An Obscure Form of Protest: Politicized Pleasure, Gay Liberation and *Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical*

Mary Rizzo

When *Esquire* magazine published a lengthy story on "The New Homosexuality" in 1969, reporter Tom Burke noted the changes between the vocal and visible young urban gay men of the era and an older generation steeped in homophile respectability. Cultural touchstones defined each as much as politics—and were, in fact, signs of political affiliation. As he found in his interviews, while the older generation identified with the doyennes of musical theater like Ethel Merman or Judy Garland, "Today, gay kids identify with males—with Peter Fonda, or Dustin Hoffman." Overall, theater was of little interest, especially Broadway—"Except, of course *Hair*."[1] *Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical*, a colorful, experimental, raucous musical revue about the lives of a group of countercultural youth written by Gerome Ragni and James Rado, premiered Off-Broadway at the Public Theater in 1967 and then moved to Broadway in April 1968. The first show to move from Off-Broadway to Broadway, it blazed the path followed by *A Chorus Line* and *Hamilton*. *Hair* became an immediate smash hit, with numerous touring companies playing the show around the world. By the end of its original run in 1972, approximately 20 million people worldwide, including innumerable gay men, had seen it.[2]

Hair drew gay fans, in part, because of its frank discussions of homosexuality. While theater became more experimental in the 1950s and 60s, Broadway musicals (with a few exceptions such as *West Side Story* and *Cabaret*) remained bastions of Americana with gentle, comedic narratives focused on heterosexual romance, offering ideology in the guise of heartfelt harmonies.[3] *Hair* was different. Its loose plot revolved around hippie Claude's dilemma of whether to evade

0026-3079/2020/5901-005$2.50/0 American Studies, 59:1 (2020): 5–26

the draft. But through its rock music score and scenes in a coffeehouse, at a party and during an LSD trip, the show depicted characters shamelessly engaging in homosexuality, bisexuality, and polyamory. Woof, one of the hippie "tribe," sings "Sodomy," in the first act in an angelic-voice, celebrating sodomy, pederasty, and fellatio, sexual acts that were banned by anti-gay laws on the books in many states.

Even with this explicit embrace of gay sexuality, *Hair* has never been placed in the pantheon of musicals, like *Gypsy* or *Rent*, beloved by gay men. It remains unacknowledged in recent scholarly articles, monographs like D.A. Miller's lyrical meditation on gay men and musicals *Place for Us: Essay on the Broadway Musical,* and in popular, grassroots historical efforts like the website Queer Music Heritage, the 2012 winner of the Allan Bérubé Prize for outstanding work in public or community-based LGBTQ history from the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender History.[4] More general histories of 1960s counterculture often ignore it or mention it fleetingly, with no acknowledgement of its importance within gay liberation.[5] Musicologist Elizabeth Wollman offers a welcome corrective in her work on adult musicals arguing that, "like *Hair,* many adult musicals were ultimately used as much to educate mainstream audiences about contemporary sociosexual mores as to entertain."[6] By not taking *Hair* seriously, critics have ignored an important source through which gay men constructed their identities and also missed how that cultural text shaped the gay liberation movement.

There are several reasons for the forgetting of *Hair*'s gay past. No character in *Hair* overtly proclaims a gay identity. With the gay liberation and LGBTQ rights movements from the 1970s onward, homosexuality became a politicized identity that defined a person, rather than a set of behaviors. *Hair*'s proto-queerness meant that it was eclipsed by other musicals and plays with explicitly gay characters, like *The Boys in the Band* and *Falsettos*. Materially, after its initial run it became difficult to see. It was revived in 1977 in a disastrous production that closed within a month. Milos Forman's 1979 film *Hair* focused on Claude, now an Oklahoma farm boy in New York City for induction into the army, and his infatuation with rich-girl Sheila. Most references to homosexuality were eliminated. The song "Sodomy" is sung to shock Sheila and her uptight friends rather than to revel in sexual pleasure. While cast albums from the original run still circulate, there was no film of this version. Starting in the 1990s, *Hair* was revived several times, both internationally and in the U.S. The 2009 Broadway revival earned several theater awards and spurred a national tour that brought *Hair* in its original form to American audiences after decades.

Hair's commercial success may be the most important reason for its being forgotten. The 1960s counterculture defined itself by rejecting consumerism, materialism, and traditional family structure and embracing nonwestern spirituality, drug use, pacifism, and open sexuality. But by the late 1960s, consumer culture was deeply entwined with the counterculture.[7] As gay activist and scholar Dennis Altman wrote in *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation* (1971)*,* one of the earliest gay liberation texts, *Hair*'s "claim to be a genuine part of the counterculture is

denied only by those who cannot forgive a Broadway success."[8] Altman connects gay liberation to a shift in gender roles propelled by the counterculture. He sees rock music and *Hair* as countercultural forms that merge masculinity and femininity, creating a more flexible template for sexuality and, therefore, gay liberation. But, as Altman notes, while the Rolling Stones' countercultural credentials would never be questioned because rock music is paradigmatically rebellious, *Hair*'s are because of its profitability and its provenance—Broadway, a cultural realm deeply associated with middle-class whiteness. Even theater scholars have privileged noncommercial or explicitly political work. As Stephen Bottoms notes in his excellent history of the Off-Off-Broadway theater movement in the 1960s, the premiere journal for theater and performance studies, *The Drama Review* (then known as *Tulane Drama Review*), ignored most experimental theater as "mere countercultural fad . . . exacerbated by the Broadway success" of *Hair*.[9]

Scholars ignore *Hair*'s place within gay liberation because they have often conceptualized consumer culture and gay activism as separate from each other. As historian David K. Johnson writes, "imagining capitalism and activism as antithetical," scholars "see a process of 'selling out,' a narrative in which a leftist political movement has declined into a market niche, a corporatized arm of the neoliberal establishment."[10] This essay counters that declension narrative by recovering *Hair*'s gay liberationist politics. It draws together two historiographies—gay liberation and the Broadway musical. By using a layered methodology, it recovers the impact of *Hair* as a text of mass culture on and for a particular audience: gay men.

First, *Hair*'s text is analyzed for its homosexual themes and how they changed over time as the show moved from Off-Broadway to Broadway, while placing the musical within the context of the counterculture and gay liberation. Scattered archives hold scripts that show the play's development over several drafts.[11] To add complexity, in 1969, in the midst of the show's four year Broadway run, Ragni and Rado published a version of *Hair* with Pocket Books that exists somewhere between the Public Theater and Broadway versions, suggesting how they envisioned the show outside of the limitations of staging. Secondly, by drawing from reviews and articles in the gay press, I delve into the reception of *Hair* by gay men who responded to the countercultural values in the musical. Gay men not only watched *Hair*, they performed in it. I recount the story of two actors to hypothesize how *Hair* contributed to a national gay network. Finally, I examine how gay liberation activists enacted their politics of visibility by utilizing the musical's legal battles to further their aims.

From Public to Pubic

Hair grew from the influences of the counterculture and underground theater in the 1960s, both of which explored sexual and gender identity. Gerome Ragni and James Rado used their knowledge of underground and experimental theater to examine the worldview of the youth counterculture, including its sexual open-

ness. Director Gerald Freeman toned down the homosexuality of their original text for its run at the Public Theater in 1967. Under Tom O'Horgan's direction for Broadway, however, homosexual themes returned, along with a camp sensibility, experimentation with gender roles, and nudity that allowed it to become popular with gay male audiences.

The counterculture defined itself against both mainstream American values and the New Left. Hippies critiqued the conformity and consumerism of middle-class life. Instead, they espoused spirituality, spontaneity, and simplicity. They also differed from the New Left, a political movement that advocated for civil rights and participatory democracy, and against corporate influence in government, imperialism and the war in Vietnam.[12] The counterculture and New Left differed in their approach to social change. The New Left, which included liberal and Marxist factions, used a variety of tactics, from marches to community organizing to anti-state violence. The counterculture, instead, felt that the truly radical act was to subvert the machinery of society by overturning its rules through behavior, dress, lifestyle, and beliefs.[13] They shared, however, a desire for living an authentic life divorced from a mass consumer culture whose unnaturalness could be summed up in the word "plastic."

Views on gender and sexuality also distinguished the counterculture from the New Left and drew gay men to the counterculture. New Left men venerated male revolutionaries as masculine role models and silenced gay activists.[14] While the counterculture may not have embraced homosexuality completely, it allowed men to adopt traditionally feminine ways of dress, like wearing long hair and jewelry, and behavior.[15] Such possibilities attracted gay men who were dismayed by the respectability politics of mid-century gay rights organizations like the Mattachine Society, which insisted that members adopt middle-class modes of dress and gender presentation.[16] For those who felt excluded by these rules, the emerging counterculture offered a radical alternative. When former New Left activist Carl Wittman wrote "The Gay Manifesto" in 1970, he argued that gays and lesbians "learned how to stop pretending from the hip revolution."[17]

In the eyes of the state, hippies and gay men were both deviant. When Dallas policemen called two hippies arrested for drug possession "anti-social queers" or when U.S. Attorney Tom Foran bemoaned that America's young people were being lost to the "freaking fag revolution" during his prosecution of the Chicago Seven in 1970, authorities conflated being countercultural with being gay. [18] In the face of such treatment by the state, both the counterculture and gay liberation refused to be socially invisible. As Guy Strait, pornographer and publisher of one of San Francisco's first gay newspapers, explained in 1967, "The straight world . . . requires good protective coloring: the camouflage of respectable appearance." But "unusual or bright-colored clothing," worn by the hippies, "becomes an alarm, a danger signal to the fearful and their armed truce with the rest of mankind. They see it as a challenge."[19] Gay liberation's pride parades and motto of "out of the closets and into the streets" equally made visibility central.

Underground theater also brought these groups together. By the early 1960s, New York City's Greenwich Village, that "mythic space of dissent," was home to playwrights, actors, and directors looking to experiment with new theatrical forms and topics in a growing number of supportive coffeehouses and theaters.[20] Dubbed Off-Off-Broadway, it was defined by an anti-commercial ethos. Some of the central Off-Off-Broadway theaters included the Caffe Cino, Café La Mama, Judson Poets' Theater, Open Theatre and Theatre Genesis. Unlike Off-Broadway, which had become by this time a smaller scale version of Broadway, Off-Off-Broadway reveled in pushing the boundaries of theater, rather than appealing to mass audiences.

Each theater had its own style. The collectively-run Open Theatre, led by Joseph Chaikin, was politically motivated. Café La Mama explored the power of visuals, physicality, and music in theater. Overall, Off-Off-Broadway gave fledgling theater artists welcoming spaces to try out their work in front of audiences whose cost for attending might be the price of a cup of coffee. Caffe Cino, in particular, became important in the emergence of the gay theater. Joe Cino, a former dancer who opened the Caffe in 1958, was a gay man whose personal warmth and energy drew many people to the café, especially other gay men. With his open attitude, he gave playwrights the latitude to basically do whatever they wanted on his small stage. Some of the Caffe's most famous productions included gay themes (*The Bed,* 1965), gay characters (*The Madness of Lady Bright,* 1964), or a campy style (*Medea,* 1965). Caffe Cino "was a place to experiment, to challenge, to question gender, social, and theatrical conventions. For the most part, however, it was not a center of direct political action. One did not go there for radical agitprop."[21] Instead, Caffe Cino depathologized homosexuality. Instead of making the "problem" of homosexuality the topic of these works (as with *The Boys in the Band*), it presented it as a part of life. Equally important, the space of the café helped cohere a gay community.[22]

Gerome Ragni and James Rado created *Hair* out of this artistic ferment. Ragni, born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1935, started acting in Washington, D.C., but a stint in the Air Force paused his career. In the early to mid-1960s, he had roles in Off-, Off-Off, and Broadway productions, including Jean van Itallie's *War* at Caffe Cino and Megan Terry's *Viet Rock*, a collaboratively produced rock musical about the war in Vietnam that would influence *Hair*. James Rado, born in Venice Beach, California in 1932, began writing musicals in college. After his own time in the military, he also moved between the levels of New York theater. Ragni met Rado while they were both performing in *Hang Down Your Head and Die*, a musical revue against capital punishment. The next year both men also appeared in *The Knack*, a comedy about dating, in Chicago. At some point, they became lovers, though Ragni was married and had a child, placing their collaborations within the history of gay cultural production both for their own identities as well as its themes.[23] Although it is unclear whether either Ragni or Rado were involved in gay political activities, it was also at this time that gay activists began to create organizations, like the Janus Society in Philadelphia

in 1963 and the Society for Individual Rights in San Francisco in 1964, whose purpose was to welcome all members of the homosexual community instead of excluding those whose gender presentation or sexual proclivities were deemed too unsettling to mainstream society.

Inspired by the young people they observed dropping out of middle-class life as a means of finding personal and political freedom, Ragni and Rado collaborated on a musical about Claude, an ambivalent hippie who considers evading the draft but eventually dies in Vietnam, his charming but selfish best friend Berger, their love interest, activist Sheila, and their group of hippie friends. They incorporated Brechtian elements learned from underground and experimental theater into their production, including creating a non-linear episodic narrative, having actors break the fourth wall to comment on the performance, planting actors in the audience, and using the stage to make statements about contemporary political issues like the war in Vietnam. Unlike traditional Broadway musicals, their musical talked explicitly about sex and played with gender roles.

In 1966, they found an enthusiastic supporter in Joseph Papp, producer of the New York Shakespeare Festival. Wanting to draw a younger audience to his new Public Theater, Papp booked the show as its opening performance. He hired Gerald Freedman, longtime collaborator, to direct, with Julie Arenal as choreographer, and Galt MacDermot as composer. Ragni took the role of Berger, but Freedman refused to let Rado play Claude. As would happen again on Broadway, the authors clashed with management, in this case Freedman, who wanted to deemphasize the show's anarchic, improvisational aesthetic. According to Freedman, the authors were unable "to understand that when you put on a show every night, after you've discovered what the piece should be through improvisation, it has to have a predictable beginning, middle and end."[24] With this focus on structure, Freedman's direction emphasized the political implications of the narrative, especially the antiwar theme and the relationship between Claude, Berger, and Sheila, which became a way to comment on sexism within the counterculture.

To tame the free-flowing plot of *Hair*, Freedman focused on its anti-war politics and the love triangle rather than on homosexuality, eliminating several references to it that can be found in early pre-production drafts of the script and the published book. These references ranged from matter-of-fact acknowledgement of homosexuality to the use of gay slurs to the politicization of sexuality by the draft. In one scene, Sheila's roommate Andrew emerges from his bedroom with two men. After the trio leaves, Claude asks, "Is he . . . *(spells it out)* H.O.M.O.?" to which Sheila offhandedly replies, "Is the Pope Catholic?"[25] Nothing more is said about the character. Freedman himself made handwritten notes about adding a speech for Berger that began, "Cocksuckers! Faggots! Lend me your ears . . . ..We all live in a concentration camp! America is a concentration camp!"[26] These rhetorical flourishes echoed that of New Left and countercultural leaders like Jerry Rubin and gay liberation's own reclamation of these epithets.

The lengthiest and most politicized discussion of homosexuality eliminated from *Hair* at the Public was the song "Nelly," which suggested that young men could publicly proclaim homosexuality in order to evade the draft. As Justin David Suran has argued, the draft forced homosexual and bisexual men to decide whether to publicly claim their sexual identity—or, for heterosexual men, adopt one for the politically expedient purpose of becoming immediately ineligible for military service.[27] In "Nelly," Berger, Woof, and Hud, the main African American character, dress Claude as a woman singing, "Have you met nervous Nelly . . . Once they get a load of you at Fort Meade, you're gonna get the deferment you need."[28] While drag had multiple meanings depending on the context in which it occurred, this performance highlighted hippie queerness while repeating stereotypes of gay men as effeminate that, nonetheless, anticipated the Gay Liberation Front's own equation of effeminacy with a radical anti-war stance.[29] Because of Freedman's editing, audiences did not see these scenes at the Public. By focusing on the heterosexual love story and the drama of the draft, Freedman downplayed the homosexual themes of early drafts and the published version, which would return on Broadway in altered form.

After its successful run at the Public and a short stint at a nightclub called Cheetah, *Hair* came to Broadway under the direction of Tom O'Horgan, who was famous for a kinetic style that emphasized movement over character. O'Horgan, with producer Michael Butler, Ragni, Rado, and composer Galt MacDermot, overhauled the show. Plot was downplayed and songs were added. The first Act introduces the audience to the world of the hippie tribe, dressed in colorful, tattered clothes and wearing long hair. Each character expresses their desires in a song, while the group's beliefs are summarized in songs like "Hair" and "I've Got Life," which are sung by the ensemble. Authorities, like parents, a school principal, and police, hassle the hippies. Claude pines for Sheila and wonders whether to evade the draft. The act ends with a Be-In and a group nude scene. In Act II, Claude returns from an induction center, distraught that he will be drafted. The tribe consoles him with an LSD-fueled party. During his acid trip, he watches as the history of American violence, racism, and imperialism play out before him in scenes featuring General Custer, Abraham Lincoln, Native Americans, and Buddhist monks. Claude wonders at the point of it all before a final moment of happiness with the tribe. The show ends by revealing he has been killed in Vietnam. The cast sings "The Flesh Failures/Let the Sun Shine In."

Hair defined homosexuality on Broadway through flexible sexual practices rather than as a fixed identity. While Freedman downplayed it, O'Horgan injected a camp sensibility into *Hair* that allowed it to be read on multiple levels by different audiences. While in traditional Broadway musicals, the "gay audience member" had to "invent[] a gay reading to the spectacle presented to him," *Hair* endorsed such readings through its staging, camp humor, and refusal to rigidly define sexual identity, instead allowing a joyous fluidity among its characters.[30] No character proclaims himself gay in *Hair*—and even Woof, usually seen as the

gay character, refuses to call himself homosexual. Instead, *Hair*'s hippies simply engage in whatever acts they want with whomever is available, as shown in a scene where Woof asks Crissy to come home with him, but Crissy has committed to Walter for the night. Walter checks with Suzannah, who responds to both, "We slept together last week. I'd rather sleep alone together."[31] These pairings and triplings complicate the notion of a binary sexual identity and flow easily between homosexuality, heterosexuality, bisexuality, and polyamory. If gay liberation helped create a politicized identity as gay, then *Hair* offered a view of sexuality as fluid and inherently playful.

O'Horgan, who made his reputation with avant garde productions like staging Jean Genet's *The Maids* with men playing the titular roles, had established a recognizable theatrical style that caused *Newsweek* to crown him "Director of the Year" in 1968.[32] Several reviews of *Hair* commented on his influence on the show's tone. *Newsweek* felt that it had a "taint of camp and aggressive put-on."[33] Novelist and screenwriter William Goldman, who wrote about the 1967-8 Broadway season in *The Season*, agreed, criticizing O'Horgan for "adding a very strong whiff of campy homosexuality."[34] While such statements carry their own whiff of homophobia, O'Horgan's direction certainly followed Susan Sontag's infamous explanation of camp as a "love of the exaggerated, the 'off,' of things-being-what-they-are-not" and an understanding of "Being-as-Playing-a-Role."[35] One critic called O'Horgan's style "body-romanticism," that downplayed the importance of spoken lines by splitting up one character between several actors who "should be interchangeable, according to his idea, taking each others' parts with ease, and being generally one gelatinous mass," ideas coming from the underground theater scene.[36]

In doing so, O'Horgan revised specific scenes as camp to allow for doubled meanings for his audiences. For example, in both versions there's a scene where a tourist couple, representative of the audience and, therefore, the Establishment, encounters the hippie tribe. Under Freedman's direction, the couple learns about the hippie's belief system, becoming more tolerant as a result. On Broadway, the scene ends with the woman in the couple revealing herself to the audience as a man in drag. As the *New York Times* put it, "the scene is transformed from pure banality to wicked camp."[37] But such camping hailed audience members differently. Like Billy Wilder's acclaimed film *Some Like It Hot*, playing with gender identity could be seen as simply comic to straight viewers while gay spectators could read the same scene in a way that helped cohere their own identity, especially when viewed in a theater along with countless others in the same position.

O'Horgan regularly played with gender on stage by having men play female characters and vice versa. While he asserted that it was primarily a means to break the audience's identification with a naturalistic character, he also saw it as having a deeply sexual undercurrent. As he explained in an interview in 1970, "This operation with the sexes as aspects of dramatic reality is obviously particularly effective considering that the theater, perhaps all art, is basically erotic in nature and most effectively appeals through erotic means and emphasis."[38] Having the

tourist woman played by a man in drag could be a throwaway joke, a campy rewrite of what had been an earnest attempt at intergenerational communication, and a way to defamiliarize gender and sexual identities all at once.

O'Horgan and the creative team's decision to end Act I with a nude scene rocketed *Hair* into notoriety. Set during a Be-In, the cast members ring bells, light incense, and sing the Hare Krishna chant interspersed with words like love, flowers, and happiness. They disappear under a large sheet to reappear naked for a few moments. They stand until sirens and a fake bust by actors dressed as police signal intermission. A clever publicity stunt, the nude scene spawned tongue-in-cheek media coverage (like Marilyn Bender's article "*Hair*—topless and no bottoms either," in the *New York Times*), ensuring controversy and sold-out theaters. Although O'Horgan argued that the act was not commercial since "real Be-Ins" often included nudity, the marketing and public relations rhetoric carefully negotiated the boundaries of how far the show could go in appealing to middle-class audiences' prurient interests.[39] To evade New York laws against nude dancing, for example, the actors stood motionless while naked.

While the nude scene could hardly be called camp, it, too, operated on multiple levels for its audiences. Diegetically explained as representing countercultural values of spontaneity and openness, it appealed to audience members looking for a lascivious thrill—including gay audience members. The creators, however, carefully emphasized nudity as a means of containing the threat of gay spectatorship for straight audiences. Numerous critics commented on its childlike innocence, like the Catholic magazine *America* which thought "it is not likely that any really adult spectator will be shocked by the uninhibited exposure of the human anatomy," seeing the musical's satire of Christianity as more problematic.[40] While conservatives refused to see the show, or did so only to condemn it, for liberals, approving *Hair*'s nude scene in conversations with friends became a method of performing an identity as modern, liberal and without "hang-ups" around sex, similarly to how middle-class audiences used the 1972 film *Deep Throat.*[41] But in the darkened theater, all audience members could indulge their voyeurism. Cast member Lorrie Davis described viewers sneaking in binoculars and cameras and thought that "most of the time the audience acted like they were viewing the play through a peep-hole."[42] Watching *Hair* was a sexualized experience, but one that impacted straight and gay audiences differently.

Hair's marketing made it clear that the musical was selling the experience of seeing naked female bodies, but in a post-*Playboy* world, seeing naked women in public was not as shocking as seeing naked men. The women had to be there, of course, in order to ensure that the scene would not discomfit straight male audiences (even though in the original version of *Hair* only Berger stripped). Participation in the nude scene was voluntary—at first. When too few women stripped, producer Michael Butler threatened the actors and then coerced them with extra pay.[43] According to Davis, "At one very heated rehearsal Michael Butler said that if more of us didn't strip, they would have to hire ringers—professional strippers—to do it. That made us all feel like the show would be a lie. It also

planted a small seed in our heads: we were doing it for free, but they would have to pay ringers extra, wouldn't they? In the meantime, more of us stripped."[44] The cast, wooed in part by the promise of being part of a hippie cultural happening, began to understand themselves as workers in relation to the management team. Moreover, the women in the cast began to see how their bodies were valued. To underline that point, *Playboy* ran a feature on "The Girls of *Hair*" in 1969 with "the loveliest, hippest girls" from productions around the world in various stages of undress, using the word "hip" to make these women representatives of countercultural sexual freedom and availability to men.[45]

But other actors and critics recognized that it was the open display of naked male bodies on stage that made *Hair*'s nude scene remarkable. Suzannah Norstrand performed in *Hair*, but didn't undress since, "The front rows are always full of fags, and they just look at the boys."[46] For William Goldman *Hair* could be summarized as "Come see the penises!" Ignoring the women in the cast completely, Goldman compared *Hair* to the groundbreaking production of *Marat/Sade* in which a male actor was seen naked from behind. "*Hair* turned the strange man around, reproduced several of him, and lo, at the first-act curtain, you in the audience got to see several penises. Suddenly you knew what art was all about."[47] Goldman's sneering tone ignores how the public display of naked male bodies as simultaneously innocent and sexual affected gay male audience members, especially those who were becoming more politicized through the gay liberation movement.

You Can Never Sin in Bed

Gay liberation moved into a new phase of public visibility after the Stonewall Riots in 1969, which occurred a little more than a year after the opening of *Hair* on Broadway. Tepid reactions to the riots by established gay organizations, like the Mattachine Society of New York, spurred the founding of New York City's Gay Liberation Front as a radical organization that operated from a position of intersectionality, seeing homophobia, racism and sexism as linked to a larger oppressive system that benefited from marginalizing these groups. Other gay liberation groups soon began to spring up around the country, establishing new underground newspapers that circulated "among activists and counterculture institutions" to help spread its message.[48] In the midst of their reporting on local and national events and debates over the relationship between gay rights and other radical movements, a number of reviews of *Hair* appeared in their pages, showing how the musical resonated with gay men in the early days of gay liberation. By comparing these reviews to those in the mainstream, straight left, and countercultural media, it becomes clear that gay critics were generally uninterested in New Left debates around authenticity and co-optation that marked most coverage in the lefty underground press. Instead, because they were well versed in reading commercial and popular texts against the grain, gay critics saw *Hair* as political even though it was profitable.

Critical response to *Hair* varied, with the mainstream press generally lauding the show. Clive Barnes, venerable theater critic for *The New York Times,* described *Hair* as "likable," connecting it to a national mythology of iconoclasm: "as long as Thoreau is part of America's heritage, others will respond to this musical that marches to a different drummer."[49] Even the *Village Voice* agreed, writing that, "Instead of reviewing *Hair* I should simply report that something downtown, dirty, ballsy, and outrageous has hit Broadway at last, and it's a smash and hopefully Broadway will never be the same."[50] But *Hair*'s presentation of singing and dancing hippies underwhelmed the underground press. When the *East Village Other* reviewed *Hair* on Broadway, it condemned the musical as an "only-in-America product" viewed by an audience that "insists it seems (including the critics who have also sold out) on watching the play as though it is a reflection of The Reality of Their Kids, and tells them the answers."[51] The Seattle-based alternative paper *Helix* focused on *Hair*'s unprecedented profits. "*Hair*," it wrote, "rips everybody off: the people who go to it, the people it's supposed to be about, most of all the poor kids who fight for the chance to sell their youth and beauty and talent for $160 a week to crowds of wrinkled voyeur-vampires. It's the best shuck going yet, maybe because it's so brazen about it."[52] The newspaper reported that a local radical collective, the SLF, had sent a letter to producer Michael Butler demanding that *Hair* donate twenty-five percent of its gross receipts to political causes. Houston's *Space City News* reported more simply that *Hair* "is also proving itself to be the time-bound, only slightly imaginative cultural artifact that it seemed to be at the outset. A sort of *My Fair Lady* of the sixties."[53] Intriguingly, the growing feminist press, including publications such as *Ain't I A Woman, Every Woman,* and *Off Our Backs*, largely ignored *Hair*, even though it enacted, in many ways, the feminist credo that the personal is political through its depictions of bodily freedom.

However, the gay press unabashedly loved *Hair,* suggesting the cultural and political divisions between the New Left and gay activism. While underground papers debated *Hair*'s countercultural bona fides, the gay press saw the musical as expressing a body-politics of joyous sexuality and tolerance that was missing from the New Left and which aligned perfectly with the way that the Gay Liberation Front was shifting from the politics of respectability to a revolution that connected the oppression of gays and lesbians with capitalism, sexism, and racism. When artist Harry Bouras, who hosted a weekly radio show on art criticism in Chicago, criticized *Hair*, Chicago gay liberation activist William B. Kelley responded with an angry letter specifically noting the critique's "supercilious comments about varieties of sexual expression." Kelley asked Bouras, "why can't you acknowledge "Hair," despite the measure of simplism and triteness it shares with all theatrical enterprises, to be the stirring, rewarding and socially important production which it is?"[54] By presenting a positive, albeit commercialized, vision of homosexuality, *Hair* countered the depiction of homosexuals in contemporary theater, which often made them into desperate or tragic figures. In 1970, the Washington, D.C. Gay Liberation Front reviewed

the Back Alley Theatre's "Focus on Homosexuality" noting that, "Once again, we are 'entertained' by an evening of predominately negative views of gay life that unduly emphasize its bad and base aspects."[55] Compared to these depictions, *Hair* presented homosexuality as part of a larger countercultural gestalt that emphasized that individual pleasure and happiness could be achieved while rejecting social conventions.

Across the country, the gay press saw *Hair* as a celebration of values of tolerance, love, freedom, and, most importantly, a raucous, unapologetic joyousness. The *Los Angeles Advocate* referred to *Hair* as a "celebration of life," complimenting director Tom O'Horgan's "genius," and Ragni and Rado for "pulling out all the stops in the denouncement of prejudice against any minority—race, color, or sexual."[56] This message is underscored in the two photos with the article, one of which depicts the cast holding protest signs like, "Lay Don't Slay," and another that shows the cast at the end of the musical singing together while Claude's body lies behind them. The photo captures the actors' energy—some are leaning forward, others have their arms outstretched, all are open-mouthed. In the context of the article, their singing together becomes a metaphor for a tolerant, loving community. The Dallas, Texas gay newspaper, *Our Community* agreed, calling *Hair,* "merely great" and rhetorically asking, perhaps in response to the underground press' dismissal of the musical's message of "peace and love" as insufficiently political, "Now, what's so wrong with that?"[57] The newspaper *Gay* also saw politics in *Hair:* "there was a profound value to be found in accepting ourselves, those of us, at any rate, who had freshness of vision" and that "our commune would be shared by people of different races and different sexual preferences because these characteristics were not as important as one's inate (sic) capacity to love."[58]

Seeing a character like the pansexual Woof was exhilarating for most gay men, though some reviewers saw his refusal to name his sexual identity as retrograde. In its review of *Hair*, gay newspaper *The Los Angeles Advocate* described Woof as "a loving free spirit that a fortunate few have known and been enriched by. However brief the acquaintance, affair, or friendship, the memory always produces a smile."[59] As this review suggests, the gay community embraced Woof as much because of his "loving free spirit" as his proclamations of desire for Mick Jagger. However, a reviewer for the Homophile Union of Boston interpreted Woof as closeted rather than liberated: "On the one hand Woof is completely frank about his feelings toward other guys; on the other he denies being a homosexual in the manner of a typical closet queen—'I'm not a homosexual or anything like that.' I can't figure out what he's supposed to be, and neither can the actor in the role." The review damns the production in terms reminiscent of the straight underground press. "It invites its very comfortable audience to join the cast in dancing and in pretending to be very avant-garde, exposing its central sin all over again . . . The show exploits the hippie scene for precisely that purpose the hippies so opposed—to make a profit."[60] However, the majority of reviews in the gay press agreed with the reviewer of *Gay*, who quoted the lyrics of "The

Bed," cut from the Broadway show but released on the album *DisinHAIRited*, as emblematic of what made the show appealing to gay men: "You can rock in bed/You can roll in bed/You can lose in bed/You can win in bed/But you can never, never, never, never, never sin in bed."[61]

Many young people performed in *Hair*. Eleven large cities, including Los Angeles and Seattle, mounted their own productions of *Hair,* some of which were extremely successful. The Los Angeles production ran for 1000 performances, for example.[62] Memphis State University produced the show on campus in 1970, a story captured in the news special *When HAIR Came to Memphis*. In deference to local mores, they cut the nude scene.[63] Touring companies performed *Hair* everywhere from Kansas City to San Antonio to Dayton.[64] With its numerous productions, *Hair* constantly needed young performers, especially those who looked countercultural. Of course, a number were gay.

By traveling nationwide with the show, these young men became part of what historian Martin Meeker calls a "homosexual geography" that introduced them to gay audiences in smaller cities and could also politicize them through interaction with college activists.[65] *The Advocate* published an article in 1972 profiling two such actors, Kenny Ortega (later director of the *High School Musical* movies) and Gregory Smith. That a public relations official joined them suggested how *Hair* as a business positioned itself to different market niches, including the gay market, a process that would grow in coming decades. The actors describe *Hair* as an environment that saw homosexuality and heterosexuality as valid and equal choices. Greg, for example, explained that, "We have a pact with the straight guys . . . If someone is coming on to them they refer them to us. If a chick is coming on to us, we refer her to the straights."[66] While large urban areas like New York and San Francisco were known for their gay neighborhoods and vibrant culture, gay actors would get advice from local stage managers about gay bars and other safe spaces in the next town on their tour. Through barguides, the actors could identify gay hangouts, though, "Most of the bars across the Midwest are fairly provincial." By moving through these towns, they helped develop a national gay network. Even in such provincial locales, Kenny, described by the author as having "eyes, dark as a soul brothers" that "drifted back in his Latin head," seems to have not incurred any trouble as a gay man of color. However, another actor, Danny Miller, received death threats from an anonymous fan in Pittsburgh who was angry that a straight actor played Woof, suggesting how deeply some fans identified with the characters.[67]

Politics affected *Hair*'s gay actors in a variety of ways. While neither Kenny nor Greg expressed deep concern about admitting their sexual proclivities, the tour's public relations official explained that a different gay actor was supposed to have been part of the interview, but because he was not a legal U.S. citizen, it was decided that he should not speak to the reporter since he could face deportation for sexual deviance or moral turpitude.[68] Protected by his *Hair* family, the unnamed actor could be openly gay within the world of *Hair*, but not outside of it. At times, they learned about politics from their travels. The tour often brought

them into contact with college campuses where "some really heavy Gay Lib" was taking place. That the cast interacted with local gay culture helped cement a national gay infrastructure and likely offered gay fans a chance to meet their idols, some of whom, like Kenny, represented the diversity of the gay community. In return, cast members could be politicized by encountering Gay Liberation through performances at or near college campuses.

An Obscure Form of Protest

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, gay liberationists protested visibly around the country, often in concert with groups like the Black Panthers and antiwar organizations. As John D'Emilio suggests, this strategy leveraged these other movements' greater visibility and, by "raising the banner of gay liberation at these and other local demonstrations, radical gays reached closeted homosexuals and lesbians in the Movement who already had a commitment to militant confrontational politics."[69] Thanks to its controversial nude scene and the legal battles that it caused, *Hair* served as one particularly public stage upon which gay activists raised their banners.

While *Hair*'s nudity would soon be eclipsed by plays and musicals like *Che* and *Oh! Calcutta*, in its historical moment, conservatives saw it as a sign of the devolution of American culture into crass filth. Even in New York City, the religious organization Operation Yorkville, later to become Morality in Media, unsuccessfully appealed to liberal Mayor John Lindsay to ban the show.[70] Boston's censor quickly closed the show in February 1970, for violating laws prohibiting lewdness and obscene entertainment. Other cities, from Chattanooga, Tennessee to Atlanta, Georgia followed suit.[71] While *Hair*'s producers could have simply excised the nude scene in these cases in order to continue the production, they chose to fight them in court. Starting with the Boston case, in each instance, judges argued that the First Amendment protected the musical. As the federal decision in the Boston case asserted, the play "constituted, however, in some degree, an obscure form of protest" and that "viewed apart from the specific incidents mentioned above [the nude scene and stage business that suggested sexual intercourse] it is not lewd and lascivious."[72] The Supreme Court let the lower court decision remain. As movies in the 1960s increasingly included explicit sexual content, *Hair* struck a similar blow for theater, especially outside of New York City. While the underground press critiqued *Hair* for selling out, it actually strengthened artists' ability to express themselves, as nudity and homosexuality had been banned in theaters in New York City since the Padlock Bill was passed in 1927 in the wake of the controversy around Mae West's risqué play *Sex*.

Gay activists used *Hair*'s liberal credentials to mount their own case for dismantling laws that targeted homosexuals and their cultural expression. When *Hair* opened in Washington, D.C. in 1971, two protests greeted the politicians who attened the black-tie opening night party, which included Republican Sens. Jacob Javits of New York, Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, and Charles Percy

of Illinois. Led by an interdenominational conservative religious organization, anti-*Hair* protestors condemned the musical's depiction of sexuality with signs that read "Shame, Sodom and Go-Mo-Raw Smut," "Hair De-humanizes Man's Soul," "Hair Today, Gone Tomorrow—What Price Decency?" and "Our Nation's Capital is the District of Corruption."[73] As Warren Keller of the Liberty Lobby reported, his group "objected to the eroticism . . . and the desecration of the flag" that supposedly he had seen when he attended other productions of *Hair* in New York, Milwaukee, and Chicago. He planned to attend the D.C. performance as well, suggesting that more than strictly scientific interest was at stake.

A protest by D.C.'s Gay Liberation Front led by founder Frank Kameny, countered the Liberty Lobby's critiques. Kameny, who was running as the first openly gay candidate for Congress in a non-voting seat representing D.C., saw the *Hair* counter protest as a platform to assert his vision of gay rights cloaked in a larger discourse of tolerance. The *Gay Blade* noted that Kameny's campaign intended to "use the free media time and space given political candidates as a means of reaching both the public and the politicians with the 'Gay is Good' message and philosophy."[74] As he explained in terms designed to appeal to religious adherents unsure about *Hair,* "We are convinced that if Jesus Christ were here this evening, he would be in the National Theater, approving, applauding and very probably participating in the cast of *Hair.*" He summarized his position simply as, "We're pro-freedom, anti-picketers, and pro *Hair*."[75] As the *Washington Daily News* described, there were two positions: "the gay people for *Hair*, on the left; the outraged against it, on the right."[76]

In 1972, a gay nightclub in Dallas, Texas owned by Dennis Sisk called the Bayou Landing also became embroiled in a free speech battle over *Hair*.[77] Indicative of the growth of the gay consumer market in the early 1970s, the Bayou Landing accommodated more than 1,000 people, and "cater[ed] to a strictly gay clientele. We just don't encourage straights in this building at all."[78] Within two months of its opening, it booked a two-day run of *Hair* produced by Gayboy International. Since several cities in the south tried to ban *Hair*, Sisk could not have been surprised that his decision to perform the musical—with nude scene—in a gay nightclub, would have potential legal ramifications. Not only did Sisk persist, he framed his actions within free speech debates and as part of the uncompromising visibility of gay liberation. He "announced over the PA system before the show went on that police were in the audience and he had been advised to eliminate the nude scene." "To audience applause," Sisk promised the performance would be "uncensored."[79] While the actors were quickly arrested and the club closed, in late March 1972, a judge ruled in favor of the Bayou Landing, saying that *Hair*'s nudity was not obscene, per se.

While Kameny led a protest and Sisk asserted his first amendment rights, at other moments gay activists adopted more countercultural methods of activism.[80] In December 1969, *Hair*'s Los Angeles production held a celebration in Griffith Park. Similar concerts were a regular occurrence in New York City's Central Park, where they were billed as *Hair*'s birthday parties and transformed the Park

into a happening where thousands enjoyed the outdoors together and took home various *Hair* souvenirs, from stickers to Frisbees.[81] But in Los Angeles, the homophobic city park commission repeatedly refused permits for the event. Held without a permit months after Stonewall as an assertion of sexual freedom, gay filmmaker Pat Rocco filmed it and incorporated footage into his movie *Mondo Rocco*, an early film document of gay life.

The local chapter of the ACLU transcribed the at-times comical hearing by the park commission, which revolved around concerns about the musical's depiction of sexuality. As Mrs. Harold C. Morton, commission chair, said, "We have no place, with our nice clean children, with our nice clean parks, to try to subvert them with indecency," though she could not describe exactly what that indecency was (and, indeed, confused *Hair* with the controversial 1966 Michael McClure play *The Beard* which depicted Billy the Kid and Jean Harlow in heaven and included simulated sexual acts). The other commissioners supported Morton with vague justifications like, "I'm against *Hair* from the reputation it has . . . I feel that I owe my obligation to my own family, my own children." One commissioner, Brad Pye, Jr., the first African American appointed to the park commission in 1968, slowed the tide of condemnation by equating the out-of-hand refusal of *Hair*'s request with racial discrimination to no avail. Instead, Commissioner Patricia Delaney read from *New York Times* critic Clive Barnes glowing review of *Hair* focusing on his description of *Hair*'s "frequent references, frequent approving references . . . [of] the expanding benefits of drugs. Homosexuality is not frowned upon. One boy announces that he is in love with Mike Jaggy." *Hair*'s Los Angeles press agent Dennis F. Shanahan corrected her mispronunciation of Mick Jagger's name in what one must assume was a tone of absolute derision, to which she retorted, "I'm sure you would know more about this sort of thing than I would." The motion to permit the event was denied, with Morton telling a secretary to "have those chairs disinfected at once" once Shanahan left.[82] Clearly, seeming sexual indecency was at the heart of the commission's concern, no matter how many times Shanahan assured them that there would be no nudity at the free concert. As Commissioner England later said, "we all know what they do in that show," suggesting that the show's refusal to condemn homosexuality and its showing of nude male and female bodies marked it as indecent.[83]

Recognizing the futility of further dealings with the council, *Hair*'s production team decided to hold their event without city approval on December 23, 1969 before a crowd of approximately 2,200 people.[84] While many of the attendees may have been unaware of the fight against the park commission, the production's refusal to concede to the commission's conservative sexual politics can be seen as an act of political protest that drew gay filmmaker Pat Rocco to attend. As historian Whitney Strub has argued, "More than mere ethnographer observing the actions around him, Rocco employed his films as bold acts of place-claiming on cultural, social, and also spatial geographies, resisting a hegemonic, heteronormative legal and political regime that claimed a monopoly on the assignment of meaning and visibility to gay identity and practice."[85] Rocco's footage of the

Griffith Park *Hair* performance appeared in his film *Mondo Rocco*, shown at the Park Theater in Los Angeles in 1969, which included scenes that documented a police bust of a gay bar with beefcake photos of men and short gay soft-core narrative films. In the *Hair* scene, Rocco explains that, "Most major love-ins in L.A. take place in Griffith Park," equating *Hair* with those quintessential counterculture happenings.[86] Rocco focuses on the crowd, with the orchestra and cast singing almost as background music. While Rocco does not make an explicit connection with homosexuality, his camera follows individual men, becoming a way to express same-sex desire within the larger undifferentiated mass, emphasizing the sexual politics of the film and the performance. That Rocco does nothing to explain to his audience of primarily gay men why *Hair* was worthy of inclusion in these short films suggests it was already clear: *Hair* was meaningful to gay men. For Rocco, who often focused on romance and fun with what Strub calls an "endearing exuberance," *Hair* fit well within his vision of a public gay identity.[87] It was countercultural *and* gay, joyous *and* political at one and the same time. While in the 1970s, Los Angeles' Gay Liberation Front would undertake a variety of protests, including kiss-ins and demonstrations, against gay bars that didn't allow patrons to touch, Rocco's footage and the Griffith Park celebration can be seen as an early precursor to those acts that utilized a mainstream cultural text in unexpected ways.[88]

Conclusion

Theater is a fantasy realm where all identities are understood to be performances available to anyone who can afford the price of a ticket. Under the darkened lights and during a live performance, audiences are free to identify with any character or actor, regardless of sexual orientation or gender. As the first Broadway musical with mixed-sex, full-frontal nudity, profanity, and frank discussions of homosexuality and bisexuality, *Hair* particularly solicited the admiration and support of gay men, especially those who were becoming involved in the emerging gay liberation movement. Why has *Hair*'s relationship with gay liberation been forgotten? In part, it is because *Hair*'s use of nudity and explicit language would soon be outstripped by the spate of "adult musicals" that premiered in its profitable wake. As one of the actors in *Oh! Calcutta* says near the end of that nearly all-nude revue that premiered on Broadway in 1971, "Gee, this makes *Hair* seem like *The Sound of Music*."[89] Gay musicals like *The Faggot* (1973) and *Let My People Come* (1974-1976) ran off Broadway while 1984's *La Cage Aux Folles* profitably brought a musical centered on gay men to Broadway.

As this essay has argued there is another reason why the connection between *Hair* and gay liberation has gone unrecognized. In many ways, historians and other scholars writing about the 1960s and 1970s have inherited a New Left framework that defined texts as authentic only when they were outside of the consumer marketplace and mass culture. For *Hair*, its profitability, which included numerous productions of the show itself, eleven cast albums and the rerecording

of some of its songs by popular bands like The Cowsills and The Fifth Dimension, meant that it could not be conceived of as having radical potential in New Left terms. Plus, *Hair* was shamelessly ubiquitous, thanks to the efforts of Gifford-Wallace, *Hair*'s public relations firm, which made sure that *Hair* actors appeared at numerous promotional activities and on television, including the 1969 Tony Awards, PBS, and *The David Frost Show*. While it touted its countercultural bona fides, *Hair* was, in many ways, aggressively middlebrow.

Gay men didn't care about *Hair*'s provenance. Accustomed to reading mass cultural texts against the grain to find themselves, *Hair* offered the rare opportunity of seeing homosexuality onstage without having to search for it. Importantly, too, the show's tone merged the counterculture and gay liberation. Its joyousness countered the depictions of tragic homosexuality shown in plays like *The Boys in the Band*. While the leaders of the New Left and the Black Panther Party wrote strident manifestos and the Weather Underground built bombs, for certain gay liberationists the most radical politics was defined by peaceful coexistence, tolerance, and joy.

For all gay liberationists, though, visibility was central to the movement. Gay liberation activists used *Hair* to raise their visibility and to advance their own political agendas. Because of its notoriety and the controversy that followed the musical around the country, gay activists like Frank Kameny could use *Hair* as a stage upon which to mount their claims for equal treatment under the law. *Hair* significantly advanced free speech for theatrical performance through its legal battles in cities like Boston and Chattanooga, as well as in forgotten settings like the Bayou Landing nightclub. More than just a text to be read or a performance to be watched, *Hair* was also a job for its actors. Due to its success and its unprecedented number of national and touring companies, it gave gay actors opportunities to experience gay life in communities large and small around the nation. These untold numbers of actors brought their identities as white and nonwhite gay men with them, strengthening the sense of a national gay community.

While *Hair* may be most famous for its nude scene, in its publicity nudity was rarely used. Instead, the ubiquitous image was a photo of the interracial and mixed sex group of actors performing. Sometimes shown as a close-up of hands, other times including the faces and bodies of the actors, variations of this image appeared repeatedly in news and magazine articles, programs for the show, and advertisements. Michael Gifford, public relations specialist for *Hair*, explained why, "One of the show's strongest elements is the seeking out of one another's bodies in dance and love—it is an urgent play—it is teeming and sprawling and crowded and it makes you believe that there is something attractive about these unwashed children and their raw energy and mindless protest."[90] While this statement suggests the cynicism of the show's management, for audiences *Hair* represented one version of a beloved community to which anyone could belong. This vision of the 1960s as a loving community welcomed viewers again in 2009, with an acclaimed revival that the *New York Times* described as "intense, unadulterated joy," that ensured *Hair*'s cultural relevance for new generations

Figure 1: The Amsterdam cast of *Hair* in 1969. Promotional photos of *Hair* around the world repeated this image of the performers with their hands raised in celebration suggesting values of tolerance, community, diversity and joy. Photo Credit: National Archives of the Netherlands

of theatergoers.[91] Developing at the same time, *Hair* and gay liberation should be recognized as influencing each other in the multiple ways outlined here. *Hair,* like all mass cultural texts, was "teeming and sprawling and crowded," making it fertile ground for one subset of its audience—gay men—to construct individual identities, form community, and create powerful movements for political and social change out of its soil.

Notes

Thank you to Whitney Strub for reading drafts of this article, Timothy Stewart-Winter for giving me a copy of Bill Kelley's letter about *Hair* and my anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments.

1. Tom Burke, "The New Homosexuality," *Esquire,* December 1969, 304.

2. Tom Shales, "Broadway loses its *Hair,*" *Courier Journal and Times* (Louisville, KY), July 9, 1972. According to a January 1, 1970 press release, *Hair* was playing in New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Las Vegas, Toronto, Boston, Paris, London, Sao Paolo, Germany, Helsinki, Belgrade, Sydney and Amsterdam concurrently. Clipping file, Billy Rose Theater Collection, New York Public Library, NY.

3. Elizabeth Wollman, *The Theater Will Rock: A History of the Rock Musical* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006) and *Hard Times: The Adult Musical in 1970s New York City* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2013), Stacy Wolf, *Changed for Good: A Feminist History of the Broadway Musical* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2011) and *A Problem Like Maria: Gender and Sexuality in the American Musical* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002)*,* Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination* (LA: University of California Press, 2003), Raymond Knapp, *The American Musical and the Performance of Personal Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006) and *The American Musical and the Performance of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), John Bush Jones, *Our Musi-*

cals, Ourselves: A Social History of the American Musical Theatre (Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 2004), and Ethan Mordden, *Anything Goes: A History of American Musical Theatre* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2013).

4. Jordan Schildcrout, "Legitimate: Jerry Douglas's *Tubstrip* and the Erotic Theatre of Gay Liberation," *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre* 30, no. 1 (2017) http://jadtjournal.org/2017/12/11/legitimate-jerry-douglass-tubstrip-and-the-erotic-theatre-of-gay-liberation/. D.A. Miller, *Place for Us: Essay on the Broadway Musical* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998). Gay Musicals, Queer Music Heritage www.queermusicheritage.com/gaymus.html.

5. For example, there is no mention of *Hair* in Peter Braunstein and Michael Doyle's excellent collection *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s* (NY: Routledge, 2002), Doug Rossinow *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (NY: Columbia University Press, 1998), Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (NY: Bantam Books, 1987), and Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

6. Wollman, *Hard Times*. 12.

7. Thomas Frank, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

8. Dennis Altman, *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation* (NY: NYU Press, 1971), 176.

9. Stephen Bottoms, *Playing Underground: A Critical History of the 1960s Off-Off-Broadway Movement* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009), 9.

10. David K. Johnson, *Buying Gay: How Physique Entrepreneurs Sparked a Movement* (NY: Columbia University Press, 2019), ix.

11. As the Broadway version has become the template for revivals of *Hair*, the current prompt book, available through music licenser Tams Witmark, indicates the standardization of the text circa 1968. Furthermore, and importantly, changes made for a 1995 revival are indicated in the prompt book.

12. Rossinow, *Politics of Authenticity*.

13. "Trip Without A Ticket," The Digger Archives, last modified 31 January 2013, http://www.diggers.org/digpaps68/twatdp.html.

14. Ian Lekus, "Queer Harvests: Homosexuality, the U.S. New Left, and the Venceremos Brigades to Cuba," *Radical History Review* 89, (Spring 2004): 57-91.

15. Timothy Hodgdon, *Manhood in the Age of Aquarius: Masculinity in Two Countercultural Communities* (NY: Columbia University Press, 2008), 178-179.

16. John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

17. Gay liberationists also critiqued the counterculture for homophobic language. In "An Open Letter to Jerry Rubin," Step May critiqued Rubin for his homophobic rhetoric in *Do It!*: "Talk about what's REALLY objectionably [sic] about university administrators, not some intended slur that is in effect an attack on all homosexuals." *Gay Flames*, New York Public Library (NYPL), International Gay Information Center (IGIC), Periodicals, Box 160, Folder Gay Flames Pamphlet.

18. Rossinow, 258 and "Federal Prosecutor Criticizes the Chicago 7 Defendants," *New York Times*, February 28, 1970.

19. Guy Strait, "What Is a Hippie?," in *"Takin' it to the Streets": A Sixties Reader*, ed. Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 269.

20. Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963: Avant-Garde Performance and the Effervescent Body* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 14.

21. Wendell C. Stone, *Caffe Cino: The Birthplace of Off-Off-Broadway* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), 173.

22. William Scroggie, "Producing Identity: From *The Boys in the Band* to Gay Liberation," in *The Queer Sixties,* Patricia Juliana Smith, ed (NY: Routledge, 1999): 237-254.

23. Sheela Lambert, "The Man Behind the Hair," *The Advocate,* August 13, 2008.

24. Barbara Lee Horn, *The Age of Hair: Evolution and Impact of Broadway's First Rock Musical* (NY: Praeger, 1991), 31.

25. Gerome Ragni and James Rado. Unpublished script of Hair. Ragni Papers. NYPL, 113.

26. Handwritten notes by Gerald Freedman. Undated. Gerald Freedman Papers, Box 7, Folder 2, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, WI.

27. Justin David Suran, "Coming Out Against the War: Antimilitarism and the Politicization of Homosexuality in the Era of Vietnam," *American Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (2001): 462.

28. Gerome Ragni and James Rado. Unpublished script of Hair. Ragni Papers. NYPL. The published book of *Hair* (1969) includes another version of this scene. Gerome Ragni and James Rado, *Hair*. (NY: Pocket Books, 1969), 58.

29. Terrence Kissack, "Freaking Fag Revolutionaries: New York's Gay Liberation Front, 1969-1971," *Radical History Review* 62 (1995): 115.

30. John M. Clum, *Something for the Boys: Musical Theater and Gay Culture* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 1.

31. Gerome Ragni and James Rado, Prompt Book for *Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical.* (NY: Tams-Witmark Music Library, Inc., 1995), 82.
32. Howard Junker, "Director of the Year," *Newsweek,* June 3, 1968, 90.
33. Jack Kroll, "Hairpiece," *Newsweek,* May 13, 1968.
34. William Goldman, *The Season: A Candid Look at Broadway* (NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969), 383.
35. Susan Sontag, "Notes on Camp," in *Art Theory and Criticism: An Anthology of Formalist, Avant-Garde, Contextualist and Post-Modern Thought* edited by Sally Everett. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 1991), 99-100.
36. Elsa Gress, "O'Horganism: The Lost Years," *The Drama Review* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1969): 115-6.
37. Eleanore Lester, "Of Course, There Were Some Limits," *New York Times,* May 19 1968.
38. Elsa Gress and Tom O'Horgan, "An Interview with Tom O'Horgan on Aspects of the Contemporary Theater," *Leonardo,* 3, no. 3 (July 1970): 348.
39. Dan Sullivan, "Nudity Moves into Center Stage," *New York Times*, April 25, 1968.
40. "Hair," *America*, June 8, 1968.
41. Whitney Strub, *Perversion for Profit: Pornography and the Rise of the New Right.* (NY: Columbia University Press, 2011).
42. Lorrie Davis, *Letting Down My Hair: Two Years with the Love Rock Tribe—From Dawning to Downing of Aquarius* (NY: A. Fields Books, 1973), 59.
43. Horn, 89.
44. Davis, 76.
45. "The Girls of *Hair,*" *Playboy,* December 1969, 135.
46. "Optional Nudity in *Hair*," *Esquire*, September 1968, 131.
47. Goldman, 385.
48. Kissack, 118.
49. Clive Barnes, "Likable Rock Musical Moves to Broadway," *New York Times,* April 29, 1968.
50. Michael Smith, "Theatre Journal" *Village Voice,* May 2, 1968.
51. "Theatra?" *East Village Other*, May 1-15, 1968.
52. Caligula "And now hoose *Hair*?" *Helix,* April 16, 1970.
53. Doug Milburn, "Hair Develops Split Ends," *Space City News,* October 11, 1969.
54. William B. Kelley to Harry Bouras, undated.
55. *Gay Liberation Front Newsletter* (Washington DC), 1970, NYPL, IGIC, Box 160.
56. Jay Ross, "Hair: A Celebration of Life," *Los Angeles Advocate,* January 1969.
57. "Hair—Old, But Alive and Kicking!" *Our Community*, January 1972.
58. Everett Henderson, "Pubic Goes Public," *Gay*, March 1, 1970.
59. Jay Ross, "Hair: A Celebration of Life!" *The Los Angeles Advocate,* January 1969, 5.
60. *Homophile Union of Boston,* 1 (1), April 1970, NYPL, IGIC, Box 160, Folder 240.
61. Everett Henderson, "Pubic Goes Public," *Gay,* March 1970.
62. Eric Grode, *Hair: The Story of the Show That Defined a Generation* (Philadelphia, PA: Running Press Book Publishers, 2010), 94.
63. Correspondence. Hair Archives. Box 1, Folder 1. Mississippi Valley Collection, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.
64. Bill Crawford, "Candi and Touring 'Hair' Provoke Varied Comments Around Country," *The Lawton Constitution And Morning Press,* May 23, 1971.
65. Martin Meeker, *Contacts Desired: Gay and Lesbian Communications and Community, 1940s-1970s* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 224.
66. Jones Windsor, "Gay Actors Kenny and Greg: Their Bag is Brotherhood," *The Advocate,* July 5, 1972.
67. Jonathan Johnson, *Good Hair Days: A Personal Journey with the American Tribal Love-Rock Musical* (Lincoln, NE: IUniverse, 2004), 259.
68. Margot Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 241-247.
69. D'Emilio, 233.
70. Clive Barnes, "*Hair* is a shaggy happening," *Saturday Evening Post,* August 10, 1968.
71. On Chattanooga, Barbara Lee Horn, *The Age of Hair: Evolution and Impact of Broadway's First Rock Musical* (NY: Greenwood Press, 1991), 88. On Atlanta, "Suit asks staging of 'Hair,'" *Atlanta Constitution,* October 16, 1971.
72. Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, *P.B.I.C. Inc. et al. v. District Attorney of Suffolk County*, 9 April 1970.
73. "Will Hair Be Long Here?" *Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), N.d. Michael Butler Collection.
74. "Kameny for Congress," *Gay Blade*, 2, no. 5 (February 1971). NYPL, IGIC, Periodicals, Box 160.

75. "Hair Raising Protested," *Washington Daily News*, March 13, 1971. Box 132. Michael Butler Collection.
76. Ibid.
77. David Bauer, "Lords of an Underground Empire," *D Magazine,* June 1979. https://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-magazine/1979/june/lords-of-an-underground-empire/
78. Advocate Papers. Bayou Landing box, One Institute. January 19, 1972.
79. "Hair Nudes Shock Big "D" Fuzz: Four Arrested at Texas-Sized Club," *The Advocate,* February 16, 1972.
80. Robert McRuer, "Gay Gatherings: Reimagining the Counterculture," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s,* eds. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (NY: Routledge, 2001), 215-240.
81. *Hair* souvenirs from the birthday parties can be found in the Gerome Ragni papers at the Billy Rose Theatre Collection in the New York Public Library.
82. "Mrs. Grundy Confronts," *Southern California ACLU,* November 1969.
83. Dan Knapp, "'Hair' Gang May Appeal Veto," *Los Angeles Times*, November 19, 1969.
84. Joe Kennedy, Photo of *Hair* concert, *Los Angeles Times,* December 23, 1969.
85. Whitney Strub, "Mondo Rocco: Mapping Gay Los Angeles Sexual Geography in the Late-1960s Films of Pat Rocco," *Radical History Review* 113 (Spring 2012): 14.
86. *Mondo Rocco.* UCLA Film Archive, Los Angeles, CA.
87. Strub, "Mondo Rocco," 13.
88. Lillian Faderman and Stuart Timmons, *Gay L.A.: A History of Sexual Outlaws, Power Politics and Lipstick Lesbians* (NY: BasicBooks, 2006).
89. Clive Barnes, "*Oh, Calcutta!* A Most Innocent Dirty Show," *New York Times* June 18, 1969.
90. Letter from Michael Gifford to Milton Glaser, 21 February 1968. Michael Butler Collection.
91. Ben Brantley, "A Frizzy, Fizzy Welcome to the Untamed '60s," *New York Times* March 31, 2009.