws which carried the possibility of up to thirty years in jail. Possibly for that reason, he embarked upon what was, in essence, a theatrical tour. His

show (billed as a religious celebration) was intended to simulate the LSD experience. It was bad theater, however, and consisted mostly of Leary sitting cross-legged on the stage in front of candles and imploring his audience, which might have had to pay up to \$4.00 apiece, to commune with the billion-year-old wisdom in their cells. Leary's tour coincided in time with the beginning of his decline among hippies, and probably contributed to it. Additionally, the increased demand for LSD brought on traffic in fake "acid," the unsuspecting would-be tripper possibly getting only baking soda or powdered milk for his money.

In 1967 methedrine replaced LSD as the major drug in Haight-Asbury. There is no evidence that marijuana is physically harmful. The evidence on LSD is open to either interpretation. Methedrine, on the other hand, is a dangerous drug. It is a type of amphetamine or "pep" pill and is most commonly referred to as "speed." Taken orally, it has the effect of a very powerful amphetamine. "It uses up body energy as a furnace does wood. . . . When it is shot [taken in the blood stream] it is said to produce an effect of watching the sun come up from one hundred miles away. And the user is bursting with energy." In an interview which I conducted in July 1968, a former "speed freak" discussed the effects of the drug.

You're really going. You know you can do anything when you're high on speed. You seem to be able to think clearer and really understand things. You feel powerful. And the more you drop the stuff the more you feel like that. It kills the appetite so, over time, malnutrition sets in. You're in a weakened state and become susceptible to all kinds of diseases. I caught pneumonia when I was on speed. But I couldn't stop. I was falling apart, but it was like I was running so fast I couldn't hit the ground. It was a kind of dynamic collapse.

The use of methedrine seemed to have leveled off in mid-1968 and was even possibly in decline.

From 1966 through 1968, there was a discernible pattern in drug use in Haight-Asbury, a pattern which has relevance in terms of the effectiveness of drug laws. I would advance as a proposition that the volume of use of a drug is determined not by the laws, but by the effects of the drug. If a drug is relatively harmless (as with marijuana), its use will spread, irrespective of severe laws. If it is harmful, its use will be limited, despite more lenient laws (as with methedrine). That heroin, cocaine, and the like have not penetrated Haight-Asbury can probably be explained in terms of the fact that their deleterious effects are well known. Methedrine was an unknown, was tried, and was found to be dangerous; thus, one frequently hears in Haight-Asbury the admonition that "speed kills."

In summary, then, the pattern of use probably reflects the effects of each drug. Marijuana, being relatively mild, is widely used. LSD is much more powerful; a person may have a good trip or a very bad one; thus, its pattern of use is checkered. Methedrine is dangerous; consequently, powerful sentiment against it has begun to form. Hippies, then, are very much predisposed to go beyond tobacco and alcohol in terms of drug use, and if what has been said here is correct, the pattern of use should be seen as a realistic response to the effects of the drugs available to them.

The plastic hippie

Everybody is familiar with the story of King Midas who turned whatever he touched into gold. Ironically, this faculty eventually brings tragedy to his life and, with it, some insight into the nature of love. In a strange kind of way, the story of Midas is relevant in

terms of the hippie movement. The hippies repudiate the values of conventional society, particularly as these relate to work and commerce. They decry the consumption mania—the ethic and passion which compels people to buy more and more. They grieve that so many people are locked into the system, making or selling things which other people do not need, and buying from them equally useless things. The system is such that every man is both victim and victimizer.

Their repudiation of conventional society brought notoriety to the hippies, and, ironically, they themselves became a marketable item, another product to be hawked in the market place. And the more they defamed the commercial process, the more they became a "hot" commercial item.

Those who used the hippie phenomenon to make money appealed in part to an audience which wanted to be titillated and outraged by revelations about sex orgies and drug parties, and in part to adolescents and young people who were not inclined to drop out, but who viewed wearing the paraphernalia of the hippie—love beads, headbands, Benjamin Franklin eyeglasses, leather shirts, and the like—as daring and exciting. These were the plastic hippies.

Any movement runs the risk of becoming merely a fad, of being divested of substance and becoming mostly style. Symbols which might at one time have powerfully expressed outrage at society's oppression and absurdity become merely fashionable and decadent. By the spring of 1968, the plastic hippie was common in the land, and leather shirts and trousers sold in Haight-Asbury shops for more than \$100. Some of the suits at Brooks Brothers did not cost as much.

In April of 1968, I interviewed Deans of Students at four Bay Area colleges—San José State College, Stanford Uni-

versity, Foothill Junior College, and the College of San Mateo. The research, financed by the United States Office of Education, focused on students who dropped out of school to live the hippie life. Uniformly, the deans indicated that, despite appearances, there were very few hippies on campus. Despite long hair and beads, most of their students were as career-oriented and grade-conscious as ever. They wore the paraphernalia of the outsider, but were not themselves outsiders.

The plastic hippies have, unintentionally, had an impact on the hippie movement. First, in one important respect, their behavior overlaps with the core behavior of the true hippie—many are users of marijuana. By the summer of 1968, the demand for “grass” had become so great that there was a severe shortage in the Haight-Asbury area. Beyond the obvious consideration of price, the shortage had two consequences. The number of “burns” increased, a “burn” being the sale of some fraudulent substance—alfalfa, oregano, ordinary tobacco, and the like—as genuine marijuana. And a synthetic marijuana was put on the market.

The “pot squeeze” and the resulting burns, along with persistent but unsubstantiated rumors that “the Mob” (organized crime) had moved in and taken over the lucrative trade, contributed to what was, by the summer of 1968, an accelerating sense of demoralization in the Haight-Asbury community.

The midnight hippie

Most hippies are in their teens or early twenties. There are a significant number of people, however, who share a whole complex of values with hippies, but who are integrated into the straight world to the extent of having families and careers. Most of these people are in their thirties. They were in college during the 1950's and were nonconform-

ists by the standards of the time. Journalists and commentators of the 1950's decried the apathy of youth and spoke of a “silent generation.” These people were part of that minority of youth who were not silent. They were involved, even then, in civil rights and peace and the other issues which were to engage the passions of youth in the 1960's.

There was no hippie scene into which these people could move. They could have dropped out of school, but there was no Haight-Asbury for them to drop into. Consequently, they finished school and moved on into the job world. Significantly, many are in professions which can accommodate a certain amount of Bohemianism. They teach in colleges and universities and thus avoid working the conventional nine-to-five day, or work as book salesmen on the college and university circuit. Relatively few are in straight occupations such as engineering or insurance or banking. They are in jobs in which there is some tolerance for new ideas and which facilitate trying out various styles of life.

The midnight hippie provides an important link between straight society and the hippie world. The straight finds hippies strange, weird, or disgusting. Therefore, he views any action taken against them as justified. The midnight hippie, on the other hand, looks straight. He has a straight job, and does not evoke the same immediate hostility from the straight that the hippie does. The midnight hippie's relative social acceptance allows him to articulate and justify the hippie point of view with at least some possibility of being listened to and believed.

HIPPIES, BEATS, AND THE “LOST GENERATION”

How may we account for the hippie phenomenon? Is it simply the traditional rebellion of youth against parental authority, or does it have more profound

implications for the society and greater consequences for those who take part in it?

I am inclined to view it as more significant than previous youth movements. Hippies differ in important ways from the beats of the 1950's or the "lost generation" of the 1920's, two groups with whom they have often been compared. In attempting to account for the movement, I have developed a theory of social deviance which identifies its unique features and yields certain predictions with regard to its future.

VERTICAL AND LATERAL DEVIANCE

The literature of sociology is rich in theories of deviance. Some focus on "cause," as, for example, the delinquency theories of Cloward and Ohlin which suggest that lower-class boys, in the face of inadequate opportunities to realize middle-class goals, resort to various forms of unlawful behavior. Others deal with the process whereby a person learns to be a deviant, Howard Becker's paper "Becoming a Marijuana User" being a major example.

In the approach taken here, neither cause nor process is the focus. Rather, I identify two types of deviance: vertical and lateral. The dimensions of each type seem to be useful in differentiating the hippies from earlier Bohemians, and in reaching conclusions about their future.

Vertical and lateral deviance occur in the context of social systems in which differentiations according to rank exist, that is, officer-recruit, teacher-student, adult-child, boss-employee, or guard-convict. Inevitably, certain privileges and prerogatives attach to the superior ranks. That is one of the things which makes them superior. Adults can smoke, consume alcoholic beverages, obtain drivers' licenses, vote, and do a host of other things which are denied to children or teen-agers.

Vertical deviance occurs when persons in a subordinate rank attempt to enjoy the privileges and prerogatives of those in a superior rank. Thus, the ten-year-old who sneaks behind the garage to smoke is engaging in a form of vertical deviance, as is the fourteen-year-old who drives a car despite being too young to get a license and the sixteen-year-old who bribes a twenty-two-year-old to buy him a six-pack of beer. They are attempting to indulge themselves in ways deemed not appropriate for persons of their rank.

Lateral deviance occurs when persons in a subordinate rank develop their own standards and norms apart from and opposed to those of persons in a superior rank. Thus, the teen-ager who smokes pot rather than tobacco is engaging in lateral deviance, as is the seventeen-year-old girl who runs away to live in a commune, rather than eloping with the boy next door. Lateral deviance occurs in a context in which the values of the nondeviant are rejected. The pot-smoking seventeen-year-old, wearing Benjamin Franklin eyeglasses and an earring, does not share his parents' definition of the good life. Whereas value consensus characterizes vertical deviance, there is a certain kind of value dissensus involved in lateral deviance.

Let us explore the implications of these two types of deviance.

Where vertical deviance occurs, power ultimately remains with the privileged. The rule-breaker wants what they have. They can control him by gradually extending prerogatives to him in return for conforming behavior. They have the power to offer conditional rewards and, in that way, can control and shape the deviant's behavior. The sixteen-year-old is told that he can take the car if he behaves himself at home. Where lateral deviance occurs, the possibility of conditional rewards being used to induce conformity disappears. The deviant

does not want what the privileged have; therefore, they cannot control him by promising to let him "have a little taste." From the standpoint of the privileged, the situation becomes an extremely difficult one to handle. Value dissensus removes a powerful lever for inducing conformity. The impotent, incoherent rage so often expressed by adults towards hippies possibly derives from this source. A letter to the Editor of the *Portland Oregonian* exemplifies this barely controlled anger.

Why condone this rot and filth that is "hippie" in this beautiful city of ours? Those who desecrate our flag, refuse to work, flaunt their sexual freedom, spread their filthy diseases and their garbage in public parks are due no charitable consideration. The already overloaded taxpayer picks up the bill.

If every city so afflicted would give them a bum's rush out of town, eventually with no place to light, they might just wake up to find how stupid and disgusting they are. Their feeling of being so clever and original might fade into reality. They might wake up and change their tactics.⁶

The second implication follows from the first. Being unable to maintain control via conditional rewards, the parent, adult or other representative of authority is forced to adopt more coercive tactics. This, of course, has the consequence of further estranging the deviant. What constitutes coercion varies with the situation, and can range all the way from locking a teen-age girl in her room to setting the police on anyone with long hair and love beads. Lateral deviance has a certain potential for polarization built into it. To the extent that polarization takes place, the deviant becomes more committed to his deviance.

The third implication follows from the first two and allows us to differentiate hippies from earlier Bohemians. Ben-

nett Berger, the sociologist, contends that the Bohemians of the 1920's and the hippies of the 1960's are similar as regards ideology. Borrowing from Malcolm Cowley's *Exile's Return*, he identifies a number of seemingly common elements in the thinking of the two groups, and, following Cowley, suggests that Bohemians since the mid-nineteenth century have tended to subscribe to the same set of ideas. The ideology of Bohemianism includes: the idea of salvation by the child, an emphasis on self-expression, the notion that the body is a temple where there is nothing unclean, a belief in living for the moment, in female equality, in liberty, and in the possibility of perceiving new levels of reality. There is also a love of the people and places presumably still unspoiled by the corrupt values of society. The noble savages may be Negroes or Indians or Mexicans. The exotic places may be Paris or Tangier or Tahiti or Big Sur.⁷

I would dispute Bennett Berger's analysis and contend that the differences between the hippies and the lost generation are quite profound. The deviant youth of the 1920's simply lived out what many "squares" of the time considered the exciting life—the life of the "swinger." Theirs was a kind of deviance which largely accepted society's definitions of the bad and the beautiful. Lawrence Lipton contrasted values of the lost generation with those of the beatniks, but his remarks are even more appropriate in terms of the differences between the lost generation and the hippies.

Ours was not the dedicated poverty of the present-day beat. We coveted expensive illustrated editions and bought them when we had the ready cash, even if it meant going without other things. We wanted to

⁷ Bennett Berger, "Hippie Morality—More Old Than New," *Trans-action*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (December 1967), pp. 19–20.

⁶ Letter to the Editor, *Portland Oregonian*, July 31, 1968, p. 22.

attend operas and symphony concerts, even if it meant a seat up under the roof in the last gallery or ushering the rich to their seats in the "diamond horseshoe." . . . We had disaffiliated ourselves from the rat race . . . but we had not rejected the rewards of the rat race. We had expensive tastes and we meant to indulge them, even if we had to steal books from the bookstores where we worked, or shoplift, or run up bills on charge accounts that we never intended to pay, or borrow money from banks and leave our co-signers to pay it back with interest. We were no sandals and sweatshirt set. We liked to dress well, if unconventionally, and sometimes exotically, especially the girls. We lived perforce on crackers and cheese most of the time but we talked like gourmets, and if we had a windfall we spent the money in the best restaurants in town, treating our friends in a show of princely largess.⁸

Could they have been more unlike the hippies? The lost generation was engaging in vertical deviance. They wanted the perquisites of the good life but did not want to do the things necessary to get them. They were a generation which had seen its ranks severely decimated in World War I and, having some sense of the temporal nature of existence, possibly did not want to wait their turn to live the beautiful life. Their deviance was at least comprehensible to their elders. They wanted what any "normal" person would want.

From 1957 through 1960, the beat movement flourished, its major centers being the North Beach section of San Francisco and Greenwich Village in New York. The beat movement and the hippie movement are sufficiently close in time for the same individual to have participated in both. Ned Polsky, writing about the Greenwich Village beat scene in 1960, indicated that "the attitudes of beats in their thirties have spread rapidly downward all the way

⁸ Lawrence Lipton, *The Holy Barbarians* (New York: Grove Press, 1959), pp. 284.

to the very young teen-agers (13-15)."⁹ It is not unlikely, then, that some hippies began as beats. There are several reasons for suggesting beat influence on the hippie movement. The beat indictment of society is very much like that of the hippies. Lipton recounted Kenneth Rexroth's observations on the social system and its values:

As Kenneth Rexroth has put it, you can't fill the heads of young lovers with "buy me the new five-hundred-dollar deep-freeze and I'll love you" advertising propaganda without poisoning the very act of love itself; you can't hop up your young people with sadism in the movies and television and train them to commando tactics in the army camps, to say nothing of brutalizing them in wars, and then expect to "untense" them with Coca Cola and Y.M.C.A. hymn sings. Because underneath . . . the New Capitalism . . . and Prosperity Unlimited—lies the ugly fact of an economy geared to war production, a design, not for living, but for death.¹⁰

Like the hippie a decade later, the beat dropped out. He disaffiliated himself, disaffiliation being "a voluntary self-alienation from the family cult, from moneytheism and all its works and ways." He spoke of a New Poverty as the answer to the New Prosperity, indicating that "it is important to make a living but it is even more important to make a life."

Both the hippie and the beat engage in lateral deviance. Their behavior is incomprehensible to the square. Why would anyone want to live in poverty? Given the nature of their deviance, they cannot be seduced back into squareness. Lipton recounts the remarks of a beat writer to the square who offered him an advertising job: "I'll scrub your

⁹ Ned Polsky, "The Village Beat Scene: Summer 1960," *Dissent*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Summer 1960), p. 341.

¹⁰ Lipton, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

floors and carry your slops to make a living, but I will not lie for you, pimp for you, stool for you, or rat for you."¹¹

The values of beats and hippies are virtually identical: the two movements differ principally with regard to social organization. Hippies have attempted to form a community. There were beat enclaves in San Francisco and New York, but no beat community. The difference between a ghetto and a community is relevant in terms of understanding the difference between the two movements. In a ghetto, there is rarely any sense of common purpose or common identity. Every man is prey to every other man. In a community, certain shared goals and values generate personal involvement for the common good. Haight-Asbury was a community in the beginning but degenerated into a ghetto. Significantly, however, more viable rural communities have been established by hippies in response to the failure of urban experiment. The beats had neither any concept of community nor any dream of transforming society.

Given their attempt to establish a viable community, the hippies will prob-

¹¹ *Ibid.*

ably survive longer than the beats, and should have a more profound impact upon the society. As has been indicated, if a society fails to seduce the lateral deviant away from his deviance it may move to cruder methods (police harassment, barely veiled incitements to hoodlums to attack the deviants, and the like). A functioning community can both render assistance to the deviant in the face of these assaults and sustain his commitment to the values which justify and explain his deviance.

The beats, then, have influenced the hippies. Their beliefs are very similar, and there is probably an overlap in membership. The hippies' efforts to establish self-supporting communities suggest, however, that their movement will survive longer than did that of the beats.

In summary, the hippies have commented powerfully on some of the absurdities and irrationalities of the society. It is unlikely that the straight will throw away his credit cards and move to a rural commune, but it is equally unlikely that he will very soon again wear the emblems of his straightness with quite so much self-satisfaction.