



CREATE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. Fowles, C. J. E. (2015) National identity, race, and gender in Hair: the American tribal love-rock musical. M.A. thesis, Canterbury Christ Church University.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



National Identity, Race, and Gender in *Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical*

by

Ceiridwen Jessica Elizabeth Fowles

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis submitted

for the degree of MA by Research

2015

ABSTRACT

The musical *Hair* opened on Broadway in 1968 during a period of great unrest in the United States. The tumultuous 1960s was a time of social change brought about by the Civil Rights Movement, the rift between the large numbers of baby boomers and their parents, and the sexual revolution. Countercultural youths were the subject of *Hair*, which followed the ‘Tribe’ of young people in New York City as they navigated the societal ills of the time, including issues of national identity, race and gender, which are the subject of this study. Through analyses of Broadway and performance, both in the Sixties and historically, this study gauges the impact of *Hair* on the musical, taking into account the real life counterparts of the issues presented on the stage. The show brought alternative fringe methods to stage, ignoring the structure of ‘book’ musicals to instead create an onstage ‘happening’ to mirror action on the streets, complete with simulated sex and nudity. The success of the show suggests that the performance style of *Hair* was effective and that the issues were important, making way for further alternative works on the stage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors for providing endless support and advice during the completion of this thesis – I would have been completely lost without them. I would also like to thank my fellow postgraduate students for answering the early-hours-of-the-morning panic questions that kept me awake. I am grateful for my family, most especially my wonderful grandmother who was always there to let me talk through any difficulties I faced in this research as well as those who helped me to fund this study.

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: NATIONAL IDENTITY.....	20
CHAPTER TWO: RACE.....	44
CHAPTER THREE: GENDER.....	67
CONCLUSION	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91

INTRODUCTION

Opening at the Biltmore Theatre in New York on April 29, 1968, *Hair – The American Tribal Rock-Love Musical*¹ loosely followed a ‘Tribe’ of young hippies, led by Claude Bukowski and George Berger, as they navigated the societal ills of the late 1960s.² Issues like what the war in Vietnam meant for the average American, the new age for race relations and increasingly present sexuality were highlighted in the show, as characters both celebrated and lamented their lives in this snapshot of the decade. The issues presented in *Hair* covered the expanse of protests in the form of a musical that strayed from most Broadway conventions, drawing influence instead from unconventional styles of performing that were nurtured in fringe performance groups like the Open Theatre. Written by actors and friends Jerome Ragni and James Rado with music by Galt MacDermot, *Hair* started life in Joseph Papp’s new Public Theater off-Broadway, moving to the off-off-Broadway Cheetah discotheque after an eight week run before eventually ending up at the Biltmore, where it ran for 1,750 performances.³

This thesis explores the impact that *Hair* had on the Broadway stage by placing its representations of national identity, race, and sexuality in the context of the actual events of the 1960s. After analysing the musical theatre productions that came before *Hair* in order to provide insight into why a show that discussed matters usually presented on theatre’s fringes became such a sensation upon its release as a mainstream piece of theatre: this thesis will argue that *Hair*’s significance lies in the way in which it simultaneously reflected *and* shaped American society in the 1960s.

¹ Hereafter referred to as *Hair*

² James Rado, Jerome Ragni, *Hair – The American Tribal Love Rock Musical (revised)*, New York; Tams-Witmark Music Library Inc., 1995

³ International Broadway Database (IBDb), <http://ibdb.com/production.php?id=3393> accessed 12/02/15

Matters of national identity in *Hair* were at the forefront as the show often referred to Vietnam, American history, and what it meant to be “American.” The first chapter will therefore explore national identity in two Broadway shows of the same season – *1776* and *Maggie Flynn* – in order to examine the difference between the “America” depicted in *Hair* compared to in other shows.⁴ Chapter One will argue that *Hair*’s depiction of the generation gap is one of the most important aspects of its commentary on national identity, as conflicting ideals of what it meant to be “American” created a rift between young people and their parents and authority figures. Vietnam, and its place in American history, is arguably the main concern of the characters in *Hair*, whose fear at the spectre of the war conflicted with a desire to fight for their country. The first chapter will also examine the imagery of the American flag and what it meant to Americans in the 1960s, as the use of the flag in *Hair* proved controversial for many reviewers.

Chapter Two will analyse *Hair*’s commentary on race relations in the 1960s. Young white protesters of the era were influenced by the Civil Rights Movement, and thus race relations were a large part of the story arc of the show. Significantly, African American characters were considered equals, as were the actors who played them. This chapter contextualises the role of African Americans in entertainment through a discussion on minstrelsy, as well as an analysis of *Show Boat* to explore the role of African Americans on Broadway, and further colonial overtures of popular musicals are examined in relation to the show *South Pacific*.⁵ Issues of race relations in the 1960s are examined with reference to the Civil Rights Movement, as well as brief analyses on the adoption of Native American culture

⁴ Peter Stone, *1776*, Music Theatre International, 1968; Hugo Peretti, Luigi Creatore, George David Weiss, Morton DaCosta, *Maggie Flynn*, 1968

⁵ Oscar Hammerstein II, *Show Boat*, 1927; Oscar Hammerstein II, Joshua Logan, *Rodgers & Hammerstein’s South Pacific*, New York; Rodgers and Hammerstein Theatre Library, 1978

by the hippies, and the ‘yellow peril.’ The racial elements of the Vietnam War are also discussed in relation to the character Hud.

Hair is arguably most well-known for its controversial nude scene at the end of the first act, as well as its openness with simulated sexual acts, and therefore it is imperative that the nature of gender and sexuality in the Sixties and in the show is examined. This discussion forms the basis for Chapter Three, in which visions sex and gender are compared to the shows *How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying* and *Sweet Charity* as the role of sexualised women are compared, as well as their compliance with this sexuality.⁶ The new sex in the 1960s is examined as the sexual openness of the hippies is replicated in *Hair*, therefore contextualising this is important. Nudity and gender roles are also discussed in regard to *Hair* as the show is open with the human body and praises a new form of masculinity, whilst still confining women to typical roles. Taken together, these three themes will provide an insight into how *Hair* was, as an early reviewer described it, ‘an authentic voice of the popular culture of 1967,’ and, at the same time, was influential on that culture.⁷ By holding a mirror up to American youth culture, *Hair* both reflected and critiqued American society.

The examination of the three threads followed in this thesis cover a substantial number of issues within the Sixties as they interlink. In discussing nationhood, one also reveals aspects of masculinity in the era as the draft affected young men – the fear of going to Vietnam shapes the lives of the men in the show. Nationhood and race are also significantly linked as African American men were sent to fight for a country that did not give them the rights they deserved at home.

⁶ Abe Burrows; Jack Weinstock; Willie Gilbert, *How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying*, 1961; Neil Simon, *Sweet Charity*, 1966

⁷ Howard Taubman, ‘Hair and the 20s; Pert Musical on Lafayette Street Recalls Another Eras Off-Broadway Revues,’ *The New York Times*, November 14, 1967, (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT11-14-67.html>)

The culture of the 1960s has been the focus of much scholarly writing, largely because of the significance of the societal changes that occurred during that time. Even before the decade was over, the remarkable aspects of its youth culture were studied; books like Theodore Roszak's *The Making of a Counter Culture* discussed at great lengths the impact of the generation that would become the 'hippies,' while later the decade would be subject to more specific scholarship such as Sherry L. Smith's *Hippies, Indians & The Fight for Red Power*.⁸ The cultural and the societal changes that rose from the 1960s were epitomised in the musical *Hair*, which is one reason that the show is worthy of study. The Broadway musical has in general been an understudied form of culture, and *Hair* has received limited attention. An important exception is Barbara Horn's *The Age of Hair*, which discusses the impact of the musical. However, *Hair*'s successful Broadway revival in 2009 makes further consideration necessary, lending credence to the efficacy and significance of the show.⁹ *Hair* was not merely a product of the Sixties but instead a viable reflection of that society that resonates beyond the decade it was released in.

An analysis of a show like *Hair* must begin with its writers, as it is their vision of the hippies and the era that is presented on stage. Gerome Ragni, a co-author of *Hair*, was a founding member of the Open Theatre, a membership that would prove influential in the writing and producing of *Hair*.¹⁰ The Open Theatre favoured experimental acting games, diverging from Constantin Stanislavski's "method" of emotional realism to become a tool for group work, favouring the notion of theatre freeing everyday life instead of being restricted

⁸ Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture; Reflections on the Technocratic Society & Its Youthful Opposition*, New York; Anchor Books, 1969; Sherry L. Smith, *Hippies, Indians, & the Fight for Red Power*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2012

⁹ Barbara Horn, *The Age of Hair: Evolution and Impact of Broadway's First Rock Musical*, New York; Greenwood Press, 1991

¹⁰ Stanley Richards, *Great Rock Musicals*, New York; Stein & Day, 1979, p.382

by it.¹¹ An additional influence on Ragni was his Broadway debut in John Gielgud's 1964 production of *Hamlet*, in which Richard Burton played the eponymous character.¹² The play was presented minimally with the appearance of a rehearsal rather than a polished production, giving Ragni a more creative grounding in niche performance.¹³ Furthermore, references to *Hamlet* in *Hair* are plentiful, mostly seen in the number 'What a Piece of Work is Man,' adapted from the famous speech in Act 2 in which Hamlet hides his true distress under more conventional rhetoric, a theme that is echoed in *Hair*.¹⁴ These themes may have arisen from Ragni's experience in the show, rooting *Hair* in a theatrical world that was willing to adapt classic stories to create new and interesting works.

Ragni's co-author, James Rado, was a student of Lee Strasberg – a man very much inspired by Stanislavski – and debuted on Broadway in Strasberg's *Marathon '33*, a play about depression-era dance marathons.¹⁵ The Strasberg method of acting had influenced major Hollywood figures such as director Elia Kazan and actor Marlon Brando, and was an acting style which required actors to show emotional availability through the improvisational work of the Actors' Studio, becoming their characters instead of acting them.¹⁶ This influence on Rado meant that the characters within *Hair* were naturalistic – the actors "became" the hippies they were portraying instead of merely pretending to be them.

¹¹ Created in the 1930s by Russian Constantin Stanislavski, the Stanislavski system required actors to question the actions of their characters to become the characters instead of simply playing them. The method required intense training in speech and body movements to combine external physical action and internal emotions to create a rounded performance; Stephen Bottoms, *Playing Underground; A Critical History of the 1960s Off-Off-Broadway Movement*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004, p.172

¹² Richards, *Great Rock Musicals*, 1979, p.382

¹³ John A. Mills, *Hamlet on Stage; The Great Tradition*, London; Greenwood Press, 1985, p.253

¹⁴ James Rado, Gerome Ragni, *Hair – The American Tribal Love Rock Musical (revised)*, New York; Tams-Witmark Music Library Inc., 1995, p.78; William Shakespeare; *Hamlet*, 2.2. 280-290; William Shakespeare; Philip Edwards (ed.), *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2012, p.47

¹⁵ James Inverne, *The Faber Pocket Guide to Musicals*, London; Faber and Faber Limited, 2009, p.102; Lee Strasberg, *A Dream of Passion; The Development of the Method*, Boston; Little, Brown and Company, 1987, p.40; June Havoc, *Marathon '33*, New York; Dramatists Play Service Inc., 1969, p.4

¹⁶ Lola Cohen (ed.), *The Lee Strasberg Notes*, New York; Routledge, 2010 p.125

Rado and Ragni performed together for the first time in 1964 in the off-Broadway play *Hang Down Your Head and Die*, a show that made anti-capital punishment statements by creating a circus-like spectacle.¹⁷ *Hang Down Your Head* was not successful—it closed after opening night—but thereafter both men kept working in New York, allowing them to start planning what would become *Hair* later that year.¹⁸ 1964 was a significant year in the making of the Sixties, for example the Gulf of Tonkin resolution increased American combat action in Vietnam, and protest groups like the University of California, Berkeley’s Free Speech Movement gained nationwide attention and inspired other college students to participate more in ‘controversial’ events.¹⁹ This meant that early in the process of creating *Hair*, the political climate of America was showing signs of change that influenced the production and possibly gave Rado and Ragni the confidence to start writing a show that would have otherwise felt extreme in its representation of a restless youth.

The breadth of training and experience from Rado and Ragni meant that *Hair* had roots within the Broadway acting community, more so than the street and protest performers who were present throughout the country. Their more traditional entry into Broadway – for example, Ragni starring in a Shakespeare play directed by theatre legend John Gielgud – meant that *Hair* could move between both worlds, unlike productions like *Viet Rock*, which is discussed at further length later in this introduction. Beyond the backgrounds of the writers and stars, though, the credentials of composer Galt MacDermot lent power to the show in the more serious world of Broadway. A Canadian with a speciality in African music,

¹⁷Jonathon Johnson, *Good HAIR Days: A Personal Journey with the American Tribal Love-Rock Musical HAIR*, New York; iUniverse, Inc., 2004, p.10; Howard Taubman, ‘Theater: Review About Death Penalty; ‘Hang Down Your Head and Die’ at Mayfair,’ *The New York Times*, October 19, 1964 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archives,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/prepost/gerry/NYT10-19-64.html>)

¹⁸ Braham Murray, *The Worst It Can Be Is A Disaster: The Life Story of Braham Murray and the Royal Exchange Theatre*, London; Bloomsbury, 2007, p.44; James Rado, ‘Hairstory; The Story Behind the Story,’ *hairthemusical.com*, February 14, 2009 [accessed 08/07/15]

¹⁹Stanley Karnow, *Vietnam; A History*, London; Random House, 1994, p.390; Robby Cohen, ‘Berkeley Free Speech Movement: Paving the way for campus activism,’ *OAH Magazine of History*, Vol. 1, No.1, Teaching about the 60’s, (April 1985), pp. 16-18, Oxford University Press, p.16

MacDermot's music emphasised the more abstract style of the lyrics in *Hair*, creating a variety of different songs that took the Original Broadway Cast Recording to the top of the *Billboard* charts and inspired over 700 different recordings of the score in multiple languages by 1970.²⁰

Referred to by Stephen Bottoms as 'an essentially lightweight, sanitized take on psychedelic rock,' the music of *Hair* managed to straddle the line between Broadway classics and popular rock, ensuring that the album was a 'must-have for the middle classes.'²¹ The new rock musical brought younger generations back to the theatre and ensured 'big ticket sales, big album sales,' giving popular music 'a new stature.'²² Whilst more traditional shows still thrived on Broadway, the emergence of rock in musicals meant more variety for the theatre going crowds. For example, shows like *Godspell* and *Jesus Christ Superstar* – the latter directed by *Hair*'s Tom O'Horgan – both opened in 1971 with scores that may have been considered risky just a few years before and have both since enjoyed successful revivals and cinematic representations.²³ Rock musicals, for example *Rent* and *Spring Awakening*, have appealed to new audiences throughout the twentieth and twenty first century, once more tapping into the desire for creations that go beyond typical 'megamusicals,' drawing crowds of young people back to the theatre in a similar vein to the draw of *Hair*.²⁴ However, *Hair* did differ from the rock musicals that preceded it because it more successfully drew upon both traditional and new styles. It was one of the last musicals of the twentieth century to have

²⁰ Robert Berkvist, 'He Put Hair on Broadway's Chest,' *The New York Times*, May 11, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT5-11-69.html>); Elizabeth Wollman, *The Theater Will Rock: A History of the Rock Musical from Hair to Hedwig*, Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 2006, p.53; Johnson, *Good Hair Days*, 2004, p.96

²¹ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.211; Charles Isherwood, 'The Aging of Aquarius', *The New York Times*, September 16, 2007 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via [nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com), http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/16/theater/16ishe.html?_r=0)

²² Mike Gross, 'Hair Sets the Stage and Broadway Now Accepts Pop Musicals as First Class Attractions,' *Billboard magazine*, November 6, 1971 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive', <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard11-6-71.html>)

²³ John Bush Jones, *Our Musicals, Ourselves: A Social History of the American Musical Theatre*, Lebanon; University Press of New England, 2003, p.261; Gross, *Hair Sets the Stage*, November 6, 1971

²⁴ John Kenrick, *Musical Theatre; A History*, New York; Continuum, 2008, p.380

songs break into the Billboard charts it topped, despite the lyrics initially being referred to as ‘too explosive in [their] attacks on society.’²⁵ In 1970, the songs ‘Aquarius,’ ‘Let The Sun Shine In’ and ‘Good Morning Starshine’ were in the top five foreign songs played on Radio and Television in the United States, demonstrating the broader appeal of a show that may have initially seemed niche in its off-Broadway iteration.²⁶

The Broadway show ran concurrently with multiple touring productions around the United States, as well as productions in European countries and further afield. By 1974, it was suggested that nearly 30 million people around the world had seen the show and domestic revenue was topping \$400,000 a week, numbers that highlight the universal appeal and mainstream aspects of the controversial performances.²⁷ A favourite production of Rado and Ragni was in Belgrade where there existed ‘no middle-class prejudices,’ and off-Broadway producer Gerald Freeman remarked on how ‘the hippies in Tokyo look exactly like the hippies in Rome,’ commenting on a global ‘disaffection with the Establishment.’²⁸ Whilst the show was welcomed in most of its global destinations, sharing the hippie message did not come without its issues. The opening night of the Sydney production was marred with a bomb scare, and the Mexican cast were taken to prison for five hours after their opening night.²⁹ Reports of bombs and arrests, however, were rare, and for the most part productions

²⁵ *Billboard*, ‘Hair Songs Too Hot to Handle, Authors Claim,’ December 28 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard12-28-68.html>)

²⁶ *Billboard*, ‘CAPAC Member’s Single Was Most Performed’ 1970, December 11 197 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard12-11-71.html>)

²⁷ Edwin Wilson, ‘A Look at Hair Six Years After,’ *The Wall Street Journal*, September 20, 1974 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/WallStJournal9-20-74.html>)

²⁸ *Newsweek*, ‘Hair Around the World,’ July 7, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Newsweek7-7-69.html>)

²⁹ *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, ‘Bomb Scare at Hair,’ June 6, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SydneyDailyTelegraph2669.html>); *Time*, ‘Hairzapoppin’,’ December 12, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Time12-12-69.html>)

of *Hair* remained unscathed and instead adapted to their local audiences.³⁰ *Hair*'s international popularity suggests that issues of disillusionment and youthful anxiety were not only relevant to a certain sector of American youths, nor were the characters simple curiosities for weekend Broadway goers. Instead the themes were largely universal and able to be transplanted into global locations.³¹

Hair is an American Broadway Musical, a type of performance with its own distinctive styles that, during its height of popularity, became an 'indicator of popular culture' as Americans across the country consumed the output from the New York stage.³² The history of the Broadway musical can be said to have started in 1866 with the opening of *The Black Crook*, a show that proved controversial, and therefore popular, due to the presence of women in very little clothing, which would have been rarer at the time, the reaction similar to that of the nudity in *Hair*.³³ Although *The Black Crook* was not the first musical, it was the first to become a nationwide hit, therefore setting the standard an American show would be measured against in terms of popularity and audience response.³⁴ By exporting *The Black Crook* around the country, a precedent was set that would define New York as the place to develop new shows. Less than forty years later, more than thirty theatres were open on Broadway, and New York City was fast becoming the place for tourists to experience the new

³⁰ Newsweek, *Hair Around the World*, 1969

³¹ It is worth briefly noting the 1979 film version of *Hair*, directed by Milos Forman. The cinematic vision of *Hair* differs greatly from what was presented on the stage, to the extent where Claude the protagonist transforms from an idealistic, loving, hippie leader into a southern soldier, ready to take his place in Vietnam, and Sheila is an elite outsider to the hippie life, instead of the college protester she is in the show. These changes led Rado and Ragni to claim that *Hair* has never had a film adaptation, therefore the film will be excluded from my analysis.

³² Richard Kislán, *The Musical; A Look at the American Musical Theater*, New York; Applause Theatre & Cinema Books, 1995, p.273

³³ Kenrick, 2008, p.66

³⁴ Ibid, p.67

tradition of the American musical, influenced by the show that opened over a century before *Hair*.³⁵

Popular in the early twentieth century, shows like *Show Boat* and *Oklahoma!* changed the way that the musical comedy would be seen on stage, integrating songs and dances almost seamlessly with a feasible story, instead of the songs appearing out of place as in a revue where any continuity would be disrupted.³⁶ *Hair* strayed from the conventions set by *Oklahoma!* due in part to its experimental start at the Public Theatre, but also because of the anti-establishment themes within the show. During the 1950s, librettos were popular on Broadway as escapist culture – in the post-bomb society at the height of the Red Scare, the idea of a light-hearted musical in which ‘social conflicts can be resolved through the transcendent power of love’ was popular.³⁷ This popularity soon diminished and by the 1960s Broadway was considered by many to be creatively stagnant, creating the ideal conditions for *Hair* to flourish.³⁸

The plot of *Hair* was sparse, relying heavily on the notion that everyone present in the theatre belonged to the ‘Tribe’ that the characters created for themselves. This belonging was enhanced by the actions of the cast, interacting with audiences before, during, and after the show, so much that some members of the audience were confused about the line between preamble and scripted show.³⁹ The naturalistic style of the show in which the characters appeared to merely be part of a happening was extended by the actual cast members hired, not for their acting ability, but for their ability to portray the characters within the show, making the authenticity of the hippies more of a priority than their value as polished actors.

³⁵ Ibid, p.112

³⁶ Sim Copans, ‘Some Reflections on the American Musical Theater’, *Revue Française d'études Américaines*, No.7, *Arts Et Société Aux États-Unis*, (Avril 79), pp.79-88, Editions Belin, p.82

³⁷ Martin Halliwell, *American Culture in the 1950s*, Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2007 p.100

³⁸ Elizabeth Wollman, *The Theater Will Rock*, 2006, p.43

³⁹ Irving H. Buchen, ‘Is the Future Hair?’, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Volume III, Issue 2, pages 324-333, Fall 1969, p.326

This search for authenticity may have been inspired by Rado's training under Lee Strasberg, as Method Acting relies largely on 'affective memory,' or the use of the memory of emotion, as an actors' tool, therefore cast members would be arguably better suited to singing about injustices if they had felt those injustices themselves.⁴⁰

Theatricality was present in all places in the anxious, youthful countercultural movement of the Sixties, from personal aesthetics to regular 'happenings,' to be hippie was to be exhibited as an 'other.' This otherness meant that hippies became the perfect commodity for the curious tourists that would make up the audience of a Broadway matinee, drawing crowds that wanted a glimpse of the lifestyle.⁴¹ In *Hair*, there was an effort to recreate the feel of the events that were occurring in the streets of Greenwich Village that Rado and Ragni observed when creating the show, transforming the everyday into the theatrical. Prominent director Peter Brook claimed that he could 'take any empty space and call it a bare stage,' a notion that when applied to the 'happenings' occurring in the Sixties creates a performative dynamic on the streets of New York as empty spaces became performance areas.⁴² The term 'happening,' coined in 1959 by Allan Kaprow, describes an event that presents art in a more kinetic, theatrical way, in which talking points of contemporary society were presented by the human form.⁴³ This style of performance was adopted by Rado and Ragni, who tried to transport the theatricality of the average day – the former empty space of the parks and street corners turned happening – onto a stage that was more used to structure and book musicals. *Hair* was unique because of this restructuring, yet it was far from the first piece of theatre to break away from the traditional moulds, nor was it the first work to deal with the Vietnam

⁴⁰ Strasberg, *A Dream of Passion*, 1987, p.113

⁴¹ John Rockwell, 'Long Hair? Can 'The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical' be the Opera of Tomorrow?' *Opera News*, December 20, 1969, (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/OperaNews12-20-69.html>)

⁴² Peter Brook, *The Empty Space*, London; Penguin Books, 2008, p.11

⁴³ C. W. E. Bigsby, *A Critical Introduction to Twentieth Century American Drama – Beyond Broadway*; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1985, p.45

War and the 1960s in such a way. However, its significance lies in the way in which it broke through the tradition of musicals in which the story telling was formulaic and managed to bring a new style to the Broadway stage.

The importance of *Hair* can be gauged from its journey to Broadway – its development at Papp's Public Theatre and subsequent route to the Biltmore was unique at the time, though, in part due to *Hair*'s success, it has since become commonplace. The direction of Gerald Freedman in the original off-Broadway production at the Public did not inspire much support for the substance of the show, instead it appeared 'too closely linked to the meretricious conventions of American musicals.'⁴⁴ This, however, was the version that eventual producer Michael Butler saw, inspiring him to seek out Papp to discuss a transfer, and to subsequently fund the move. As a man with former political aspirations, Butler was well connected and when he saw *Hair* at the Public, he thought it was 'a musical about Indians,' his attention caught by the Native American imagery used.⁴⁵ Despite the initial misunderstandings, Butler felt a kinship to the show, himself harbouring anti-Vietnam War sentiments, and thought it was 'the strongest anti-war statement ever written,' so it seemed inevitable that he would take the show uptown.⁴⁶

Prior to moving to the Biltmore, *Hair* had a brief and disappointing residency at the Cheetah, a popular discotheque that housed Jimi Hendrix before he found fame and was attended by other prominent figures like Salvador Dali, giving it artistic credentials.⁴⁷ The Cheetah, though difficult to work in, sufficed until Butler was able to hire Tom O'Horgan,

⁴⁴ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.210; Robert Brustein, 'From Hair to Hamlet,' *The New Republic*, November 18, 1967 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NewRepublic11-18-67.html>)

⁴⁵ Josh Greenfield, 'The Man Who Gave Us Hair; How a Cool Loser became a Connection', *Life Magazine*, June 27, 1969, p.54; Eric Grode, *Hair; The Story of the Show That Defined a Generation*, London; Goodman, 2010, p.44

⁴⁶ Johnson, *Good Hair Days*, 2004, p.15

⁴⁷ Johnson, *Good Hair Days*, 2004, p.17; Steven Roby, Brad Schreiber, *Becoming Jimi Hendrix: From Southern Crossroads to Psychedelic London, the Untold Story of a Musical Genius*, Cambridge; De Capo Press, 2010, p.144

the director Rado and Ragni initially requested, to direct the new show for Broadway.⁴⁸ The eventual Broadway production drew on O'Horgan's experience in the Open Theatre becoming a piece of theatre that was more radical than other Broadway shows offered as the Open Theatre diverged from what was mainstream at the time by highlighting the fissures in society instead of presenting an idealised vision world.⁴⁹ The radicality of *Hair* may be scrutinised when considering it was a show within the mainstream institutions despite the insistence of those involved that it was not, yet the journey of the show – from the Public to the Biltmore – could suggest that there was radical credibility at the birth of the production.

Before *Hair* made waves on the New York stage, guerrilla performers, such as The San Francisco Mime Troupe on the West Coast, took to the streets to create grass root performances that were the antithesis of the Broadway style. Defined by their anti-theatrical stance, guerrilla street performers saw their work as protest over theatre, playing amongst crowds instead of defined performance spaces.⁵⁰ The works of guerrilla performers may have altered the style of *Hair*. Instead of focussing on entertaining an audience, street performance drew the audience into the action, as *Hair* did when actors would spread into the auditorium, breaking the fourth wall. Where in traditional theatrical performances an audience chooses to view the work, the protest of The San Francisco Mime Troupe was instead a venture into real life art that may appear more visceral than seeing a performance in the box of a stage, in the vein of Brecht's Epic Theatre.⁵¹ 'Epic Theatre' constitutes a style that tries to stir reason over feeling, relying on the removal of theatrical conventions to instead make a piece of work that

⁴⁸ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.210

⁴⁹ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.210; Carol Martin, 'The Open Theatre's The Serpent, Terminal, and the Mutation Show' in James M Harding, Cindy Rosenthal (eds). *Restaging the Sixties; Radical Theaters and Their Legacies*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2006, p.80

⁵⁰ Nora M. Alter, *Vietnam Protest Theatre; The Television War on Stage*, Bloomington; University of Indiana Press, 1996, p.6

⁵¹ Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre; The Development of An Aesthetic*, London; Methuen & Co, 1964, p.23

would inspire thought instead of emotions.⁵² *Hair* had subtle aspects of Epic Theatre influence in it by forgoing the traditional book musical style, and it also arguably tried to emulate this street work in its own performances – the hippies in the show performed for both the audience in the theatre and the audience in their own world, blending the street spectacle of draft card burning with its story telling in the theatre. It is interesting to note that The San Francisco Mime Troupe in 1969 came out against the commercialism of rock and culture in the late Sixties, like the popularity of *Hair*, arguing that the cultural changes in society became more of a fashion statement than a societal shift, dismissing any claim to radical theatrics that the show may have had as mere commercialism, relying on ticket sales instead of art.⁵³

On the other side of fringe performance, groups like the Bread and Puppet Theater Company, founded in New York City in the early Sixties, redefined performance and protest by presenting radical shows, creating puppets that towered over crowds to enhance their works.⁵⁴ The shows presented by the Bread and Puppet had ‘no surface, they [were] all depth,’ becoming performances that replaced story with simple spectacles, an oxymoron that befits the character of the company where emotions took precedence.⁵⁵ The larger than life puppets used by the company created a world that was both fictional and real; spectators were encouraged to become involved in the performance simply because the performance was so separate from reality.⁵⁶ The company further encouraged the audience to become part of the

⁵² Ibid

⁵³ Susan V. Mason, ‘San Francisco Mime Troupe Legacy; Guerrilla Theater’ in James M. Harding, Cindy Rosenthal (eds.) *Restaging the Sixties; Radical Theaters and Their Legacies*, Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press, 2006, p.201

⁵⁴ Gerald Bordman, Thomas S. Hischak, *The Oxford Companion to American Theatre*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2004, p.91; Interestingly, the puppets were so popular in the New York scene that even the 1979 film version of *Hair* included them in the background of a scene, despite its absence of other important cultural parts of the Sixties.

⁵⁵ Stefan Brecht, ‘A Poor Theatre’ *The Drama Review; TDR*, vol. 14, No. 3 (1970), The MIT Press, p.90

⁵⁶ Theodore Shank, *Beyond the Boundaries: American Alternative Theatre*, Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press, 2002, p.112

story by sharing bread with them at the end of performances, creating a temporary community within the vicinity of the shows.⁵⁷ The shows were created not for commercialism, but instead to create something meaningful – in fact puppeteers for the Bread and Puppet were only paid for a short period of time in 1969/70, instead volunteering their time in the periods before and after.⁵⁸ By ensuring that their productions did not become commodities, the company nurtured the feeling of revolution and radicalism within its shows, something that *Hair* did not have when it opened at either the Public or the Bitlmore. The sense of community created by the Bread and Puppet however was emulated in productions of *Hair* as the fourth wall broke and actors interacted with the audience as equals at multiple points throughout the show.

Beyond fringe theatre troupes, possibly the most radical performances came out of the Black Arts Movement, founded by Amiri Baraka – then known as LeRoi Jones. The works of the Black Arts Movement incorporated large bodies of work and involved much more than theatre, yet Movement's work emphasised the idea of African Americans playing a role within American society as an 'other,' functioning to 'construct and confront racial categories.'⁵⁹ Whilst the concept of role-playing and subsequent refusal to assimilate and deny African American cultural experiences was beyond anything within *Hair*, the differences are also important to note. The work of the Black Arts Movement will be discussed at greater length within the analysis of race, however it would be amiss to discuss radicalism and fringe theatre outside of Broadway without an awareness of the cultural shift that was occurring in Black communities across America.

⁵⁷ Ibid

⁵⁸ Barry Goldensohn, 'Peter Schumann's Bread and Puppet Theater', *The Iowa Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1977) p.78

⁵⁹ Harry J. Elam, Jr., 'The Black Performer and the Performance of Blackness; *The Escape; or, A Leap to Freedom* by William Wells Brown and *No Place To Be Somebody* by Charles Gordone' in David Krasner, Harry Justin Elam (eds.) *African-American Performance and Theater History: A Critical Reader*, New York; Oxford University Press, 2001, p.288

One of the most important Off-Broadway groups for the development of *Hair* was the Open Theatre, which was home to Tom O'Horgan and Gerome Ragni. Founded in 1963 and disbanded a mere decade later, the Open Theatre presented *Viet Rock* in May 1966, a largely improvised play that Ragni was involved in.⁶⁰ *Viet Rock* was not only the first prominent antiwar play, but it was also one of the first pieces of fiction to question the purpose of the war, utilising satire and comedy to soften the more sorrowful undercurrent of the events happening on stage and in real life.⁶¹ The loose story follows a group of men who were deployed in Vietnam interspersed with other relevant skits, for example, the end of the first act has a scene in which an array of characters are interviewed by interchangeable senators, questioning their response to the war.

The comparisons between *Hair* and *Viet Rock* are easy to make in terms of content, however *Hair* covered a broader perspective of actions within the United States in the Sixties, underpinned by the Vietnam War, whereas *Viet Rock* took place in the jungles, therefore losing some of its effectiveness as the characters are removed from American society.⁶² The similarities between the two can be seen in the roll call scene in the Trip Scene in the second act of *Hair*, in which each male tribe member jumps from a helicopter and talks about their worries which is very like a scene in the first act of *Viet Rock*, in which 'the GIs say their lines to the audience as they float down to earth' after parachuting out of a plane into the actual jungle.⁶³ The fact that the bulk of the action happened in Vietnam in *Viet Rock* did not, however, mean that other issues were ignored within the show, they occurred instead in more subtle ways. Throughout the show, the GIs soldiers are referred to as 'Girlies,' challenging

⁶⁰ Shank, *Beyond the Boundaries*, 2002, p.38; Megan Terry, *Viet Rock; A Folk War Movie*, The Tulane Drama Review, Vol. 11, No.1 (Autumn 1966)

⁶¹ Alter, *Vietnam Protest Theatre*, 1996, p.5; Terry, *Viet Rock*, 1966, p.197

⁶² Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.181

⁶³ Rado; Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.69; Terry, *Viet Rock*, 1966, p.205

the image of a soldier's masculinity which again was questioned in *Hair*.⁶⁴ There were parallels drawn between Vietnam and the American treatment of Native Americans, when the Sergeant asks war protesters if they had 'forgotten the Indian Wars already,' comparing the Vietnamese to Indians.⁶⁵ These parallels were less explicitly shown than they were in *Hair*, and may have become lost in the improvisational, radical texture of the show, a style that meant that *Viet Rock* was not popularised as an introduction to protest, its audience reduced in size as a result.

What differentiated *Hair* from *Viet Rock* was commercial appeal and context – in 1966, anti-war sentiment was not as prevalent as it was a mere two years later, which meant that its audience was smaller than *Hair*'s was, as its premiere in 1968 came when the Vietnam War started to affect the conscience of American citizens.⁶⁶ The fact that *Viet Rock* did not make the transition uptown may also be attributed to the style of the show; more deeply rooted in the alternative scene, the Open Theatre production had even fewer defined characters than *Hair*, relying more on the imagination of the audience. This was the intention of Joseph Chaikin, the founder of the Open Theatre, as he preferred 'theatrical expression' to realism, following the Brechtian thought in which an audience has to be removed from a piece of theatre to actually gain anything from it and has to be shown the nature of society rather than shielded from it.⁶⁷

As *Hair* would be later, *Viet Rock* was heavily influenced by the styles of the creative minds of the Café La Mama experimental group of which the Open Theatre was an offshoot, encouraging new acting styles and a form of togetherness between performers that would

⁶⁴ Ibid, p.202

⁶⁵ Ibid p.23

⁶⁶ Gerard J. De Groot, *A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War*, New York; Longman, 2000, p.288; Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States, 1492 – Present*, New York; Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2005, p.483

⁶⁷ Shank, *Beyond Boundaries*, 2002, p.38; Brecht, *Brecht On Theatre*, 1964, p.275

define the Tribal relationships in *Hair*. The piece was created entirely through the work of the actors involved and their emotional responses to war, forming a theatrical event that relied heavily on the relationships between those performing it, instead of the support of set pieces and costume.⁶⁸ What may be considered the downfall of this method, however, was the setting: actors removed from war were playing soldiers and improvising what that might have felt like, drawing on no experience. In contrast, in *Hair* young actors were improvising and acting out the scenes that were occurring in the streets around them every day, from source material based around what was happening in New York City at the time.

It is difficult to gauge the lasting effects of a theatrical production – one can visualise the immediate reaction of an audience, but the continuing impact of a show on an audience may never be understood. *Hair* was seen by middle class theatre audiences, the people it rallies against who may have enjoyed a night at the theatre but then voted for Nixon and a continuation of war. Mark Steyn suggested that the *Hair* style of musical meant that the audience could ‘feel good about feeling bad,’ the parents of the baby boomers could see the show as their acknowledgement of the ‘hippie’ strife to assuage the youths in their life when they return to conservative views.⁶⁹ This would mean that the emotive immediate reaction would subside and they would return to the lifestyle that exacerbated the generational gap. The show also failed to represent the conservative youth of America, highlighting the countercultural experience of the time.

Although most known for its association with civil rights movements and a liberal counter culture, there was a shift towards right leaning conservatism in the Sixties. In the beginning of the decade, Republicans had suffered in elections, both nationally and at a state

⁶⁸ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.179

⁶⁹ Mark Steyn, *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight; Musicals Then and Now*, London; Faber and Faber, 1997, p.211

level, as the charismatic John F. Kennedy invigorated Democrats.⁷⁰ By the end of the decade, Richard Nixon was president and in some parts of the country, evangelical Christianity was on the rise, indicating that the social changes had caused a backlash.⁷¹ The rise in Christianity and a desire for ‘family values’ would shape the American political climate for decades afterwards as the counter culture faded into the past, something that would not have been predicted by the countercultural characters in *Hair*. It may be because of this that the show retains its relevance – the ideal world of the hippies did not have the opportunity to take root and therefore the hope for change still seems thrilling.

It is important to analyse the value of culture in society to understand why a study of a piece of theatre like *Hair* is useful. Culture as an industry responds to the demands of its audiences – a piece of art is unlikely to succeed without a desired audience for it. Adorno has referred to the culture industry as ‘a moment of the spirit which dominates today,’ therefore works produced reflect the time they are made.⁷² It is therefore evident that by being a successful show and permeating popular culture – through billboard charts, Broadway grosses and touring productions – *Hair* was a response to the cultural climate, and subsequent references to the show were confirmation of the effectiveness of this.

The theatrical context and journey of *Hair* made it unique at the time of its opening as a performance, but it was the content that brought the show to mainstream attention and notoriety. In the following chapters, the themes of national identity, race and sexuality in the show will be analysed for the way in which they both reflected and shaped American society, whilst still drawing on the parallels and divergences of *Hair* from the other shows presented on the New York stage, both historically and contemporaneously.

⁷⁰ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors; The Origins of the New American Right*, Princeton; Princeton University Press, 2001, p.67

⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.242

⁷² Theodor W. Adorno; Anson G. Rabinbach, ‘Culture Industry Reconsidered’ in *New German Critique*, No. 6 (Autumn, 1975) p.15

CHAPTER ONE: NATIONAL IDENTITY

Hair brought attention to many of the issues presented by the American 1960s. One key theme in the musical is the disillusionment of young Americans, their anxieties about their place as citizens within the nation, and their opposition to the war in Vietnam. These issues will be discussed in this chapter as national identity is evaluated in relation to its representation in *Hair*. First, an analysis of the place of *Hair* within the context of other Broadway shows that ran concurrently with similar thematic plot points is essential to understand the impact of and reaction to the show. Second, an analysis of the youthful disillusionment and generation gap as presented on stage will give an insight into what made audiences, although largely older, connect with the show and the characters within it. Third, the matter of patriotism and conflicting ideas of national identity will be viewed through the lens of Cold War paranoia about Vietnam and beyond.

There was a generational gap in the 1960s as baby boomers, those born in the twenty years after the Second World War, were given 'delayed acceptance of their adulthood' and adults were '[confused] about the social role of the adolescent,' leading to clashes as society divided by age.⁷³ The environment in which these children of the post-war age grew up was one shaped by the affluence of the decade: they enjoyed the birth of television, suburbia and the freedoms granted by university.⁷⁴ The culture of teenagers, much different from that of their parents and the generations before, was also influenced and enabled by social upheavals like the Civil Rights Movement and the sexual revolution, which became both paths to freedom and causes of anxiety.⁷⁵ The young people that would become the 'hippies' were presented with conflicting views of what it meant to be American, about what was expected

⁷³ Fred Milson, *Youth in a Changing Society*, London; Routledge, 1972, p. 35

⁷⁴ Adam Garfinkle, *Telltale Hearts; The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement*, London; Macmillan Press, 1995, p. 46

⁷⁵ *Ibid* p.8

of them, and what it meant to be a hero in the decades after World War II, a confusion exacerbated by the perceived gap between themselves and their parents. The result of this combination of factors was a shifting culture inspired and created by the youth, one that is shown in *Hair*.

It is important to put the content of *Hair* into the context of the rest of the Broadway season, which involved two other musicals that dealt with similar thematic issues of national identity and history and opened shortly after *Hair* – *1776* and *Maggie Flynn*. The season pinpointed the end of the reign of pure book musicals like *Oklahoma!*, which opened on 31 March 1943 and presented a nostalgic view of the American past that stylistically influenced Broadway for years afterwards.⁷⁶ Shows like *Oklahoma!* provided an escape from the fear of World War II, for example, whereas *Hair* presented the social fissures created by such conflict – war, youthful disillusionment, alienation from the national mainstream – for all to see and immerse themselves in.⁷⁷

The comparison between the style of *Hair* and the style of *Oklahoma!* is useful to examine more closely, as despite the fact that the two ‘[have] the same internal engine,’ the difference between the musicals that defined their period of Broadway is great.⁷⁸ Rosenberg and Ernest Harburg suggest that shows such as *Oklahoma!* ‘begot and nourished Americana,’ implying that the show encouraged a sense of pride in American history and society that continued largely throughout the Broadway period leading up to the rise of rock musicals like *Hair*.⁷⁹ Whilst in the opening number, *Oklahoma!*’s Curly sings ‘Oh What a Beautiful Morning,’ praising his home land, *Hair*’s hippies welcome in a new age of ‘Aquarius,’ a shift

⁷⁶ Mark Steyn, *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight; Musicals then and now*, London; Faber and Faber, 1997, p. 180

⁷⁷ Richard Traubner, *Operetta; A Theatrical History*, New York; Routledge, 2003, p. 401

⁷⁸ Steyn, *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight*, 1997, p.125

⁷⁹ Bernard Rosenberg; Ernest Harburg, *The Broadway Musical; Collaboration in Commerce and Art*, New York; New York University Press, 1993, p. 173

that would fundamentally change the way society functions, distancing themselves from an American past that was not aligned with their ideological future.⁸⁰ Despite the changes to musicals *Hair* introduced, the Americana style was kept afloat in shows like *1776*, and is consequently important to understand the dynamics of this style.⁸¹

The musical *1776* opened on Broadway in March 1969, almost a whole year after the debut of *Hair*.⁸² *1776* revolved around the lead up to the signing of the Declaration of Independence, with a focus on the relationships between the Founding Fathers and the newly developing idea of America as a nation state. The relevance of *1776* to how *Hair* dealt with national identity and citizenship derives from the fact that *1776* followed the trend of providing heroic representations of American national figures – the Founding Fathers, though flawed, were still idolised, whereas in *Hair* they were questioned, lampooned and made into figures of scorn. *1776* also took a different approach to the medium of musical theatre; there were no chorus girls or dance numbers and the subject matter was presented in a serious manner in contrast to *Hair*, in which the whole show could almost be seen as a dance number and the serious matters were viewed in a more satirical way.

Near the end of *1776*'s second act, John Adams questions 'Is Anybody There?' expressing his discontent with the pace at which the battle for independence is moving. Yet he still maintains a belief that he can in the future: 'see the bells ringing out/[he] hear[s] the cannons roar/[he] see[s] Americans – all Americans/free forever more.'⁸³ In the world of *1776*, America was 'great' from the outset, founded on the pure belief in American exceptionalism in which those who oppose this foundation of idealism were eventually convinced of the cause. This questioning of the future presented in *1776* can be directly

⁸⁰ Oscar Hammerstein II; Richard Rogers, *Oklahoma!*, 1943 ; Rado; Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 6

⁸¹ Rosenberg, Harburg, *The Broadway Musical*, 1993, p. 173

⁸² IDBd, <http://ibdb.com/production.php?id=2859> accessed 12/02/15

⁸³ Peter Stone, *1776*, Music Theatre International, 1968, p. 106

contrasted to Claude's lament at the end of *Hair*'s first act, 'Where Do I Go?' in which he wonders if anyone would 'tell [him] why, tell [him] where?'⁸⁴ The differences between the two songs are telling of the visions of national identity presented in both musicals. Whereas *Hair* presents a picture of an American youth discontent with their country, *1776* presents a group, though disconnected from the contemporary way of life, forging their own great identity with almost two centuries of hindsight as proof. The rhetorical questions posed in these two songs allow the audience to interact with the concepts presented – they are not the passive observers in these cases and are instead confronted with the dilemmas of the characters. Instead of simply suspending disbelief, a theatre audience is 'enveloped in light and sound and movement' and in the case of *1776*, they are surrounded by events of their own history with the comfort that historical distance provides, whereas in *Hair* the audience is asked to question current affairs and the nature of contemporary identities.⁸⁵

Whilst *Hair* may have marked a transition from the Americana appeal of *Oklahoma!* and *1776*, it was *1776* that won the Tony Award for best musical over *Hair* in 1969. To win a Tony award is one of the biggest indicators of popularity and presence in the world of Broadway, which suggests that *1776* may have been more popular with the American Theatre Wing – the body that decides the winners – however this was not entirely telling of the popular support for the musical. *1776* ran for 1,217 performances, falling short of *Hairs'* 1,750, but still enjoyed reasonable success at the time, even being adapted into a 1972 film of the same name.⁸⁶ The success of the musical, however, mostly waned after the film was released and the original Broadway run closed, rarely being revived for the contemporary stage, which is indicative of the relative decline of the traditional type of musical and

⁸⁴ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.58

⁸⁵ Rosenberg; Harburg, *The Broadway Musical*, 1993, p. 173

⁸⁶ IBDD, <http://ibdb.com/production.php?id=2859> accessed 12/02/15; IBDD, <http://ibdb.com/production.php?id=3393> accessed 12/02/15

representation of American history when compared to the success of *Hair* in the twenty first century, indicated by the well-regarded Broadway revival in 2009.⁸⁷ That *Hair* tapped into the zeitgeist of the 1960s, and continues to be regarded as relevant to contemporary societal issues, is part of its long term success that surpasses the appeal *1776* had.

What may have caused the decline in popularity for *1776* is the fact that it was about American history, placed simply into one moment in time and presented in a way that was fitting to its contemporary culture and historiographical views. Frank Furedi suggests that ‘those who plunder the past are seeking authority and legitimacy for their actions,’ so by revisiting the founding of the United States, *1776* can be read to be reaffirming American actions in a time when societal upheavals meant that the past and foundations of the country were being questioned.⁸⁸ Whilst *1776* presented a concentrated image of a specific group of people during a very unique time, *Hair* questioned images of history in a broader way, enabling its impact to adapt to problems of audiences beyond the 1960s and into times in which society is being scrutinised.

Another show to emerge from the same Broadway season and subsequently fall into the annals of musical history was *Maggie Flynn*, which opened on 23 October 1968, after *Hair* and before *1776*.⁸⁹ The production only ran for 82 performances and 6 previews, failing to get either critical or popular support.⁹⁰ The show was set around the time of 1863 New York Draft Riots and was based on the lives of Irish immigrants to New York. Described as ‘the first anti-protest musical,’ the undertones of the show suggested that even ‘the most necessary social unrest is heinous anarchy,’ so its relationship with the American past was

⁸⁷ Ben Brantley, ‘A Frizzy, Fizzy Welcome to the Untamed ‘60s,’ *The New York Times*, March 31, 2009 (accessed 05/02/2015 via [nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com),

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/01/theater/reviews/01hair.html?pagewanted=all>)

⁸⁸ Frank Furedi, *Mythical Past, Elusive Future; History and Society in an Anxious Age*, London; Pluto Press, 1993, p. 6

⁸⁹ IBDD, <http://ibdb.com/production.php?id=3429> accessed 12/02/15

⁹⁰ Ibid

one that coincided with the idea of America as a beacon of greatness, and was diametrically opposed to *Hair*'s suggestion that America had the opportunity for greatness but had yet to reach the heights.⁹¹ *Maggie Flynn* was described in previews as 'The Sound of Music in blackface,' with a similar intended audience and theme, having traditional family values at the core of both shows, yet *Maggie Flynn* failed to adapt to the contemporary tastes.⁹² Luigi Creatore, the librettist, was told by Broadway businessmen to see *Hair*, as that was what audiences wanted instead of his love story; he responded that 'it wasn't our style,' indicating his possible lack of faith in the viability of a show similar in style to that of *Hair*.⁹³ The content of the show had the potential to align with the audience for *Hair* – the question of national identity and unpopular draft measures presented in both, but Creatore's conviction that traditional Broadway styles were still pertinent to the post-Aquarian age led to its downfall. The show 'disappeared with barely a trace' despite its efforts to 'give an old, old, old-fashioned musical contemporary relevance,' which served to show how the mere subject of turbulent historical moments did not ensure cultural popularity – if *Hair* been a traditional book musical like *Maggie Flynn*, it may have been as equally badly received.⁹⁴

As 1960s culture changed so rapidly and both the shape and public opinion of the Vietnam War altered from day to day, *Hair* fast became a snapshot of history even in its own time. By contextualising *Hair*'s place within one season, the pattern and influence of the musical becomes evident. *Maggie Flynn* opened to an audience that was searching for *Hair* and not romanticised history while *1776* opened to an audience conditioned to seeing history on stage in a way that subverted traditional historical images. John McGrath posited that theatre is the place where 'the life of a society is shown in public to that society,' so where

⁹¹ John Simon, *Living Theatre or Twitching Corpse*, New York Magazine, November 11, 1968, p. 54

⁹² Lawrence DeVine, *The Perils of 'Maggie'*, New York Magazine, October 14, 1968, p.54

⁹³ Ibid

⁹⁴ Steven Suskin, 'On The Record: Maggie Flynn, and Solo Albums from Ann Hampton Callaway and Jill O'Hara,' *Playbill*, March 1, 2009 (accessed 06/02/2015 on [playbill.com](http://www.playbill.com), <http://www.playbill.com/article/on-the-record-maggie-flynn-and-solo-albums-from-ann-hampton-callaway-and-jill-ohara-com-158439>)

Maggie Flynn showed a human love story and *1776* one of true belief in American exceptionalism, *Hair* showed one of turbulence and disruption and proved to be more popular, pervading popular culture after opening.⁹⁵

Hair depicted a world in which the characters were drifting away from the plans their parents and figures of authority had for them into a society of their own creation as a ‘Tribe.’ This lifestyle, however, was not universally praised. Instead, its viability was questioned, most prominently when the character Claude reads from one of his newspaper clippings that he was in ‘the age where it’s more fun than ever to be young,’ which he responded to by suggesting instead that it was ‘the age where it’s more fun than ever to be stoned,’ showing the differences between societal images of youthful experience and the reality of it.⁹⁶ The relationship between generations is most clearly represented in the figures of Claude’s parents, who on Broadway were played simultaneously by three different actors each, turning a single family unit into a chorus as their sentiments are echoed, implying that the opinions of Claude’s parents are repeated throughout the country.⁹⁷ His parents clearly care about him, yet the division between the two parties appears to the characters to be insurmountable, sentiments that were echoed with the droves of youths dropping away from the structure their parents had chosen for them, shown by a fifty year low point percentage of young adults living with their parents by 1970.⁹⁸ This move from the parental home was caused by many factors, including increased enrolment in college, availability of jobs and societal freedom, yet in the years following, the percentage turned the other direction, suggesting that the era was an anomaly

⁹⁵ John McGrath, *A Good Night Out; Popular Theatre: Audience, Class and Form*, London: Nick Herm Books, 1996, p. 83

⁹⁶ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 22

⁹⁷ Ibid p.2

⁹⁸ US Bureau of the Census, *Young Adults Living At Home: 1960 to Present*, census.gov, September 15 2004

In their generational studies, William Strauss and Neil Howe suggest that it is the environment one grows up in that affects their outlook as young adults.⁹⁹ The parents of the baby boomer generation faced a post-war world in which their offspring were the symbols of the fertility of the American Dream and the boomers relished in the indulgence of the age. The Cold War ideologies pervaded family life as for men, having children was ‘a new badge of masculinity and meaning,’ and for women becoming a mother was ‘the ultimate fulfilment of female sexuality,’ creating an environment in which the ability to raise patriotic, American children was the pinnacle of family life.¹⁰⁰ When sections of the youth of America refused to fight for their country and instead fought against what authorities figures told them to do, they appeared unpatriotic, the antithesis of what an atomic age child should have been. The dismantling of the family unit during the 1960s, therefore, could have been viewed by parents as a failure to live up to the standards set by the society they came of age in. This relationship created tensions within families that are shown within *Hair*, where his mother asks Claude what he wants to be, ‘besides dishevelled,’ wondering how long she has to support him for.¹⁰¹ Here, Claude’s mother and father are searching for a future for their son as much as he is, despite a ‘nearly pathological passivity’ of the changes in the shape of society.¹⁰² The show deconstructed the ideal Cold War family and presented the conflicting visions the baby boomers and their parents had of the future of society, where the young were forging their own kind of relationships beyond the security of contained familial units.¹⁰³

Claude's parents are the archetypal suburban dwellers – his mother is seen vacuuming the floor, his father reads his newspaper, unsympathetic to Claude’s lifestyle and maintaining

⁹⁹ Neil Howe, William Strauss, ‘The Next 20 Years: How Customer and Workforce Attitudes Will Evolve,’ *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 2007, p.48

¹⁰⁰ Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound; American Families in the Cold War Era*, New York; Basic Books, 1988 p. 146 & 140

¹⁰¹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.24

¹⁰² Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture*, 1969, p.22

¹⁰³ May, *Homeward Bound*, 1988 p. 221

status quo – living a middle class life that may seem mundane to the younger generations who were promised so much from this prosperous period. In the decade, newly suburban housewives were increasingly diagnosed with ‘suburban neurosis,’ unhappy with the isolation they felt in outer city environments.¹⁰⁴ This condition of middle-aged housewives would affect the younger generations too as they sought alternative ways of living, desperate to not turn into their parents. In *Hair* during Claude’s trip scene in which new soldiers are dropped out of a helicopter into the war zone, one says: ‘I don’t want to be anything, especially a housewife with kids,’ only to be told that he wouldn’t be.¹⁰⁵ This exchange may be indicative of the choice between following in the footsteps of the older generation and having a suburban lifestyle, or the life-threatening situation that war presented. There appeared here, in the darkness of Claude’s hallucination, no third option – he would either become his parents or die at war, his new society created by the Tribe cast as unsustainable. The fear presented in the world of *Hair* is arguably unfounded when taking into consideration the audience of the show. The generational gap represented in the show appeared as an insurmountable fissure, yet the fact that audiences were multi-generational suggests that there were more similarities than differences.

The relationship between Claude and his parents was a main feature of the show – their desire for their son to go to war and fight for his country contrasted with his moral opposition to the conflict. His parents want him to be ‘American,’ an idealised vision of their son – the soldier that would go to Vietnam, be killed, and finally make them proud.¹⁰⁶ Claude, on the other hand, has an obsession with being anything but American. When he introduces himself, he affects a northern English accent, singing about ‘Manchester England,

¹⁰⁴ Sue Middleton, *Disciplining Sexuality; Foucault, Life Histories and Education*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1998, p. 61

¹⁰⁵ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 69

¹⁰⁶ James Rado, Gerome Ragni, *Hair – The American Tribal Love Rock Musical*, New York; Pocket Books, 1968, p. 440

England,’ despite being reminded by the Tribe of his Flushing, Queens origins.¹⁰⁷ The fact that Claude is from Flushing could be a clue to his misaligned identity – it was an immigrant town that hosted the New York World’s Fair in 1964, a ‘dazzling spectacle’ that was described as ‘Utopian,’ championing a perfect future with the theme of ‘Peace Through Understanding.’¹⁰⁸ Claude would have seen the fair, or at least references to it, growing up in Flushing, and may have been taken in by the fantasy of this future, yet this ideal world failed to live up to expectations – the fair fell short of its anticipated numbers and the peaceful future promised seemed further and further away as America became more involved in the war in Vietnam and the Civil Rights struggle continued.¹⁰⁹ The visions of America presented by the fair, and the symbolic American son of his parents’ dreams, did not align with the world that Claude saw in the news and amongst his friends, so he chased a different identity in playing the Englishman. Disillusionment with the future is a major theme in Claude’s character arc: he is presented as a man who did not know what to do with his life, one ‘torn between fidelity to the Tribe and some misplaced sense of obedience.’¹¹⁰

The distance between Claude and his parents may have been indicative of the growing disparity between his expectations and reality, fuelling a fear of growing up. Barbara Horn suggested that the baby boom generation dropped out due to ‘a painful lack of love and genuine emotional interaction in the family’ a theme that is present within the musical.¹¹¹ In the titular song ‘Hair,’ Claude compared his familial ties with that of Jesus and his mother, asking that if Mary loved her son, ‘why don’t my mother love me.’¹¹² This question in the

¹⁰⁷ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 12

¹⁰⁸ Lisa L. Colangelo, ‘1964 World’s Fair: When the World Came to Queens,’ *The New York Daily News*, 2014, (accessed 03/12/2014 via *nydailynews.com*, <http://creative.nydailynews.com/worldsfair>)

¹⁰⁹ Joseph Tirella, *Tomorrow-Land: The 1964-65 World’s Fair and the Transformation of America*, Lanham; Rowman & Littlefield, 2013 p.270

¹¹⁰ Jill Dolan, *The Feminist Spectator in Action; Feminist Criticism for the Stage and Screen*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013, p. 162

¹¹¹ Horn, *The Age of Hair*, 1991, p. 5

¹¹² Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 39

midst of a light-hearted number highlighted the undertone of personal anguish that ran through the musical, stretching beyond the big issues that were protested on a larger scale and creating a more intimate association with the emotions presented. Echoing the sentiments in 'Hair,' the song 'I Got Life' is reactionary and can almost be read as a plea, as it sees Claude reassuring himself of his abilities after receiving his draft notice, differentiating himself from the soldier lifestyle and asserting his status as a human being. In being himself he is shrugging off the label of soldier and of an American, becoming instead a kind of neutral citizen, connected to the wider world through his English fantasies and attempts to connect to Native American lifestyles through his 'Tribe.' In the build up to the song, his parents asked 'what you got 1968... that makes you so superior...,' the response to which was that 1968 has 'life.'¹¹³ Claude empathises with his parents in the song, stating that he has 'headaches and toothaches and bad times too,' listing the physical aspects of the two sides of the divide that are the same, yet stating that he has 'crazy ways' and 'million dollar charm,' attributes that they do not appear to embrace. The contrasting needs of Claude and his Tribe and what his parental figures provide drove the action in *Hair* and shaped the way that the characters dealt with the problems they had been presented with – instead of a sense of safety within their familial units, the characters felt abandoned by the people they should have trusted.

Beyond Claude's parents, another family mentioned within the show is Jeanie's. Jeanie is a young girl who asked her parents for money to help, telling them she was pregnant, and was told to 'stay pregnant.'¹¹⁴ The fact that Jeanie is pregnant and a soon to be parent blurs the boundary between her and the older generations, having responsibilities beyond herself and lacking the support she needs as a future mother. Possibly because of the fact that she has been rejected by her family, Jeanie acts as a maternal figure for the Tribe,

¹¹³ Ibid, p.26

¹¹⁴ Ibid, p.20

taking the role of parent as she sits on the precipice of adulthood. She appears omniscient and distant, despite being deeply in the fold of the Tribe, and represents the parental figure that the Tribe members needed, despite her love for her friends being largely unrequited. The only positive reference to parents come from Woof, who loves 'all his fathers' and his 'big fat cab-driver mother.'¹¹⁵ That Woof referred to multiple people as his father implies that his mother was more similar to the hippies in her sexual and romantic relations, subscribing to a different vision of familial relationships to the parents of Claude or Jeanie and therefore more of an accepting figure in the life of her child than the others of her generation. Woof's love of his mother and 'fathers' is presented in a comedic manner, his character having the most open love for the people around him, creating a link between more liberal parenting styles and a light hearted approach to relationships.

Other adult figures within the show include a couple visiting New York on honeymoon, who stumble upon the Tribe and questions their ways of life. Although the couple is used as comic relief, the apparently genuine interest in the lives of the hippies is one of the most sympathetic moments involving adult figures. Whilst Off-Broadway the couple was played straight, in the Broadway production, the female figure, referred to by the Tribe as Margaret Mead, reveals that she has male genitalia when she opens her coat and is wearing nothing but jockey shorts.¹¹⁶ The couple are interested in the hippie lifestyle as 'outsiders,' and it is interesting that the female figure is called Mead as her namesake is a famous anthropologist whose work – studying the sexual patterns of tribes in Samoa and examining the 'repressive' way America dealt with adolescents– was translated into the production.¹¹⁷ The implication is that the Tribe of hippies is like any other tribe that was studied – separate from the rest of the country in their ways and worthy of researching. The Tribe creates their

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p.11

¹¹⁶ Ibid, p.41

¹¹⁷ Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality*, New York; Routledge, 2003, p. 15

own social order in terms of relationships, both platonic and sexual, shown near the end of the second act in which the hippies discuss who they are going to sleep with that night and allude to the changing sexual relationships within the group.¹¹⁸ ‘Casual sex’ became the subject of study within the 1960s, therefore the presence of a prominent anthropologist within the show combined with the Tribes’ open sexuality gives the audience permission to analyse the aspects of countercultural relationships in a defined way.¹¹⁹

In the song 'My Conviction,' Mead asks that members of the audience allow their children to 'be free, no guilt be whoever you are, do whatever you want to do, just as long as you don't hurt anybody,' a sentiment that contradicts the other adults in the show, possibly because as tourists they had less experience with the lifestyle of the hippies.¹²⁰ It can be suggested that Broadway audiences were also reflected in the couple, as their entrance involved them interrupting the show and walking to the stage through the auditorium, temporarily being one with the audience.¹²¹ This is a reversal of the action that the cast took when they broke the fourth wall and interacted with the audience, something that happened throughout the show, so it represented an exchange of ideals. *Hair* was described as ‘something safe,’ a way for the audiences to interact with the world of the hippies from the comfort of a Broadway theatre, their questions and thoughts voiced by the honeymooning couple.¹²² The couple also represent to an extent the ‘sense of shared insecurity between the old and young,’ with Mead’s revelation, and the secrecy surrounding it, narrowing the identity gap of the generations as both have problems with their place in the world.¹²³ As Mead opens her dress, she positions herself as an ‘other’ in comparison to both her husband

¹¹⁸ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 82

¹¹⁹ Barry Reay, ‘Promiscuous Intimacies: Rethinking the History of American Casual Sex,’ *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol. 27, March 2014, p. 2

¹²⁰ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 40

¹²¹ Ibid p. 35

¹²² Rockwell, *Long Hair?*, December 20, 1969

¹²³ Wilson, *A Look at Hair Six Years After*, September 20, 1974

and Claude's parents, aligning more with the hippies and hoping for a sense of trust between herself and the group as outsiders. In turn she puts trust in the audience as well, becoming another figure to draw them into the life of the hippies and the alternative. The couple leave the stage quite content with their encounter with the Tribe, as did Broadway audiences, having experienced a 'be-in' of their very own, guided through the world of the hippies by the protagonists.

Claude's parents and Margaret Mead were figures that the Tribe directly interacted with in the show during the real time run, whereas other figures of authority existed in the background of the main action. In Bergers' song 'Going Down' for example, his expulsion from school is acted out by the Tribe using props instead of the creation of separate characters. This suggests that figures in authority could be interchangeable – instead of relating to the audience as parents, or outside observers, teachers became more of an ethereal entity that deserved little empathy. This theme is repeated again during discussions of Claude's draft board visit, in which the unknown evaluators deemed him fit enough to go to Vietnam – an important moment that was relayed instead of shown in real time.¹²⁴ Further to this, when Sheila returns from the protest in which the hippies attempted to 'levitate the Pentagon,' based on actual events in 1967, she describes how 'they tear-gassed [the protesters]' instead of the event being shown.¹²⁵ The 'Levitation of the Pentagon' was probably the most prominent moment of protest that separated the Sixties hippies from prior anti-war demonstrators, creating an original vision of youthful protest that was unique to its decade.¹²⁶ The fact that this moment of hope and spiritualism was broken up by troopers in a conservative, hawkish manner suggests that no one older could be trusted with the message of the antiwar movement. The absence of these figures of authority arguably makes their

¹²⁴ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.34

¹²⁵ Ibid p.42

¹²⁶ Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture*, 1969, pp.124-125

decisions more extreme – they are not human beings living by the rules and are instead mere obstacles to the hippie lifestyle. Teachers, troopers and draft board members are not a physical part of the story and they apparently deserve little of the Tribe’s attention, existing upstage or not at all.

Despite the fact that the older generations were presented as outsiders to the world the hippies inhabited, and therefore could be seen as the scornful ‘others’, the audience for *Hair* consisted of those that were being derided on stage.¹²⁷ The result could have been one of complete dismay and resentment for the show, yet as one reviewer put it, the audience ‘yielded easily to the mirror they were held up to view.’¹²⁸ As theatre is a public event, the historical meaning, social context and importance of the messages of shows are seen through the eyes of the audience, and the audience for *Hair* invested meaning into the show by watching it for its five year run.¹²⁹ The older generations listened to the messages presented, putting trust in the show that was called a ‘truer and fairer representation of hippiedom than anything the theatre has offered so far.’¹³⁰ It was a channel for youthful exuberance that many desired to embrace – Colette Dowling, a reviewer, said that she also wanted to be ‘flying forty feet through the air on a rope, a flower stuck behind [her] ear.’¹³¹ The sometimes unbridled zeal shown by the audience culminated in the finale that was instigated during the

¹²⁷ Marilyn Bender, ‘Hair – Topless, and No Bottoms, Either,’ *The New York Times*, April 28, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT4-28-68.html>)

¹²⁸ Coral Crosman, ‘Broadway Hit Stirs Public; Hair is Exciting,’ *Schenectady Union-Star*, May 18, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SchenUnSt5_18_68.html)

¹²⁹ McGrath, *A Good Night Out*, 1996, p. 83

¹³⁰ Henry Hewes, ‘The Theater of Shattered Focus,’ *Saturday Review*, January 13, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SaturdayReview1-13-68.html>)

¹³¹ Colette Dowling, ‘Hair – How a Small Time Musical from Lafayette Street Found Fame and Fortune on Broadway,’ *Playbill Magazine*, September 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Playbill9-68.html>)

West End production of the show in which the cast and audience held an impromptu dance party on stage, a moment that was then replicated in subsequent productions of the show.¹³²

As productions went on and the original Broadway run extended, the open casting sessions for the hippies involved increasingly younger actors, suggesting that the musical was one that the younger generation could relate to; they wanted to represent their peers on the Broadway stage and saw the show as part of something that would allow the hippies to be brought to life.¹³³ The open casting also meant that there was a greater opportunity for performers to audition from all walks of life, regardless of class, race and gender, creating a greater snapshot of the different type of people involved in and represented by the show. The value of *Hair* therefore can be seen in the fact that it provided a place for young performers to act out the events that were happening around them on the streets to an audience that was typically upper middle class who were paying to listen. This meant that the real life generational divide may not have been as widespread as the show suggests – as producers and audiences were putting their faith in young actors to carry the show they gave weight to the usefulness of a voice from that generation.

Perhaps the event that caused the deepest fissures between the young and the old was the Vietnam War– protests raged in the streets and college campuses and many young men burned their draft cards at the risk of imprisonment.¹³⁴ The shadow of Vietnam loomed over those eligible for the draft and by the time *Hair* opened Off-Broadway in 1967, there had been American intervention in country for twelve years, with ground troop numbers

¹³² Anthony Lewis, 'Londoners Cool To Hair's Nudity; Four letter Words Shock Few at Musical's Debut,' *The New York Times*, September 29, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT9-29-68.html>)

¹³³ Colette Dowling, 'Trusting the Kids and the Stars,' *Playbill Magazine*, May 1971 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Playbill5-71.html>)

¹³⁴ M. J. Heale, *The Sixties in America; History, Politics and Protest*, Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2001, p. 91

escalating from 1965.¹³⁵ The Vietnam War was different in nature to any that had come before it – it was a dirty and confusing war that dragged and was 'waiting to be forgotten even before it was over.'¹³⁶ The great battle against evil and against the clock, if the Domino Theory was to be believed, involved America as a 'protagonists in that most linear narrative' of a clear-cut moralistic battle.¹³⁷ The belief of America being the paragon of virtue led to escalations in the fight against communism and the new 'savages' in an Asian country that, to many, appeared a world away. It was a time in which the United States was trying to maintain its position as a superpower and continue the ideals of Manifest Destiny, the belief that the American system was inherently better, as riots and social disruptions at home called into question the viability of the American way.

The experience of the Vietnam War was entirely different to the wars faced by the older generations. For example, during World War II, most families had relatives fighting in the war, and it impacted all layers of society, unlike the Vietnam War in which those that fought were primarily working class.¹³⁸ This class division, as well as an increasing percentage of people in further education separating themselves from those with just a high school diploma meant that those that did fight in the war were those without the connections to remove themselves from the draft.¹³⁹ Within *Hair*, the male Tribe members lament the fact that they are 'all Vietnam bait,' a turn of phrase that ought to be further considered.¹⁴⁰ Youths felt that they were being sent to Vietnam purely as bait, and as reports came back that implied the action in Vietnam was largely about killing as many enemies as possible, this way of

¹³⁵ Karnow, *Vietnam – A History*, 1983, p.426

¹³⁶ Kristin Ann Hass, *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial*, Berkeley; University of California Press, 1998, p. 9

¹³⁷ Donald Ringnalda, *Fighting and Writing the Vietnam War*, Jackson; University Press of Mississippi, 1994, p. 194

¹³⁸ Christian Appy, 'A Working Class War' in Robert J. McMahon,(ed.) *Major Problems in the History of the Vietnam War*, Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003, p. 255 & 251

¹³⁹ Ibid, p. 258

¹⁴⁰ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 35

thinking was not absurd to the audience.¹⁴¹ The song 'Three-Five-Zero-Zero' is based on the poem *Wichita Vortex Sutra* by Allen Ginsberg, and discusses the concept of soldiers as bait and enemies as numbers, the title referring to the predicted number of Viet Cong killed in a month stated by a US general.¹⁴² The number became a celebration of death that culminated in a frenzied dance as the Tribe acts out their own deaths and rebirths, singing about how they would 'take weapons up and begin to kill.'¹⁴³ The song was performed in a manner that appeared to be a desperate plea – the Tribe was aware of consequences of the orders they were given and appeared to be driven to madness by the concept, the song culminating in staggered, jolted movements and the crescendo of noise, creating a musical war zone on the Broadway stage.

The war in Vietnam could be read as a modernised form of Westward expansion – taking historical American idealism and spreading further West to save an underdeveloped people from themselves, much like the effort to increase land space in America in the 19th century.¹⁴⁴ In this paradigm, the Viet Cong served as the equivalent of aggressive Native Americans and United States soldiers were the great heroic figures of days gone by who were mythologised by the films and television that the baby boom generation watched growing up.¹⁴⁵ The mythological saviour of Western Civilisation – portrayed by people like John Wayne – was a popular cultural trope where a Wayne like figure was someone to aspire to, embarking on a mission a great personal expense to fight the 'savage' other.¹⁴⁶ The saviour paradigm could become a shield behind which hawks could hide when the war was questioned by those at home – the myth manifested into actual life and death situations for all parties.

¹⁴¹ Appy, *A Working Class War*, 2003, p. 251

¹⁴² Grode, *Hair: The Story*, 2010, p.16

¹⁴³ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 77

¹⁴⁴ John Hellman, *American Myth and the Legacy of Vietnam*, New York; Columbia University Press, 1986 p.36

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 71

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid*

In *Hair*, the idea of war as being a 'noble cause' and a fight between 'good' and 'evil' was questioned on numerous occasions as characters held placards with phrases such as 'lay don't slay' and chanted slogans like 'what do we think is really great, to bomb lynch and segregate.'¹⁴⁷ This moralistic stand against the war paints it as one of colonial power in which America is seen to be taking advantage of its position as a pretender to the name of greatest nation. The idea that America was founded on noble principles and spreads this enlightenment across the world was questioned through repeated references to Native American culture – the hippies being referred to as a Tribe, combined with the aesthetics of beads and feathers, connected them with the culture. These references heavily imply that the country had destroyed groups of people before and seemed on the path to do it again if the war was not stopped.

Indeed, in the trip scene in the second act, the Tribe goes through a constant cycle of killing other groups of people, from monks being killed by nuns to the Viet Cong being killed by Native Americans, each group kills the next, and then the action is reversed and repeated, the death cycle continuing under flashing lights and loud percussion, all to prove the futility of war.¹⁴⁸ This retelling of history as just a repetition of the murder of different groups aligns with the idea that Vietnam is just a repeat of Manifest Destiny and the destruction wrought by Westward expansion while calling into question the morality of prior wars. The great leaders of American history were did not escape this revision of history either as people like General Washington, Ulysses S Grant and Abraham Lincoln also appear in the trip scene as inadequate leaders with no hope of winning. By re-imagining America's place in history as just one part of a cycle of destruction, *Hair* brought to the forefront the question of whether American society is the 'greatest,' or just the most destructive framed in a time when society

¹⁴⁷ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 17

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, p.76

had the 'anxious need to prove the toughness of the contemporary American character.'¹⁴⁹ As Daniel Ellsberg stated in the documentary *Hearts and Minds*, many Americans felt that they 'weren't on the wrong side,' but instead 'were the wrong side,' a sentiment that is present throughout the show.¹⁵⁰

The trip scene also features a recreation of the immolation of monks in the frenzy of death and murder, which was particularly poignant when viewed in the context of the handful American citizens who burned themselves to death to condemn United States action in Vietnam.¹⁵¹ By performing immolation at centre stage, Rado and Ragni recreated the strength of the emotion and the sacrifice that some people made in protest against the war, as well as the theatricality of such a death, despite the fact that most Americans ignored those actions.¹⁵² The public aspect of immolation was highlighted by the death of Norman Morrison, who in 1965 burnt himself outside of the Pentagon in view of McNamara's office, becoming a gruesome spectacle.¹⁵³ This type of protest would be in the minds of those seeing the show and the impact of such a spectacle is connected to the protests in the musical. Though the characters in the show did not go as far as making a martyr of themselves in that way to protest the war, it could be argued that Claude, in his eventual journey to Vietnam, became the martyr for the Tribe – the character leaves the group and enters the quagmire of war to fight for his country.

The Tribe's reaction to the war in Vietnam was not one of just moral opposition but also a reaction of self-preservation. After a visit to the induction centre, Claude says that he 'wants to be over here doing the things they're defending over there' and he is afraid of dying,

¹⁴⁹ Hellman, *American Myth*, 1986, p.51

¹⁵⁰ Peter Davis (Director) *Hearts and Minds*, 1974

¹⁵¹ Christian Appy, *Vietnam; The Definitive Oral History, Told From All Sides*, St. Ives; Ebury Press, 2008, p.150

¹⁵² Zinn, *A People's History*, 2005, p.486

¹⁵³ Appy, *Vietnam*, 2008, p.150

whereas Berger instead focuses on the fact that the soldiers 'rape and loot,' an apparently more fundamental anti-war stance in this situation than Claude has, despite the questionable relationships he has with women that will be expanded on in another chapter.¹⁵⁴ This fear, highlighted in 'Where Do I Go' and continued throughout the show, implies that the character is not inherently against the war like others, he is still torn between his loyalty to family and country and his ideals. For Claude, the thing he wanted most was to be 'invisible' and through his invisibility 'perform miracles,' it was through fear that he acted, and the fear of the piece was felt by the audience, despite the light-heartedness of the rest of the show.¹⁵⁵

The climax of the first Act involves the men of the tribe burning their draft cards, something that many Americans did despite the threat of a prison sentence for it. Of the Americans that did not go to Vietnam, an estimated sixty per cent claimed to have taken 'active steps' to ensure that they did not get called to war, purposely failing medical exams and influencing the outcome of their call in other ways.¹⁵⁶ When the men of the Tribe burn their cards to avoid the war, they do so in a ritualistic way with the use of incense, bells, and chanting, culminating in an infamous nude scene in the background as Claude sings 'Where Do I Go.' The song epitomises the dilemma faced by many of his generation – whilst his friends, his Tribe, are singing about 'beads, flowers, freedom, happiness,' Claude is wondering if he will discover the meaning behind both his life and the war.¹⁵⁷ Without their draft cards the males of the Tribe become one, naked to the world and ready for the consequences, whereas Claude is still bound by societal pressures at centre stage.

Within the trip scene in the second act, Claude's fears are once more made manifest as he hallucinates a roll call that culminates in Claude's parents fawning over a military suit

¹⁵⁴ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1966, p. 417

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 80; Dowling, *Hair – How a Small time Musical*, September 1968

¹⁵⁶ De Groot, *A Noble Cause?*, 2000, pp. 312

¹⁵⁷ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.56

on a clothes hanger, pretending it is their son, their pride both visible and audible.¹⁵⁸ This empty coat suggests that the parents do not see beyond the soldier, failing to acknowledge the desires of the son and instead hope for the chance to send their son to war. When Claude emerges at the climax of the show, shorn of the hair he loved so much and the identity he forged for himself, he has finally filled the role his parents wanted for him. In his military uniform, Claude tells his friends that ‘they got [him],’ ‘they’ being both the military and the enemy, unseen by the Tribe, a hidden malignant force.¹⁵⁹ He is destroyed by the war long before he gets sent to Vietnam as becoming a soldier removed the vitality and ‘life’ he sang about in the first act, both figuratively in the form of his separation from the Tribe he loved, and literally, as his time in Vietnam proved deadly. In the beginning of the show, Claude states that he is ‘human being number 100563297... just another number,’ and in the closing scene that is what he becomes – a statistic in the list of war casualties.¹⁶⁰

Beyond the nationalism brought about by the War, the American flag was a contentious object in an age of mass protest and antiwar demonstrations – simultaneously used as proof of ‘American-ness’ and a symbol of the broken promises of the United States, in 1968 a Federal Flag Desecration Law was passed prohibiting any insult to the flag.¹⁶¹ One of the most prominent cases of ‘flag desecration’ in the 1960s occurred in late 1968 when countercultural icon Abbie Hoffman donned an American flag shirt when testifying in front of the House Un-American Activities Committee.¹⁶² The arrest for flag desecration may have been spurred on more by Hoffman’s other protest activities rather than an isolated occurrence, yet the fact that he could be arrested for wearing the stars and stripes is indicative

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, p.76

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, p.87

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, p.12

¹⁶¹ Woden Teachout, *Capture the Flag; A Political History of American Patriotism*, New York; Basic Books, 2000, p.173; Michael Welch, *Flag Burning: Moral Panic and the Criminalization of Protest*, New York; Walter de Gruyter, Inc., 2000 p.53

¹⁶² Marty Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman; American Rebel*, New Brunswick; Rutgers University Press, 1993, pp.186

of the society in which *Hair* existed, having opened mere months prior. In the Second Act of *Hair*, Woof is cradled in the flag, a use of the patriotic imagery that shocked some. The scene occurs before the song ‘Don’t Put it Down’, which satirizes the way the flag is viewed in America as the tribe sing that they are ‘crazy for the red white and blue.’¹⁶³ The satirical tone of the song is maintained as the Tribe ceremoniously folded the flag in ‘the proper military manner,’¹⁶⁴ showing reverence to it whilst mocking it. The flag provides both comfort by way of rocking Woof and an omen – the flag draped coffins returning from Vietnam could just as easily be occupied by the male members of the Tribe as anyone.

The ‘flag scene’ became controversial, the line between respect and desecration apparently thin – one reviewer stated that ‘the sacred rules concerning the flag [were] not broken,’¹⁶⁵ whereas others suggested the scene desecrated the flag.¹⁶⁶ A touring production in Boston in 1970 was met with dismay as the city censor, Richard J. Sinnott, suggested that the scene with the flag was un-American and that the United States ought to ‘[bring] back the stocks and horsewhips for anyone who abuses the American flag.’¹⁶⁷ The treatment of the flag, and the reactions to this treatment of the flag, vindicate the content of the show – Americans were apparently ‘crazy for the red white and blue,’ ruminating more on the patriotism surrounding the flag than the other issues presented in the show.

Hair arguably captured a moment in American history in which the generational gap was at its most prominent, yet the audiences embracing the show is indicative of the adaptability of both generations. Whilst the young people in the show lamented the fact that

¹⁶³ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.50

¹⁶⁴ Ibid

¹⁶⁵ Crosman, *Broadway Hit Stirs Public*, May 18, 1968

¹⁶⁶ William F. Buckley, ‘Broadway Review,’ *The National Review*, May 21, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NationalReview5-21-68.html>)

¹⁶⁷ Guy Livingston, ‘Nudity and Flag ‘Desecration’ Figure in Appeal Against *Hair* in Foldo in Hub,’ *Variety*, April 15 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Variety4-15-70.html>)

their parents were not listening to their protests, parents in the audience thrilled at seeing hippies on stage. Though many reviewers and audience members bridged the generational gap implicitly by attending, the controversy that followed the show around – for example, the issues in Boston discussed in this chapter and in further detail in chapter three – is a reminder of the differing opinions of those that did not see the show and evidence that there were still people in positions of authority that disagreed with the message of the show. *Hair* created its own history with an alternative vision of the past viewed through the lens of contemporary issues, altering what would have been the accepted narrative. The Vietnam War and what that meant for the character of American society was discussed in the show, becoming a focal point of the hippie life and its protest points. Members of the Tribe in *Hair* were moved by their allegiance to their country whilst at the same time torn by what that allegiance meant for their morals and ideals, representing a disillusioned youth that adult audiences accepted in droves. The character of America overlaps with one of the major issues of the early twentieth-century – race relations. In the decade of the Civil Rights movement, an analysis of race relations in the Sixties and *Hair* are vital and will occur in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO: RACE

Possibly the most contentious part of the Sixties was the Civil Rights Movement, which brought race relations to the forefront of American minds. In *Hair*, issues of race were highlighted in terms of the experience of African Americans whilst Native American culture was utilised as a symbol of 'real America,' and the stereotype of Vietnamese 'Gooks' was lampooned. First an analysis of race and performance is necessary to gauge the effect of *Hair* on the Broadway stage. Second, the advertising and production of the show brought in racial elements that are vital to an evaluation of the show. Third, the context of race in the 1960s and the representations in *Hair* enable an examination of the reasoning behind decisions of the characters. Fourth, Vietnam once more becomes a major aspect of the theme as racial inequalities are highlighted by reactions to the war.

To understand race on Broadway and the references made within *Hair*, the context of race on stage has to be drawn from the early days of American performance, stretching from Minstrelsy to Mammies before analysing Broadway musicals. This history of race and culture shapes the way that the black militant Hud sees the world and therefore inform his responses to the world around him, supported by other varied African American characters. The deconstruction of the culture of performance paired with abstract uses of Native American imagery meant that *Hair* was significant on Broadway for its treatment of race when considering the shows that had come before it. Before the role of race in *Hair* is analysed in detail, this chapter will explore the history of racial stereotypes in Broadway musicals (most notably in *Show Boat* and *South Pacific*) in order to demonstrate the significant shift in tone that *Hair* represented.

Race has been a major component of American performance since the eighteenth century, where African American characters were portrayed in comical ways, largely by

white men in blackface.¹⁶⁸ The first example of black caricatures occurred in the 1767 show *The Disappointment*, in which an African American man called ‘Raccoon’ was played by a white man as a vain and superstitious joke, a character that was recreated in the minstrel shows of the nineteenth century.¹⁶⁹ Minstrel performance had its origins in white working-class neighbourhoods in the early 1800s as poor performers would relate to the marginalisation of African Americans, yet as the country approached Civil War minstrel performances became more racist in their content, leading to the typical characters that would reoccur throughout the early twentieth century, like *The Disappointment*’s ‘Raccoon.’¹⁷⁰ In minstrel performances, the songs typically performed were often referred to as ‘Ethiopian Songs’ and their lyrics would consist of a ‘fake black dialect,’ a sound that would be mocked in *Hair*.¹⁷¹ This kind of entertainment changed somewhat after the Civil Rights Movement, but issues regarding representations of African Americans remain even in the twenty-first century, highlighted particularly by the lack of diversity in the 2016 Oscar nominations.¹⁷² In *Hair*, characters of all races within the show were portrayed as equals, only appearing in stereotypical or racist roles when those tropes are being broken down to highlight the injustices within society.

Broadway and race relations had a tumultuous relationship – in the early twentieth century, African Americans largely acted in segregated, so-called black shows, being cast in mainstream musicals only as side parts. Arguably starting in 1903 with the musical *In Dahomey*, starring famous actor Bert Williams, two different Broadways existed with popular

¹⁶⁸ Alan W. C. Green, ‘Jim Crow,’ ‘Zip Coon’: The Northern Origins of Negro Minstrelsy, *The Massachusetts Review*, Vol.11, No.2, (Spring, 1970), pp.385-397, p.387

¹⁶⁹ Green, ‘Jim Crow,’ ‘Zip Coon’, p.385

¹⁷⁰ Larry Starr, Christopher Waterman, *American Popular Music; From Minstrelsy to MP3*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2010, p.21

¹⁷¹ Daniel Hardie, *The Ancestry of Jazz: A Musical Family History*, Lincoln, iUniverse Inc., 2004, p.68 & 70

¹⁷² Cara Buckley, ‘Another Year, Another All-White Ballot’, *The New York Times*, January 15th, 2016

vehicles for white and black audiences separated.¹⁷³ What is interesting about figures such as Bert Williams is that despite playing in all black productions, many actors had to act their blackness. Williams became a ‘native sage,’ representing and humanising African Americans whilst at the same time pandering to white audiences to conform to the character of black minstrelsy.¹⁷⁴ When black characters were played for white audiences, they were presented only for the entertainment of that audience, their blackness both presented as entertainment and a sign of inferiority.

The two levels of performances overlapped throughout the following decades until one of the most popular shows in Broadway history opened, the 1927 musical *Show Boat*, a musical heavily featuring African American actors. Arguably enabled by the Harlem Renaissance, *Show Boat* utilised the increasing presence of black actors and their skills nurtured in African American culture to present an integrated show.¹⁷⁵ *Show Boat*, however, still presented black characters in subservient roles, a theme that continued in other shows which had non-white characters. After *Show Boat*, possibly one of the most prominent musicals that presented race relations was *South Pacific*, in which white Americans interacted with pacific-Asian characters through an almost colonial lens. In both shows, it was the white characters that the story revolved around, leaving people of other races in stereotypical roles that exacerbated cultural images of people of different ethnicities.

Opening December 27, 1927 and running for 572 performances, *Show Boat* was one of the first musicals written with an integrated audience in mind, yet due to the time of

¹⁷³ Marva Carter, *Swing Along; The Musical Life of Will Marion Cook*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2008, p.58

¹⁷⁴ William M. Sote, ‘Damned Funny: The Tragedy of Bert Williams’ in *Journal of Popular Culture; Summer 1976, Vol. 10, No.1*, p.7

¹⁷⁵ Robin Breon, ‘*Show Boat*: The Revival, The Racism,’ *TDR (1988-)*, Vol. 39, No.2 (Summer, 1995), pp.86-105, p.93

creation it was not particularly progressive in its treatment of African American characters.¹⁷⁶ The show, despite its integration, was dominated by both the white characters and the white cast as the roles for African Americans were largely stereotypical, and although that may have been due to the time the show was set in, there appeared little conflict between the subjugated black characters and the white characters.¹⁷⁷ The story is that of three generations of a white family, starting on a show boat called *The Cotton Blossom* in 1887 and continuing on until 1926, a time period that is well known for its Jim Crow rules after the Reconstruction era, grounding the show in a racial setting. The racial issues present in *Show Boat* have meant that revival attempts have been contentious, especially in North America - one such revival was a cause of controversy in 1993, for example, which is indicative of the troubled representations of racial relations and the out-dated characters within the show, despite its place in the Broadway historical cannon.¹⁷⁸

From the opening number, *Show Boat* presented a world in which black people and white people were vastly different in their societal roles, in line with the views of citizens in the time it was set. In the 1927 version of the song 'Cotton Blossom,' an African American chorus sings 'Niggers all work on de Mississippi/ Niggers we all work while de white folks play,' which, in addition to using the taboo phrase "Nigger," established their roles as workers, particularly with cotton, whilst white guests are enjoying their leisure time.¹⁷⁹ Joe, an African American worker, later sings the song 'Ole Man River,' possibly the most famous song to come out of the show. The song is about the river that 'jes' keeps rollin' along,' whereas for African Americans, one 'gits a little drunk an' you lands in jail,' creating an

¹⁷⁶ International Broadway Database, <http://www.ibdb.com/production.php?id=10538> accessed 12/02/15; Todd Decker, *Show Boat: Performing Race in an American Musical*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2013, p.4

¹⁷⁷ Decker, *Show Boat: Performing Race in an American Musical*, 2013 p.6

¹⁷⁸ Breon, *Show Boat: The Revival, the Racism*, p.86

¹⁷⁹ Hammerstein II, *Show Boat*, 1927, p.1

image of alcoholic black men that are readily arrested.¹⁸⁰ Paul Robeson, a prominent singer and activist, when approached to perform the role of Joe in the London production took issue with this stereotypical image of alcoholism and instead changed ‘gits a little drunk’ to ‘show a little spunk,’ adding a more defensive tone to the song.¹⁸¹

The show featured a ‘mammy’ figure in the form of Queenie who was played by a white woman in blackface in the original Broadway production and subsequently portrayed by Hattie McDaniel in the 1936 film version, a character that is problematic when viewed through a contemporary lens.¹⁸² Mammy figures supported the notion that slavery and the position of black women in society was not as bad as suggested by those in the system.¹⁸³ The contented slave image that pervaded early twentieth century culture combined with a national nostalgic sentiment for the Old South popularised characters like Queenie, whereas the culture of the Civil Rights era presented varied viewpoints of African American society which highlighted contemporary struggles for acceptance, such as *Hair's* Hud.¹⁸⁴

Show Boat featured one of the first interracial marriages on stage between the characters Steve and Julie, yet Julie as a mixed race woman could pass as ‘white.’ The two characters are threatened with arrest in the first act of the show when a sheriff calls Julie a ‘Negress,’ and accuses the couple of miscegenation.¹⁸⁵ Steve ingested some of Julie’s blood to claim that he had ‘nigger blood’ in him, meaning that a performance featuring both of them as main characters could not go ahead.¹⁸⁶ This led to Julie and Steve leaving the boat, their reputation and skills in the show second to racist sentiments. Miscegenation laws were a

¹⁸⁰ *Show Boat*, Act One Scene One

¹⁸¹ Breon, *Show Boat: The Revival, The Racism*, p.95

¹⁸² *Ibid*, p.91 & 99

¹⁸³ K. Sue Jewell, *From Mammy to Miss America and Beyond; Cultural Images & the Shaping of US Social Policy*, New York; Routledge, 1993 p.38

¹⁸⁴ Micki McEyla, *Clinging to Mammy; The Faithful Slave in Twentieth-Century America*, Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press, 2007, p.116

¹⁸⁵ *Show Boat*, Act 1, Scene 4, 1927

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid*

major issue at the turn of the 20th century, yet Oscar Hammerstein, the librettist of the show, was a staunch defender of interracial marriage, concerned about the plight of African Americans which informed his decision to include a sympathetic interracial couple.¹⁸⁷ Interracial relationships were a large part of *Hair*, after being legalized following the landmark 1967 Loving v. Virginia ruling that deemed anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional because they were used largely to push White Supremacy, yet the fact that the race of couples had to be explicitly referenced is indicative of the contemporary opinion on interracial relations.¹⁸⁸ The nature and importance of interracial relationships in *Hair* will be discussed later in this chapter.

It can be argued that Steve and Julie only appear in the show to move the plot lines of the white characters – the departure of the couple meant that the white leads, Gaylord and Magnolia, could take their place in the show, and again in the second act, Julie gives up her job to cater to Magnolia's needs. In the second act, Julie is a divorced alcoholic club singer in Chicago who walks out to enable Magnolia to take her place, once again relinquishing her position to appease the white protagonist who rises to become a musical star. The fact that Julie plays second best to Magnolia is telling of the place of non-whites in society, even if she could pass as white – the audience appeared to need a white character to lead the action.

After *Show Boat*, the musical that most heavily deals with race in an American context is arguably *South Pacific*, opening April 7th 1949 and running for 1,925 performances.¹⁸⁹ Telling the story of American military personnel in the South Pacific, the show makes a plot of point of the racial prejudices of the nurse Nellie and her judgements on her love interest Emile's Euro-Polynesian children. The show also follows a lieutenant called

¹⁸⁷ Jim Lovensheimer, *South Pacific: Paradise Rewritten*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2010 p.16

¹⁸⁸ Peter Wallenstein, 'The Right to Marry: Loving v. Virginia,' *OAH Magazine of History*, Vol. 9, No.2, Taking a Stand in History, (Winter, 1995), pp.37-41, p.41

¹⁸⁹ International Broadway Database, <http://www.ibdb.com/production.php?id=1831>

Cable and his wooing of the ‘native’ Liat, a fetishized vision of island women that appears only in the context of her relationship with him. The show had colonial elements in it, presenting Pacific Islanders as inferior, yet Nellie and Cable start to question their racial prejudices by the end of the show. The Rodgers and Hammerstein show was popular, winning the 1950 Best Musical Tony Award, therefore its representations of the Polynesian people and the development of its characters in relation to them is important.¹⁹⁰

South Pacific is noteworthy because of its representation of the Asian subtext surrounding the Polynesian characters – the percentage of Asian Americans in the United States in the fifties was low due to immigration laws that favoured Europeans, and population numbers did not even hit half a million.¹⁹¹ In *South Pacific*, a character called Bloody Mary is described as ‘small, yellow, with Oriental eyes’ and speaks in simplistic, distorted English, often cackling to announce her arrival.¹⁹² The orientalism of Bloody Mary is noteworthy, as she appears to be a materialistic, unscrupulous businesswoman, compared unfavourably to the white American army nurses like Nellie. Her daughter, Liat, is described as ‘a small figure... silent, shy and motionless... with the honest curiosity and admiration of a child.’¹⁹³ The infantilization of the native people only serves the colonial image of Pacific Islanders, and in referring to their aesthetics as ‘Oriental,’ by extension South East Asians.

These colonial visions suggest and assert ideas of Western cultural supremacy over indigenous island people, for example, a religious dance ceremony is described as ‘primitive,’ perpetuating the image of uncivilised Asian cultures.¹⁹⁴ These concepts of colonialism, however, are challenged by both Nellie and Cable who had throughout the show

¹⁹⁰ The Tony Awards, tonyawards.com

¹⁹¹ Helen Zia, *Asian American Dreams: The Emergence of an American People*, New York; Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001, pp. 4-5

¹⁹² Hammerstein II, Jogan, *South Pacific*, 1978, p.14

¹⁹³ Ibid, p.70

¹⁹⁴ Lovensheimer, *South Pacific: Paradise Rewritten*, 2010, p.162

held racist ideas, yet developed into more accepting characters later. Nellie, though initially taken aback by Emile's children and marriage to a Polynesian woman, in the end vows to look after and love the children when she thinks that their father is dead.¹⁹⁵ After falling in love with Liat and experiencing Island life, Cable sings the song 'You've Got to Be Carefully Taught,' suggesting that racist ideology in the United States is taught from a young age instead of inherent.¹⁹⁶ The biracial children, a result of miscegenation, and the condemnation of racism in Cable's song received mixed responses when the show opened. Initially Rodgers and Hammerstein were told to lessen the explicit remarks on the nature of racism which they did to an extent by removing certain phrases, yet they refused to remove references to American racism. The comments on racism resulted in both a multitude of complaints about the content of the show and requests to use the lyrics in sermons, highlighting the intolerance of some sectors of society and indicating that presentations of racism on Broadway were important in the link between culture and society in that age.¹⁹⁷

Both *Show Boat* and *South Pacific* showed racial intolerance that was common at the time of their release, creating a commentary on the issues presented instead of being created to be explicitly racist. Subservient African American characters and primitive Polynesians were a product of the culture of the societies in which they were presented – following Adorno's theories of the culture industry – as *Hair*'s more inclusive racial elements were a product of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. The stereotypes used in *Hair* were arguably inspired by the stage representations in musicals like those discussed as well as cinematic and televisual representations, leading to revised versions of characters that audiences had seen before.

¹⁹⁵ Hammerstein II, Logan, *South Pacific*, 1978, p.81 & 126

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, p.103

¹⁹⁷ Lovensheimer, *South Pacific: Paradise Rewritten*, 2010, p.105

It is vital, however, to consider influences from sources beyond Broadway and traditional popular entertainment. As fringe performance troupes and more experimental spectacles influenced *Hair*, to properly gauge the capabilities of the show to represent African American figures the impact of the Black Arts Movement needs to be examined. As discussed in the introduction, the Black Arts Movement was a collaborative effort of different kinds of artists performing and dissecting black identity, disassociating themselves with white culture and instead connecting to their 'African roots.'¹⁹⁸ The aim of the Black Arts Movement was to create Afro-centric culture and bring it to the streets, to '[awaken] Black people to the meaning of their lives' and to merge the values of the Black Power movement with black artistic aesthetics.¹⁹⁹ *Hair* does not align with the intentions of the Black Arts Movement despite sharing the same space in time – the story of race in *Hair* is told from the euro-centric viewpoint that mainstream culture followed. Dramatist Larry Neal referred to musicals like *Hello Dolly* as 'hipper versions of the minstrel show' in the way they used African American actors without 'alert[ing] their nature,' fitting the characters into the white paradigm instead of creating a narrative of their own, and leading figure Amiri Baraka dismissed the show as having 'nothing to do with black people.'²⁰⁰ Though *Hair* had a militant character in Hud, with Black Power ideations, he did not come with a narrative or culture of his own to the extent that Black Arts characters did, becoming part of white culture instead of the desired African American aesthetics. *Hair*, compared to the Black Arts Movement, did little to spread the notion of black nationhood, however its importance to mainstream performance and its creation of opportunities for African American performers makes it worthy of a deeper analysis.

¹⁹⁸ Elam, *The Black Performer and the Performance of Blackness*, 2001, p296

¹⁹⁹ Larry Neal, 'The Black Arts Movement' in *The Drama Review: TDR*, Vol 12, No.4, Black Theatre (Summer 1968), p 32;29

²⁰⁰ *Ibid*, p.33; Helen H. King, 'Hair – Controversial Musical is Biggest Outlet for Black Actors in US Stage History,' *Ebony Magazine*, Johnson Publishing Co. Inc., May 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Ebony5-70.html>)

Hair had racial elements to it from the very beginning – the subtitle of ‘American tribal rock-love musical’ connected the show to Native American tribal elements from the offset, and the original advertising for the show consisted of images of Native Americans passing the ‘peace pipe.’²⁰¹ Continuing this promotional theme, the original Off-Broadway soundtrack album cover was an image of a group of Indians with Ragni and Rado inserted into it, casting the white hippies into roles of Native Americans, their outfits made up of a combination of street and ‘tribe’ fashion.²⁰² Native American culture featured so heavily that future producer Michael Butler thought he had bought tickets to ‘an Indian show’ and was surprised by the content of *Hair* when he first saw it.²⁰³ The references to Native American culture within the show fit in with the countercultural infatuation with all things tribal as a ‘living base for an alternative American identity.’²⁰⁴ In American culture, there is a history of primitivism – the desire to be ‘other’ and utilise the culture and aesthetics of groups deemed inferior.²⁰⁵ In *Hair*, the use of Native American imagery follows a form of ‘fetishization’ that glorifies the ideas of a culture without acknowledging any historical significance of such aesthetics.²⁰⁶ As an ‘American Tribal’ musical, *Hair* represented the hippie desire to take mainstream culture back to a supposed simpler time, one that rejected the very history that made America what it was and instead start from the beginning in an idealised vision of the country.

Beyond Native American history, *Hair* firmly associated itself with black culture and history, primarily through its African inspired rock and roll score.²⁰⁷ Galt MacDermot, the composer for *Hair*, had previously found fame with the ‘Best Instrumental Theme or

²⁰¹ Grode, *Hair; The Story*, 2010, p.44

²⁰² Ibid

²⁰³ Johnson, *Good Hair Days*, 2004, p.52

²⁰⁴ Smith, *Hippies, Indians, & The Fight for Red Power*, 2012, p.7

²⁰⁵ James F. Knapp, ‘Primitivism and the Modern’ *boundary 2*, Vol. 15, No.1/2 (1986-1987) p.368

²⁰⁶ Ibid

²⁰⁷ Berkvist, *He Put Hair on Broadway’s Chest*, May 11, 1969

Instrumental Version of Song' Grammy Award for 'African Waltz,' a song recorded by Cannonball Adderley in the 'hard bop' era.²⁰⁸ The music of the hard bop era appealed to African American listeners, becoming very popular in black neighbourhoods, therefore the hiring of a composer of hard bop to write the music for *Hair* meant that the score had roots in African American culture, despite the white Canadian composer.²⁰⁹ The rock musical score of *Hair* was one of the most popular aspects of it, the album selling widely amongst all levels of American society, therefore the fact that the score featured songs that were in a style primarily targeted at African American communities can be seen either as an acceptance of black culture, or a new version of white America claiming that culture for its own entertainment. The experience of MacDermot and his collaborations with hard bop musicians suggests, however, that the rock music sounds of the show were respectful of their origins.

As well as utilising a composer lauded for his connection to music typically associated with black consumers, *Hair* featured the highest number of African American actors on Broadway. Before the Broadway opening of the show in 1968, only 57 of the 523 actors working on Broadway were black, mostly given opportunities to perform in all-black productions.²¹⁰ *Hair*'s cast was unusually diverse, and by 1970 over 150 African Americans were cast in roles in *Hair* in tours all over the United States, becoming one of the biggest outlets for black actors at the time.²¹¹ The significance of the interracial aspects of *Hair* was great, and as a member of the original Broadway chorus stated, '... the few blacks that come to see it are proud that we are on Broadway.'²¹² What that statement reveals, however, is the disparity between the people represented on the stage and the people that were able to buy

²⁰⁸ Past Winners, Grammy Awards website; David H. Rosenthal, *Hard Bop: Jazz and Black Music, 1955-1965*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, p.67

²⁰⁹ Ibid, p.62

²¹⁰ Stacy Wolf, *Changed for Good: A Feminist History of the Broadway Musical*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p.79

²¹¹ King, 'Hair – Controversial Musical is Biggest Outlet' May 1970

²¹² Ibid

tickets for the show. It is indicative of the times that only ‘few blacks’ were able to see the show that was inspired in some part by their struggles, yet *Hair* attracted a higher percentage of African American audience members than most other shows.²¹³ This suggests that the black characters in the show were representative of the plight of their real life counterparts as *Hair* was an accessible show for people that would not have otherwise seen themselves represented in mainstream culture.

Beyond the creation and advertising of *Hair*, a study into the content of the show reveals the elements that were absent from many others of its time: African American characters were given a voice, the ‘Tribe’ of hippies put themselves in a position of solidarity with Native Americans, and the plight of the Vietnamese was highlighted as an issue. Though far from unique in its presentation of characters of other races, *Hair* combined the elements of being released at the right time for its message, the skills of its creative staff in representing multiple voices and the large scale use of African American performers to become one of the most prominent musicals to discuss matters of race at the time.²¹⁴

In the years before the Civil Rights Movement, African Americans faced large levels of discrimination in the United States. The late nineteenth century Plessy v. Ferguson ruling created a doctrine of ‘separate but equal,’ enabling legal segregation that would become one of the major points of contention in the Civil Rights era.²¹⁵ Beyond segregation, black communities were living with the threat of being lynched, brutal deaths that would draw scores of white spectators.²¹⁶ The act of lynching in the United States was a spectacle – a lynching would be announced in the press and photographs and postcards were distributed

²¹³ Wollman, *The Theater Will Rock*, 2006, p.54

²¹⁴ William M. Stowe, ‘Damned Funny: The Tragedy of Bert Williams’, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol X., Issue 1, pp.5-13, Summer 1976, p.5

²¹⁵ Clarence Thomas, *The Virtue of Defeat: Plessy v. Ferguson in Retrospect*, *Journal of Supreme Court History*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, pp. 15-24, December 1997 p.18

²¹⁶ Amy Louise Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle; Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890 – 1940*, Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 2009, p.24

after the event.²¹⁷ The spectacular aspects of lynching created an environment in which black lives were worth very little except for their abilities to draw an audience and sell memorabilia. In early 1968, three black students were killed at South Carolina State College and thirty more injured during a protest,²¹⁸ highlighting the cause behind the continuing anger and increasing militancy, shaping the character of African Americans in *Hair*.

The nature of the Civil Rights Movement changed in the late 1960s, and the importance of the fight for equality was highlighted by an event that occurred in early 1968. Just over three weeks before opening night, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated, sparking riots and protest nationwide as the hope of the Civil Rights Movement was fading.²¹⁹ The assassination was a catalyst, and the 1968 riots could be seen as the culmination of a difficult decade long struggle, once more bringing the plight of African Americans to the front pages of the nation.²²⁰ The mountaintop King promised seemed further away and as prominent figure Stokely Carmichael called for more militant action as a response, the nature of young black protest arguably changed.²²¹ It is in this climate that *Hair*'s black characters were presented to an audience that would be aware of such important events, and therefore know of the reasoning behind the stance of characters like Hud and would possibly create more of a personal connection.

Hud, a militant Black Power supporter, is introduced in the song, 'Colored Spade,' which consists of a list of all the slurs used against African Americans historically. Within the song, he describes himself as a 'slave, voodoo zombie, ubangi-lipped flat nosed, tap dancer

²¹⁷ Linda Kim, 'A Law of Unintended Consequences: Unites States Postal Censorship of Lynching Photographs,' *Visual Resources*, 28:2, 171-193, May 2012, p.171

²¹⁸ Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line; American Race Relations in the Global Arena*, Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 2001, p.213

²¹⁹ Dana Lanier Schaffer, 'The 1968 Washington Riots in History and Memory' in *Washington History*, Vol. 15, No.2 (Fall/Winter, 2003/2004), p.5

²²⁰ Schaffer, 'The 1968 Washington Riots in History and Memory,' 2003/2004, p.6

²²¹ Martin Luther King, Jr., 'I've Been to the Mountaintop,' April 3, 1968; Stokely Carmichael, April 5, 1968 Press Conference, (Speech accessed on 11/06/2015 on history.com, <http://www.history.com/speeches/stokely-carmichael-on-assassination-of-martin-luther-king-jr>)

resident of Harlem,’ amongst other offensive terms.²²² Through the song Hud attempts to reclaim the words used against him whilst at the same time disassociating himself with them, claiming at the end of the song to be ‘President of the United States of Love.’²²³ Whilst his image of a militant Black Power supporter may have caused some fear from white people as the demands of the Black Power movement ‘exacerbated deep fissures’ in American politics, his assertion that he is loving deepens his character with a ‘hippie-ness’.²²⁴ Hud positions himself as an astute man rejecting racial injustice whilst at the same time utilising his equal standing with his white Tribal peers.

Another song, ‘Dead End,’ performed early in the first act, highlights the inequalities faced by black people at the time as four African American Tribe members list street signs that symbolically serve to restrict their lives.²²⁵ The song comes after ‘Ain’t Got No,’ a number that lists the things the characters do not have, therefore linking the things that characters lack to the restrictions placed on their lives.²²⁶ The list in ‘Dead End’ interestingly omits the signs used during segregation like ‘No Colored Allowed,’ instead containing more generic examples. This may be because of a disillusionment with the Civil Rights Movement: America may have become more integrated, but there were other restrictions placed on African Americans that were subtler. By 1967, large numbers of young black Americans were angry with the perceived lack of progress and the dead end the movement seemed to have met, choosing to unite for Black Power. The Black Power movement encouraged young

²²² Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.12

²²³ Ibid

²²⁴ Winston A. Van Horne, ‘The Concept of Black Power; Its Continued Relevance,’ *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol.37, No.3, *Sustaining Black Studies*, January 2007, Sage Publications, pp.366

²²⁵ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1996, p.15

²²⁶ Ibid, p.14

black people to become more aspirational, consolidating groups and preparing to push in more extreme measures for equal rights.²²⁷

The second act of *Hair* turns its focus to more historical events through the trip scene, placing race relations in a new context. In a roll call of popular figures in American history, Abraham Lincoln is played by a black woman who announces herself by saying in stereotypical minstrel dialect ‘I’s here boss.’²²⁸ The characters then cakewalk during minuet, but are interrupted by ‘three African witch doctors, in masks, with spears, wearing Dashikis,’ after which Lincoln shouts ‘Oh my God, Niggers!’ The trio sing ‘Abie Baby,’ a song reminiscent of the Ethiopian Songs of minstrelsy, glad that they’re free thanks to ‘yo massa Lincoln... emanci-mother-fuckin’-pator of the slave.’²²⁹ Lincoln in the meantime is getting his shoes shined with a blonde girls’ hair, before reciting a revised version of the emancipation proclamation.²³⁰ This skit briefly highlights the history of African Americans in American culture. The dialect used simulates that of minstrel shows, the inclusion of a cakewalk is reminiscent of plantation culture and the introduction of ‘African witch doctors’ arguably relates back to historical events in which African American slaves would satirically sing and dance, mocking their masters, in this case mocking Lincoln.²³¹ The transformation of Lincoln into a black woman is noteworthy when considering his place in the mythos of American history. As President during the Civil War, Lincoln oversaw a country that was divided therefore it was not difficult to compare the United States as it appeared 100 years apart, rife with racial tensions. Throughout the 1960s Lincoln was interpreted as an

²²⁷ Van Horne, *The Concept of Black Power*, 2007, p.374

²²⁸ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 71

²²⁹ Ibid, pp. 72- 74

²³⁰ Ibid

²³¹ Brooke Baldwin, ‘The Cakewalk; A Study in Stereotype and Reality,’ *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (Winter, 1981), pp. 205-218, p.207; William D. Piersen, ‘Puttin’ Down Ole Massa: African Satire in the New World’, *Research in African Literatures*, Vol.7, No.2 (Autumn, 1976), pp. 166-180, Indiana University Press, p.166

integrationist, his disapproval of slavery read instead as a disdain of racism.²³² The creation of a female black Lincoln highlighted the adaptability of the ‘character’ of the nineteenth President, turning him into a person that is both one with African culture and afraid of it, rewriting the accepted image Lincoln.

In contrast to the miscegenation plot point in *Show Boat*, *Hair* praises interracial relationships, both sexual and platonic. Hud is an integral part of the main protagonist's group, prominently involved in every conversation and decision as an equal instead of becoming comic relief. Arguably more importantly, however, is the fact that the Tribe does not appear to discriminate in the race of their sexual partners, even chanting ‘black, white, yellow, red/ copulate in a king size bed’ during the first act.²³³ This acceptance of each other is highlighted by the songs ‘Black Boys/White Boys,’ in which the white female Tribe members sing about the black males, and the black females sing about white males. The two songs are performed in succession, the ‘White Boys’ trio stylised like The Supremes, donning exaggerated dresses and wigs, and culminate in the two groups joining together in a ‘mixed media,’ a collaboration between races.²³⁴ The songs draw attention to the societal issues involved in interracial dating, most particularly ‘White Boys,’ in which the trio mention how their ‘daddy warns [them] no no no,’ and describe the stereotypes each has about the other race.²³⁵ The parameters of sexual relationships in *Hair* will be explored in the next chapter, however it is important here to highlight the response to relationships from a racial viewpoint.

Some conservative white reviewers were ‘appalled’ by ‘black-white sex scenes,’ although that shock may have been more related to the sex scenes than the characters within

²³² Barry Schwartz, ‘Collective Memory and History: How Abraham Lincoln Became a Symbol of Racial Equality’ *The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 38, Issue 3, pp.469-496, June 1997, pp.487-88

²³³ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.17

²³⁴ Ibid, pp. 64-65

²³⁵ Ibid, p.65

them, using the veil of race as an excuse for their disdain for sexual activity on stage. On the other hand, some African Americans did not like the use of black people to spread a 'white message,' especially in relation to sex.²³⁶ An argument could be made for their discomfort in discussing interracial relationships in the show, considering the audience for *Hair* was predominantly white and therefore the relationships between black and white Tribe members were played only as a point of interest instead of inclusively. The use of the relationships, sexual or otherwise, between black and white people as a plot point, even in a positive way, may have seemed reductive in the show; in *Show Boat* the relationship is dramatic and leads to a new arc, if only to allow the white characters to step in, whereas in *Hair* they simply exist with little grounding. This existence, however, may be indicative instead of a more open society and view of interracial relationships – they do not need to be part of a major arc and are instead commonplace in the idealised world of the Tribe.

Interracial relationships had an incredibly troubled history in the United States where anti-miscegenation laws existed in some states until they were ruled to be unconstitutional in 1967, the year in which *Hair* opened off-Broadway.²³⁷ It was not just legally that interracial relationships were difficult as segregation and societal prejudice meant that both partners become outsiders to the others' world, making the pure act of dating difficult.²³⁸ Where obstacles such as housing discrimination still existed, maintaining relationships was difficult, which is why the relationships in *Hair* were significant. Although the young Tribe members were not getting married in the show, normalising interracial relationships on stage meant that young Americans were represented on stage in a way that did not make their coupling a major plot point.

²³⁶ King, *Hair – Controversial Musical*, May 1970

²³⁷ Anita Kathy Foeman, Teresa Nance, 'From Miscegenation to Multiculturalism; Perceptions and Stages of Interracial Relationship Development,' *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 4, (Mar., 1999), pp.540-557, p.542

²³⁸ Joseph Golden, 'Patterns of Negro-White Inter-marriage,' *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Apr., 1954) pp.144-147. p.144

Whilst the Black Power and Civil Rights movements brought attention to the African American cause, the plight of Native Americans was largely ignored in popular culture despite increasing federal restrictions.²³⁹ One of the most important events of the Red Power movement had yet to happen when *Hair* opened in 1968; the Alcatraz takeover in the autumn 1969. Under the name of ‘Indians of All Tribes,’ young Native Americans claimed Alcatraz – unoccupied Federal land – as their own, gaining the support of non-Indian activists.²⁴⁰ Prior to the occupation there had been calls for Native rights, however national attention had been occupied largely by the Civil Rights Movement. That Native Americans were largely ignored by citizens did not mean that they were forgotten – the memory of America’s past with Natives was instead used to draw parallels with the Vietnam War, ignoring their contemporary issues.

The fact that the young characters in their show are part of a ‘Tribe’ draws attention to their adoption of Native American culture. By becoming a Tribe, the hippies are differentiating themselves from the rest of society and becoming a body of their own, conflating their strife with that of Indians. Many baby boomers adopted the style of Native Americans, attempting to challenge mainstream Western culture, yet their attempts to emulate an ‘Indian’ aesthetic led instead to the commodification of feathers and beads.²⁴¹ The fact that countercultural youths could buy their way into the ‘lifestyle’ meant that they could pay for a ‘legitimate’ life of oppression, lessening their claims of a desire to return to American roots through rejection of Euro-American culture.²⁴²

An example of this claim to Native appearance occurs during a scene with Claude’s parents in which he wears beads and flowers, whilst at the same time announcing his British

²³⁹ Smith, *Hippies, Indians, & the Fight for Red Power*, 2012, p.5

²⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p.85-87

²⁴¹ *Ibid* p. 7 & 72

²⁴² Irwin Unger, Debi Unger, *The Times were a Changin’; the Sixties Reader*, New York; Three Rivers Press, 1998, p.158

heritage as well as his opposition to the war.²⁴³ His parents respond by telling him that ‘this is not a reservation,’ calling him ‘Tonto’ in reference to the famous side kick from *The Lone Ranger*, a ‘hapless, slow-witted stereotype.’²⁴⁴ Though in *The Lone Ranger* the protagonist rarely fought any Indians, there was often a heavy implication that the white saviour would solve any problems, writing Native Americans out of their own history.²⁴⁵ This rewrite of history was the image that older generations had through popular culture like the television show, as well as Western films, however in *Hair* the history of Native Americans was involved in the trips scenes’ cyclical death sequence.

The adoption of a Native American identity rooted the hippies in the past whilst at the same time drawing parallels to contemporary American policy in reference to action in Vietnam, a comparison that was present on many occasions in which the nature of America was questioned.²⁴⁶ The treatment of Native Americans was arguably repeated during the age of the ‘yellow peril,’ a time of anti-Asian sentiment when people from China, Japan, North Korea and Vietnam were considered challengers to white American hegemony, shaping the US response to the perceived danger of South East Asians.²⁴⁷ Asians were often viewed as inferior, a precedent set during the American occupation of the Philippines after the Spanish American War in which the guerrilla tactics of Filipino soldiers were viewed as savage.²⁴⁸ This image of savage guerrilla soldiers was echoed in the Vietnam War, where the Viet Cong were viewed as less than human because of their fighting style. In the years between the turn

²⁴³ Ragni, Rado, *Hair*, 1995, pp.23-26

²⁴⁴ Ibid p.25; Michael Ray Fitzgerald, ‘The White Savior and his Junior Partner: The Lone Ranger and Tonto on Cold War Television (1949-1957),’ *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 46, Issue 1, pp. 79-108, February 2013, p.92

²⁴⁵ Ibid, p.89

²⁴⁶ Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian*, New Haven; Yale University Press, 1997, p.156

²⁴⁷ Stanford M. Lyman, ‘The “Yellow Peril” Mystique: Origins and Vicissitudes of a Racist Discourse’, *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 13, No.4 (Summer, 2000), pp. 683-747, p.684

²⁴⁸ Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government; Race, Empire, the United States, and the Philippines*, Chapel Hill; The University of North Carolina Press, 2006, p.90

of the twentieth century and the beginning of military action in Vietnam, the treatment of Asians, both from other nationalities and American born, was troublesome.

Possibly the most significant moment in the ‘yellow peril’ era was the internment of Japanese citizens in World War II. After the attacks on Pearl Harbour, people of Japanese descent – including those born in the United States – were relocated to detention camps due to fear of espionage, a policy with obvious racial overtones when considering the absence of discrimination against German and Italian Americans.²⁴⁹ Anti-Japanese sentiment had existed throughout most of the century, for example in the early twentieth century the *San Francisco Chronicle* suggested that Japanese immigrants refused to assimilate and were simply waiting to return to Japan after spying on the United States.²⁵⁰ The mistreatment of Asians did not improve, rather the rise of Communism in South East Asia and action in Vietnam led to the assumption that all Asians were Communist ‘Gooks.’²⁵¹

In *Hair*, though there were no explicitly Asian characters, the racism present in military actions in Vietnam is mocked during the trip scene as the soldiers jump out of a helicopter into the war zone, one of them shouting ‘hello yellow man down there, I’m gonna get you...’²⁵² Through this line colonial aspects of the war are implied – an unknown Vietnamese man is literally beneath the soldier that attacks from a position of superiority. The implication of indiscriminate killing is indicative of the way the Tribe views the war – it is not a war to save the citizens from oppression and is instead an exercise of American power. The racial elements of the war were also mentioned in reference to the soldiers that were fighting it, particularly the young African American men that were drafted.

²⁴⁹ Cheryl Greenberg, ‘Black and Jewish Responses to Japanese Internment’ *Journal of American Ethnic History*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (Winter, 1995), pp.3-37, p.3

²⁵⁰ Lyman, ‘The “Yellow Peril” Mystique, Summer 2000, p.699

²⁵¹ Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*, 2001, p.216

²⁵² Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.69

The fear of the draft and the war shaped the actions of many of the characters, yet the stakes may have been highest for the militant Hud. The Vietnam War was one that disproportionately affected the young black men who seemed to be fighting two battles – one in the jungles of Vietnam, the other on the streets of America. As Claude discusses his physical, Hud quotes Stokely Carmichael, saying that the draft was ‘white people sending black people to make war on yellow people to defend the land they stole from red people.’²⁵³ By using this phrase Hud is highlighting the racial elements of the war, suggesting that it is not only African Americans that are victims of the inequality of warfare as instead it appears that everyone but white people are fighting a war that means little for their own position in society. African Americans had been present in almost all of America's wars in the hopes of getting recognition for their efforts by way of equal rights back home, yet they continued to face discrimination in the United States and on foreign soil during wartime.²⁵⁴ The levels of racism in the armed forces went beyond segregated units and offensive slurs from their brothers in arms – in World War I, for example, messages were sent ahead to occupied France requesting that black soldiers were not given too much praise for their participation in an attempt to uphold Jim Crow values even as soldiers risked their lives on the field.²⁵⁵

Integrated units within Vietnam meant that soldiers of all races fought together, which in some units created a ‘brotherhood’ yet in others it evolved into explicitly racist sentiments, such as the raising of the Confederate flag.²⁵⁶ Racial tensions within combat units in Vietnam were not eased by the fact that African American soldiers were more likely to be tasked with the most dangerous missions, therefore integrated sections took missions in which comradery

²⁵³ Simon Hall, *Peace and Freedom: The Civil Rights and Antiwar Movements in the 1960s*, Philadelphia; University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005, p.1; Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.35

²⁵⁴ Robert W. Mullen, *Blacks in America's Wars*, New York; Pathfinder, 1973, p.8

²⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p.44

²⁵⁶ Christian Appy, *Vietnam*, 2008, p.363; James E. Westheider, *Fighting on Two Fronts; African Americans and the Vietnam War*, New York; New York University Press, 1997, p.84

or lack thereof would mean the difference between life and death.²⁵⁷ It was therefore not surprising that Civil Rights groups as well as militants like the Black Panthers opposed the conscription of African American youth – it was viewed by some radicals as a ‘sinister attempt systematically to murder young African Americans.’²⁵⁸

The disproportionate levels of young black men in the dangerous jobs in Vietnam was because of the lack of opportunities in the still racially uneasy America. The jobs that were less risky were reserved for more educated soldiers – a rank difficult to achieve when considering that *Brown v. Board of Education* only occurred in 1955, meaning that the Vietnam generation were still victims of the unfair system as the education system was largely weighted against them.²⁵⁹ Grunts on the frontline of the war were there due to the lack of opportunities to better their life situations in the country that they were fighting and dying for – the efforts of veterans of other wars did less to help future soldiers and citizens than anticipated. In *Hair*, Hud would have been very aware of these unfair circumstances and the better opportunities of the white Tribe members, therefore his defiant reaction to the war arguably was more weight than that of characters like Berger.

The tangled history of race and the United States was arguably one of the most prominent parts of 1960s protest, therefore the presentation of these issues on stage in *Hair* was important. Whilst the history of race and performance was marred with inequalities and offensive stereotypes, the Civil Rights Movement made room for more accepting performances. The increase in African American actors on Broadway was enabled by the open casting of *Hair* as characters were created that were prominent in mixed race groups. The protests against Vietnam that formed the back bone of *Hair* were given a deeper meaning

²⁵⁷ Ibid, p.14

²⁵⁸ Ibid, p.20

²⁵⁹ Ibid p.14

when contextualising the role of African Americans in the war, explaining the militant stance of Hud. Interracial relationships were possibly the most important aspect of race in *Hair* as sexuality changed in the 1960s, which is the theme of the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: GENDER

In addition to national identity and race, the role of sex in society, the significance of the human body, and gender roles are all themes that the world of *Hair* explores. The hedonistic character of the Tribe in which the search for instant pleasure is praised manifests into simulated orgies on stage, the pansexual partner swapping within the group, and a quasi-religious ode to ‘Sodomy.’ Much like the nature of sex and love in the Sixties, the interpersonal relationships presented in *Hair* differ to those presented before on the Broadway stage therefore an examination of shows with sexual themes is necessary. Second, an analysis of the nature of sex in the 1960s and *Hair* is vital to understand what made the show different to those that came before. Third, in *Hair* the body was more than a mere sex object and was instead transformed into a vehicle for love and acceptance, a theme that was present throughout the countercultural movement. Finally, gender roles were examined and altered to an extent in *Hair*, although to suggest that there was gender equality would be a fallacy.

The women of Broadway in the Sixties were more liberal than any before – more than ever the characters of the decade before seemed archaic as major changes in the society of the sixties meant that the power of woman was more than that of a humble prize for the protagonist. As theatre can be seen as a ‘very complex social event,’ a new view of gender and sexuality in the Broadway musical became important as stories on stage meant a participation in wider cultural conversations in society.²⁶⁰ Whilst *Hair* was flawed in some aspects of its representations of women when viewed from a contemporary perspective, the roles for females were stronger than other musicals of the time which is indicative of its setting and year of release. It is important again to analyse other musicals of the decade that

²⁶⁰ McGrath, *A Good Night Out*, 1996, p.5; Wolf, *Changed for Good*, 2011, p.311

have interesting male and female character dynamics and references to sexuality, represented by *How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying*²⁶¹ and *Sweet Charity*.

How to Succeed... which opened October 12 1961 and ran for 1,417 performances, is set in the 1950s corporate climate where a savvy young man, J. Pierrepont Finch, rises from his lowly window washing position to become company head by manipulating his colleagues and taking advantage of those in power above him.²⁶² The show opened at the end of the so-called 'Golden Age' of musical theatre, straddling the line between the typical, popular structured musical and the decline of the medium in the early Sixties.²⁶³ Its treatment of sex, the body and gender roles is satirical, gently mocking the ideals of femininity and masculinity. In the show, women are both sex objects and cunning masterminds in their trickery – their sexuality firmly in their hands while using their bodies to get what they want. The men in the show – important business men with no real comprehension of what that entails – are enthralled by the presence of the female secretaries and are largely unable to control their impulses.

Within the show Finch is helped the most by the female secretaries who arguably have the greatest power within the company. His love interest, Rosemary, is intuitively aware of the role of women in the corporate world and is almost as manipulative as Finch in her quest to succeed in her goal of marrying him. Rosemary, though on the surface the typical 1950s woman, sings 'Happy to Keep His Dinner Warm' knowingly, aware of the implications of being the wife of a businessman. Whilst in *Hair* the spurned female characters long for the return of the males that they loved, Rosemary is content to wear 'the wifely uniform' and to 'bask in the glow of his perfectly understandable neglect.'²⁶⁴ The

²⁶¹ Hereafter referred to as *How To Succeed...*

²⁶² IBDB.com, <http://www.ibdb.com/production.php?id=2885>

²⁶³ Wolf, *Changed for Good*, 2011, p.33

²⁶⁴ Burrows; Weinstock; Gilbert, *How To Succeed...*, 1961, pp.12- 13

blatant references to the neglect of the fifties housewife is due to the satirical tone of the show, and is indicative of the fact that the audiences are aware of the problems within the stay at home wife paradigm.

The show starkly presents the views of women in the work place in the 1950s, particularly in the song 'A Secretary is Not A Toy.' The number comes after the appearance of Hedy LaRue, a highly sexualised character based on Hedy Lamarr, an actress famous for her role in the Czech film *Ecstasy*, known for its 'celebration of awakening female sexuality.'²⁶⁵ LaRue appears as an unintelligent character, yet her demeanour allows her to manoeuvre her way around the company, using her sexuality as leverage when necessary. In 'A Secretary is Not A Toy,' the company workers are told that 'a secretary is not to be/ used for play therapy,' to the chagrin of the secretaries.²⁶⁶ Another number in which the prowess of the secretaries is highlighted is 'Paris Original,' a song in which the secretaries all accidentally wear the same dress 'with sex beyond endurance,' the intending to attract a partner.²⁶⁷ Within the song, the women are angry at each other for wearing the same dresses, yet the men barely notice, instead exclaiming 'what a dress!'²⁶⁸ 'Paris Original' highlights how much the women manipulate the men, and once more shows how clueless the males are to the power of the secretaries.

The comparisons between the power of women in *How To Succeed...* and *Hair* are important. In the world of the former, women maintain the appearance of being unaware of their own sexuality where their conversations with men are concerned, whilst scheming amongst themselves and with the audience. In *Hair*, and in the counterculture climate, the explicitness of female sexuality is used and abused – women are no longer seemingly

²⁶⁵ Ruth Barton, *Hedy Lamarr: The Most Beautiful Woman in Film*, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2010, p.30 & 220

²⁶⁶ Burrows; Weinstock; Gilbert, *How To Succeed...*, 1961, p.37

²⁶⁷ Ibid, p.61

²⁶⁸ Ibid, p.64

unwitting players and are instead as accountable and disposable as the male characters. Both shows, however, present their female characters in relation to their male counterparts. There are few moments within both shows in which the women discuss anything other than the men in their lives and how much they care for them. For example, when Sheila returns from a protest in Washington, she says very little about the protest before explaining her relationship with Claude and Berger, despite her protester credentials being shown as one of her defining features.²⁶⁹

Sweet Charity, which opened January 29 1966 and ran for 608 performances, begins with illuminated lights telling the audience that they are watching ‘The adventures of Charity, the story of a girl who wanted to be loved,’ setting the tone for a plot involving much unrequited love.²⁷⁰ The show is about a taxi dancer in New York City called Charity Hope Valentine and her search for a man who will accept her. The sexuality of women in *Sweet Charity* largely consists of their abilities to get paying customers to dance with them – possibly the most famous part of the show is the group number, ‘Big Spender,’ which developed a life of its own as a popular song out of the musical and consisted of the dancers at the club trying to draw the attention of paying customers.²⁷¹

Taxi Dancers in major cities would be paid to dance with men in dance halls, and Charity utilises these brief encounters in her attempt find romance, yet she is unsuccessful. The opening scene finds her meeting her boyfriend Charlie, a married man who she believes will divorce his wife and marry her but she is pushed into the river instead. This kind of relationship was typical of many young dancers in that profession who would hope for greater rewards for themselves than the money earned from dances, which would on occasion

²⁶⁹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 38

²⁷⁰ IBDB.com, <http://www.ibdb.com/production.php?id=3281> accessed 12/02/15; Simon, *Sweet Charity*, 1966, p.5

²⁷¹ Simon, *Sweet Charity*, 1966, p.19

turn into after closing 'dates,' or even involve 'erotic contact in the form of genital rubbing.'²⁷² Charity does not meet the men in the show through her job despite her early efforts and instead she hides her profession from her potential suitors when she gets close to them. There is an element of embarrassment at her sexualised job as she attempts to find a husband to take her away from the lifestyle – she is not happily using her sexuality to her advantage and is instead stuck selling dances to anyone who wants them.

Near the end of the Second Act, Charity performs 'I'm a Brass Band' after her new fiancé Oscar tells her he loves her, literally announcing that 'somebody loves [her] at last' to the sound of a marching band.²⁷³ The song is the culmination of the insecurities of Charity throughout the show and her treatment at the hands of the men she has met through her work – when Oscar says he loves her she starts explaining how she is not a 'poetical virgin,' convinced that her job and sexual relations would mean she is not worthy of love.²⁷⁴ This concern is legitimized as Oscar leaves her because of her past. The shame Charity feels about her sexuality is not present in the characters in *Hair* – they wear it as a point of pride, but the difference is that the Tribe are largely willing actors in sexual relationships, as opposed to Charity's dancing for money.

Charity appears endlessly optimistic in her pursuit for love, despite being jilted by every man she comes across. Her character is similar in that respect to the female characters in *Hair*, who appear to believe the best in the partners they pursue. In both musicals women appear defined by their relationships with men, unlike in *How To Succeed...*, in which it seems almost as if the men are defined by their relations with the women in the offices. The difference in the relationships within these shows may be indicative of the classes the women

²⁷² *The Confessions of a Taxi-Dancer: Intimate Secrets in the Lives of Girls Who Dance for a Living*, Detroit; Johnson Smith & Co, 1938; Barry Reay, 'Promiscuous Intimacies: Rethinking the History of American Casual Sex in *Journal of Historical Sociology* Vol.27 No. 1 March 2014, p.8

²⁷³ Simon, *Sweet Charity*, 1966, p.111

²⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.107

represent – Charity is a poor taxi dancer, the secretaries exist in a middle class corporate world and Sheila can be described as middle class due to her college student status. Whilst Charity uses her sexuality to try and lift herself out of her situation, she is open to the abusive way the men in her life treat her. The secretaries would see the upward mobility of the men in their offices – that mobility being the driving factor of the show – and are aware of how to manipulate the men and take advantage of their position in the world. Sheila is older than her friends, and although the status of the rest of the tribe is never explicitly revealed, she is both older and more educated than them, seeing herself as a saviour for the men in the tribe.

As all three shows suggest, the nature of sex had changed by the 1960s as the dawn of the sexual revolution and the Summer of Love changed societal attitudes in America to an extent. The introduction of the contraceptive pill gave women more choice and freedom with their sexual activities in a transition away from the traditional system of virginity until marriage.²⁷⁵ The most famous studies into sexuality, the Kinsey Reports, considered the United States to be ‘the most repressive’ culture in terms of sexual attitudes, but that repression was largely felt amongst the female populations.²⁷⁶ A 1948 study showed that 92 per cent of boys in America had masturbated to completion, compared to the 1953 report in which only 58 per cent of women, both young and old, had done the same.²⁷⁷ This does not, however, mean that casual sex in the Sixties was an entirely new concept, but rather reflects the implication of having sex before marriage in previous decades was that it was done ‘in anticipation of marriage.’²⁷⁸ Though there were obvious outliers within the studies, a large percentage of women in the Fifties were either inactive sexually, or felt societal pressure to

²⁷⁵ Robert Muchembled, *Orgasm and the West; A History of Pleasure from the Sixteenth Century to the Present*, Cambridge; Polity Press, 2008, p. 35

²⁷⁶ Ibid, p.217

²⁷⁷ Ibid, pp.218-219

²⁷⁸ Reay, *Promiscuous Intimacies*, March 2014, p.3

lie about such things as there existed a premarital double standard.²⁷⁹ This changed in the late Sixties, as shown by a study of college students that found an increase of premarital sex by 9.6 percent for females between 1965 and 1970, an increase that was shown in *Hair* as characters swapped fixed partners throughout the show.²⁸⁰

Sexual acts occur regularly throughout the show and, as one reviewer put it, ‘to the tribe... sex is politics.’²⁸¹ In *Hair*, sex is the way to move beyond the set roles that society has placed on the young and reach into the humans behind the figures that the characters represent. During sex, people can connect despite skin colour, gender or style, it is seen as a way to see through the outside presentations and instead see the human beneath. Sex was such critical part of the show that when the tour visited Boston in 1970 – the tour stop also marred with flag controversy – the production was closed unless ‘completely all simulation of sexual intercourse or deviation’ was removed, something that touring cast refused to do.²⁸² That the production faced trouble for its sexual content in 1970 proved that the changes brought about in the Sixties did not affect all places and levels of society and was arguably concentrated geographically in cities on the coasts. What makes the trouble in Boston so important, however, is the city's history with banning material that could be deemed indecent. The phrase 'Banned in Boston' was popularized in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century, marking out the arts that were controversial at the time, but also increasing their appeal because of this controversy.²⁸³ Though obscenity trials had markedly slowed down by the time *Hair* arrived in the city, the history of censorship combined with the troubles the

²⁷⁹ Ira L. Reiss, ‘The Double Standard in Premarital Sexual Intercourse; A Neglected Concept,’ *Social Forces*, Vol.34, No.3, (Mar., 1956), pp. 224-230, p.234

²⁸⁰ Karl King, Jack O. Balswick, Ira E. Robinson, ‘The Continuing Premarital Sexual Revolution among College Females,’ *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 39, No. 3, August 1977, p. 456

²⁸¹ Buchen, *Is the Future Hair?* Fall 1969

²⁸² Livingston, *Nudity and Flag ‘Desecration’*, April 15, 1970

²⁸³ David W. Cudhea; Ronald P. Kriss, 'Banned in Boston – Everything Quiet? Sensational trials Less Frequent Now, But 'Cheap Stuff' Poses Major Problem' in *The Crimson*, December 5th 1952, (accessed 03/05/2016 via <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/1952/12/5/banned-in-boston-everything-quiet-pthe-phrase/?page=single>)

production faced suggest that the show was seen as indecent, a label that did not cause too much trouble in other productions around the United States.²⁸⁴

In possibly the most explicitly sexual scene in *Hair*, Woof performs a song entitled ‘Sodomy’ in a religious manner within the first few minutes of the show. Framed as a prayer ‘in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,’ Woof asks God why ‘sodomy /fellatio /cunnilingus /pederasty... sound so nasty.’²⁸⁵ He expresses an interest in masturbation and invites the Tribe, and by extension the audience, into a ‘holy orgy.’²⁸⁶ At a time in which sodomy was still illegal throughout most of the country, conflating the idea of religion and sex, particularly the taboo sex featured most prominently within the song, is indicative of the tribal and countercultural rejection of the mainstream opinion on love and sex.²⁸⁷ In ‘Sodomy,’ sex is a holy thing, a sensation similar to that of praying. It alludes to a connection between two physical beings, no matter what their predilections, that is godly. References to the *Kama Sutra* in the song also bring Eastern religions into the ideal of sex, *Kama* meaning pleasure in Sanskrit, a phase that, according to the book, is to be enjoyed during youth.²⁸⁸ It can be argued therefore, that sex, or sodomy, in Woof’s eyes is a rite of passage to connect to higher beings and fully embrace youth. However sex in *Hair* is not always a ‘religious experience’ and can be at times purely about base sexual satisfaction, which leads to abuse in some occasions.

Berger is the most sexual character in the show, a man who sees sex merely as a point of pleasure and not necessarily an agent of love. His relationship with Sheila is tumultuous at best – her affection for him remains largely unreciprocated as he is more interested in

²⁸⁴ Ibid

²⁸⁵ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995 p.10

²⁸⁶ Ibid

²⁸⁷ Melinda D. Kane, ‘Timing Matters: Shifts in the Casual Determinants of Sodomy Law Decriminalization, 1961-1998,’ *Social Problems Vol.. 54, No 2*. Society for the Study of Social Problems, Oxford University Press, May 2007 p.214

²⁸⁸ Vātsyāyana, *Kama Sutra*

physical experiences, be it with her or any other characters. This relationship improved after edits to the off-Broadway show that was originally performed, however when it first opened, Berger was an abusive character. Upon her return from the protest in Washington, for example, Sheila presents Berger with a shirt, but he proceeds to slap her before ‘stomping on the shirt’ and chanting the word ‘sex’ repeatedly.²⁸⁹ In early versions of the show, Berger raped Sheila in front of the whole Tribe, once more reinforcing his preference for base sexual needs over affection that can be found through a relationship.²⁹⁰ As Berger claims sexual dominance over Sheila, he also offers her to Claude, who appears infatuated with her. Sheila was a figure used for sexual pleasure in a way that contradicts the pleasure espoused in ‘Sodomy.’ This is also makes Berger somewhat hypocritical when taken into consideration with his belief that soldiers in Vietnam were raping people – he looks down on war as a degrading act, yet participates in such things himself. This lack of progressive foresight is a flaw in his character which is discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

The character of the relationships between the three central figures in the Tribe is described succinctly by Jeanie - ‘Sheila’s hung up on Berger, Berger is hung up everywhere. Claude is hung up on a cross over Sheila and Berger.’²⁹¹ Whilst Berger abuses Sheila, she stills loves him, and their relationship is watched over by Claude – described here in an almost messianic way. The triumvirate leading the Tribe interconnect their relationships, lust and desires, exchanging partners at any turn as they are ‘overtly triangulated.’²⁹² The relationship between Berger and Claude appears more loving than the interactions involving Sheila. The two men appear to have a bond deeper than friendship – as highlighted in a scene in which they welcome Sheila back from the protest but end up embracing each other

²⁸⁹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p. 44

²⁹⁰ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.212

²⁹¹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995 p.49

²⁹² Wolf, *Changed for Good*, 2011, p. 108

instead.²⁹³ Indeed, at the end of the show when Claude appears as a ghost like figure after his time in Vietnam, it is Berger he calls for and not Sheila, voicing his fears to the person he had the closest relationship to.²⁹⁴ Although there appears to be sexual element to their relationship, the deeper love that is highlighted by the countercultural movement occurs more frequently, downgrading physical relationships with Sheila to less than that of the relationship between the two Tribe leaders.

Homosexuality in *Hair* appears often as a way to escape the war in Vietnam – when Claude gets his draft card, he states that he would ‘tell them I’m a faggot and hide out in Toronto’ – or implicit, as in Berger and Claude’s relationship, however there are two characters that appear more explicitly homosexual.²⁹⁵ Woof does not overtly state his homosexuality, yet describes himself as a man ‘hung up on Berger’ and Mick Jagger.²⁹⁶ Woof appears uninterested in the women in the show and instead surrounds himself with the male characters. It is noteworthy that Woof is interested in Mick Jagger, a figure with ‘an openness to sexuality [that] include[d] both the heterosexual and homosexual.’²⁹⁷ Woof recognises Jagger’s position as a sex symbol, stating that he has a ‘certain spectacular quality’, saying that although he himself is ‘not a homosexual’ he would ‘love to go to bed with him.’²⁹⁸ The celebrated sexuality that Jagger represents is indicative of Woof’s relationship with sex – he is eager to love and be loved and relates to the male figure that represents the lifestyle he wants.

The character Crissy appears mostly in the background throughout most of the show, but her song in the lead up to the Act One finale is one of the most popular breakaway hits. In

²⁹³ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.43

²⁹⁴ Ibid, p.88

²⁹⁵ Ibid, p.34

²⁹⁶ Ibid, p.49

²⁹⁷ Sheila Whiteley, ‘Little Red Rooster v. The Honky Tonk Woman; Mick Jagger, sexuality, style and image’ in Sheila Whiteley, (ed.) *Sexing the Groove: Popular Music and Gender*, New York: Routledge, 1997 p.75

²⁹⁸ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995 p.63

‘Frank Mills,’ described as a ‘lovely Lennon and McCartney like ballad,’ Crissy is looking for the titular man who it is implied that she met just once, stating that she does not ‘want the two dollars back/just him.’²⁹⁹ The song shows Crissy’s vulnerability – a song in the style of The Beatles by a ‘sweet little’ character, it alludes to the innocence of the girl who still pines for a man she does not know.³⁰⁰ The song, however, does not merely reveal the infatuation Crissy has for Mills, but also that she has a girlfriend, once more alluding to the fluidity of relationships within the show.³⁰¹ Whilst the song reveals the potential homosexuality of Crissy, it only allows lesbian interactions to be framed within the context of finding a man to complete the relationship. The power of female sexuality is reliant on the approval of men, and the usefulness of that sexuality to males.

The representations of homosexuality in *Hair* is significant in the context of Broadway as a New York State ban on homosexuality on stage was only lifted in 1965.³⁰² Despite this ban, Broadway was a haven for ‘sly, coded sexuality’ that would enable gay fantasies to take the stage, so the blatant references to sex, especially gay sex, was fresh on the Broadway stage.³⁰³ The golden age of Broadway, in the 1950s, heterosexuality provided the foundation for many musicals, the only vague brush with homosexuality occurs in the female duets and friendships that were standard in shows of the time.³⁰⁴ *Hair* was neither a purely straight affair, nor was it a story of homosexuality. Instead, the fluidity of sexuality is accepted, something that would not have been present in previous musicals. The apparent bisexuality of characters like Claude and Berger stemmed from the close relationship

²⁹⁹ Clive Barnes, ‘Theatre: ‘Hair’ – It’s Fresh and Frank’, *The New York Times*, April 30, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT4-30-68.html>); Rado, Ragni, 1995, *Hair*, p.53

³⁰⁰ Doris Hering, ‘Old Faces and New Hair’, *Dance Magazine*, July 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Dance7-68.html>)

³⁰¹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.53

³⁰² Nicholas De Jonah, *Not In Front of the Audience; Homosexuality on Stage*, London: Routledge, 1992 p.89

³⁰³ Steyn, *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight*, 1997, p.199

³⁰⁴ Wolf, *Changed for Good*, 2011, pp. 32-34

between the James Rado and Gerome Ragni, the creators of *Hair*. The two protagonists were based on the pair who were engaged in a ‘deep, lifelong friendship’ as Rado claims Ragni was ‘a love of [his] life,’ therefore their creations imitated real life.³⁰⁵ The fact that the Tribe’s pansexuality is informed by moments behind the curtains is evidence of the realism of the show and the character of the varying types of relationships present in sections of the counterculture. In an interview in 2013, Rado also suggested that the most important songs, and the most relevant to the contemporary world, were ‘Black Boys and White Boys,’ the most overt praise for interracial couples on Broadway that broadened the variety of ‘taboo’ relationships on stage.³⁰⁶

A new dynamic was added to the relationship between Sheila, Berger and Claude when African American actress Melba Moore took the role of Sheila in 1969 after playing a singer in the Supremes trio. Prior to her short run as Sheila, the role had been consistently played by white, blonde actresses, which made Moore’s casting in the role all the more significant.³⁰⁷ The intricacies of the relationship between the three leads therefore has a deeper layer, as not only is a woman having relations with multiple men, but the unions are interracial. As mentioned in the previous chapter, refusal to accept interracial marriage was only just deemed unconstitutional in the 1967 *Loving v. Virginia* ruling, therefore the casting of a leading couple as interracial, despite their troubles, was significant.

³⁰⁵ Sheila Lambert, ‘The Man Behind the *Hair*,’ August 13 2008, *Advocate.com* (accessed 09/07/2015, <http://www.advocate.com/arts-entertainment/theater/2008/08/13/man-behind-hair>)

³⁰⁶ Stephen Dare, ‘Interview with Jim Rado, Co Creator of ‘*Hair*,’ February 11, 2013, *metrojacksonville.com*, (accessed 09/07/2015, <http://www.metrojacksonville.com/article/2013-apr-interview-with-jim-rado-co-creator-of-hair->)

³⁰⁷ Robert Berkvist, ‘Melba Changes Color of Hair,’ *The New York Times*, September 14, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT9-14-69.html>)

Beyond sex, nudity was a major facet of the new breed of sexual identity in the 1960s, where ‘clothes hindered interpersonal communication.’³⁰⁸ The naked body was, to the hippies, a way to connect to each other and nature in a way that was not possible when clothed. The exhibition of the human body was not for mere voyeuristic pleasure but instead an appreciation for the vulnerability and power of the body, a reference to ‘a primal necessity underneath the radical posturing.’³⁰⁹ Nudity became a symbol of the earnest search for answers – beyond the ‘costume’ of the counterculture that was outwardly presented to the world, the intended message still stood, the physical body was ‘the ultimate test of authenticity.’³¹⁰ Producer Michael Butler stated that it was the nudity within in the show that people came to see, and then they ‘[had] them for the messages in the second act which mean so much,’ aware that the naked body, being a sordid thing for decades, would draw the attention needed to other issues.³¹¹ The naked body in *Hair*, therefore, though controversial in many ways was presented with a purpose.

The most prominent moment of nudity in *Hair* occurred at the end of Act One in which the Tribe disrobed as Claude sang ‘Where Do I Go?’ The scene was not the first time that the naked body had been presented on the Broadway stage, however it was unique in the sheer numbers of participants and the fact that, as one reviewer wrote, it was ‘probably the unsexiest nude scene ever to have been devised.’³¹² It is a pivotal point in the show, as the character tries to figure out his place in the world and decide which path to follow. The

³⁰⁸ Timothy Miller, *The Hippies and American Values*, Knoxville; The University of Tennessee Press, 2011, p.30

³⁰⁹ Dolan, *The Feminist Spectator in Action*, 2013, p. 162

³¹⁰ Bigsby, *Beyond Broadway*, 1985 p.314

³¹¹ Simon Garfield, ‘Hair Restorer,’ *The Guardian*, September 4, 2005 (accessed 20/05/2015 on [theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com), <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2005/sep/04/theatre>)

³¹² Alan Brien, ‘Alan Brien Takes an Advance Look At a Frontal Attack on Broadway’, *The London Sunday Times*, April 28, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/LonSunTimes4_28_68.html) ; Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.212; Leo Mishkin, ‘Hair Explodes on Broadway’, *New York Morning Telegraph*, May 1, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/MorningTelegraph5-1-68.html>)

nudity therefore highlights his vulnerability in that moment, despite the fact that Claude himself is not naked. The moment is symbolic for this reason – as his tribe strip themselves of society’s ideas of how they should look and what they should do, it is the doubtful Claude that still conforms, foreshadowing his eventual role as the soldier his parents wanted him to be.

Nudity was optional for the cast, which meant that the participation varied as different cast members became more comfortable in their roles, resulting in less than ten Tribe members standing naked on the dimly lit stage on opening night.³¹³ As the show became more popular and the scene more widely discussed, increasing numbers of cast members participated, to the point where, according to book writer Jerome Ragni, ‘even the stagehands’ wanted to take their clothes off.³¹⁴ In an *Esquire* interview in September 1968, the female cast members discuss their decisions regarding the nude scene. Lynn Kellogg, who played Sheila, said that she did not ‘feel the world is ready to approve’ of the scene, yet Emmaretta Marks ‘like[d] to feel free,’ highlighting the difference of opinion that was prevalent through the 1960s.³¹⁵

Audience responses to the scene varied from praise to indignation – one reviewer lauded the ‘strangely solemn’ scene, yet when the show toured there were more controversies.³¹⁶ In Indiana in 1970, for example, the county called for ‘body stockings, mesh bras and pasties’ in the nude scene, and the same controversies would follow the tour in other locations too.³¹⁷ The character of the show, and the reaction to the scene, was succinctly

³¹³ Ibid

³¹⁴ Bender, *Hair – Topless*, April 28, 1968

³¹⁵ *Esquire*, ‘Optional Nudity in Hair,’ September 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Esquire9-68.html>)

³¹⁶ John Weightman, ‘Bald Remarks on Hair,’ *Encounter Magazine*, December 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/EncounterMag.html>)

³¹⁷ *Variety*, ‘Baptists Hit Use of County Aud For Hair Two Nighter,’ August 5, 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Variety8-5-70a.html>)

summed up by actress Melba Moore when she said ‘I’m not embarrassed, the audience is.’³¹⁸ The nude scene became a reflection of the character of the audience – those who disapproved were those that disapproved of the counterculture, whereas some audience members wholeheartedly embraced the scene, themselves disrobing in solidarity.³¹⁹

Changing attitudes to sex and nudity went hand in hand with alternative views of gender roles. Both femininity and masculinity in the 1960s changed greatly – women had more freedom, both in sexual terms with the contraceptive pill and culturally through the feminist movement whilst concepts of masculinity shifted through the freedom to sport longer hair and reject formal aesthetics and actions. The pill and sexual revolution heralded a new form of power for women, there was a freedom to enjoy sex as much as men with a reduced risk of pregnancy, enabling women to take control of their sexuality.³²⁰ In *Hair*, the roles of males and females fit into the countercultural ideal of genders – the wild men and the sexual women. The women in *Hair* also experienced the double standard they had to face in terms of being sexually free and open, whilst at the same time most of the named characters pine for the men that have left or ignored them – Sheila for Berger, Jeanie for Claude, and Crissy for the unseen ‘Frank Mills.’ In a culture in which sex means freedom, it follows that to be free one would have to have sex, creating a dynamic in which the availability of sex meant that casual sex was the new frontier and that it was the route to embracing modern femininity.³²¹ When discussing the character of male roles in society, John Beynon states that ‘if maleness is biological, then masculinity is cultural,’ and it is clear that the culture of

³¹⁸ Berkvist, *Melba Changes Color of Hair*, September 14, 1969

³¹⁹ Scott Warfield, ‘From Hair to Rent; Is ‘Rock’ A Four-Letter Word on Broadway?’ In Everett, William A; Laird, Paul R (Eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Musical*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 234

³²⁰ Muchembled, *Orgasm and the West*, 2008, p.53

³²¹ *Ibid*

masculinity changed in the Sixties. Masculinity in *Hair* was marked by a wild sex drive, wild energy, and a freedom to be wild with one's appearance.³²²

The height of masculinity in *Hair* was represented by Claude and Berger – two characters that were free to be whatever they wanted to be, separate from the identity of their more conservative peers, yet their definitions of masculinity were vastly different from each other. For Berger – the ‘handsome womanizer’ – being a man meant being highly sexually motivated, it meant taking women – or men – and claiming them as his own, asserting his sexuality by removing his clothes at any opportunity, and through his treatment of Sheila.³²³ Berger's man is a contradiction – his sexuality and desires were taken to extremes in his mistreatment of women, therefore he became to an extent a countercultural version of the soldiers in Vietnam who would, as he laments, ‘...loot, rape and kill...’³²⁴ He represents the figure prevalent in the counterculture – a restless ‘rock star’ type, defined by the feeling of relationships becoming an ‘enclosure,’ where ‘immobility is threatening.’³²⁵ Monogamy does not appear to suit Berger as the concept of one person demanding a more mature relationship from him scares him, yet instead of being an unlikeable character for that reason, he is described by Clive Barnes in a review as a ‘psychedelic teddy-bear.’³²⁶ If Berger is considered ‘psychedelic teddy-bear,’ it only seems to be because of the omission of his flaws. The standard by which he is judged is different to that of other men within the show – Jeanie

³²² John Beynon, *Masculinities and Culture*, Buckingham; Open University Press, 2002 p.2

³²³ Dolan, *The Feminist Spectator in Action*, 2013, p.161

³²⁴ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.35

³²⁵ Simon Reynolds; Joy Press, *The Sex Revolts; Gender, Rebellions and Rock'n'Roll*, London; Serpent's Tail, 1995 p. 49

³²⁶ Clive Barnes, ‘The Theater: ‘Hair,’ a Love-Rock Musical, Inaugurates Shakespeare Festival’s Anspacher Playhouse,’ *New York Times*, October 30, 1967 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT10-30-67.html>)

describes the father of her baby as ‘some crazy speed freak’ with disgust, whereas Berger’s manic actions and addictions are simply accepted.³²⁷

By way of introduction, Berger acts out what he assumes the audience thinks of him and his appearance, asking ‘What is it Agnes, a boy or a girl?’ instantly referencing the fact that his masculinity is not the same as a traditional vision of masculinity.³²⁸ Berger’s introductory song – ‘Donna’ – is about his search for a ‘sixteen year old virgin,’ a Madonna figure that he could connect with.³²⁹ Throughout the song he describes the spiritualism he feels, relating his search for the girl who ‘got busted for her beauty’ to his transcendental meditation and search for the ‘yoga light.’³³⁰ This introduction separates Berger from Claude, having a ‘freewheeling carelessness,’ the opposite of Claude’s considered character.³³¹

Claude’s masculinity is vastly different – although sexual, Claude relies more heavily on the emotional side of relationships. He pines after Sheila, searching for something more meaningful than the sex that Berger seeks. He is more in tune with his emotional side compared to Berger’s compulsion and is ultimately the one that ends up fulfilling the traditional masculine role of soldier. When Claude goes to Vietnam, his precious hair is cut, a ‘shorn lamb ready for sacrifice to a modern god of war,’ the virility that came with his aesthetics stolen from him.³³² Claude’s hair represents his rebellious nature – the titular song is a love letter to hair, an exuberant defence of his right to ‘let it fly in the breeze.’³³³ When Claude is sent to war, he is fulfilling the wish of his parents – his mother tells him that ‘the

³²⁷ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.21

³²⁸ *Ibid*, p.7

³²⁹ *Ibid*

³³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.7- 8

³³¹ Caitlin M. Casey, ‘Beyond Shining, Gleaming, Streaming; Hair Revival Reflects a Complex Sixties,’ *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture*, Vol. 2 Issue. 2 2009, p.256

³³² Alan N. Bunce, ‘Hair Arrives on Broadway,’ *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 3, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via ‘The *Hair* Online Archive,’ <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/ChristianScienceMonito.html>)

³³³ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.38

army'll make a man out of you' after he gets his draft card, and his father tells him to 'be a man' in the roll call during the trip scene.³³⁴ The trip scene reveals the fears and concerns of Claude, so when his father conflates being a soldier with being a man, the masculinity that he needs to portray to find his place in the world is one of a fighter, compared to Berger's restless hyper-sexual masculinity.

The women in *Hair* are not praised for their countercultural ideology as much as the men, instead they are left behind, either annoying the male characters or waiting to be noticed by the men they desire. Sheila, for example, is sexually abused and sings about the fact that Berger does not acknowledge her in 'Easy to Be Hard,' yet at the end of the song embraces him.³³⁵ In 'Easy to Be Hard,' Sheila asks 'how can people be so heartless,' saying that she 'need[s] a friend,' but seldom references her discomfort and need after the scene.³³⁶ A college student, Sheila is older and presented as a strong figure, yet when she is involved with the males characters her strength dissipates and instead she is left resentful. This is indicative of the double standards that plagued much of the early counter culture, the 'age-old patriarchal right of men to use and trade women.'³³⁷ It was not until the early to mid-Seventies that opinions of college level youths on the morality of both male and female sexuality converged to similar levels, despite the sexual revolution, which may explain the differing characteristics of Sheila and the two male leads.³³⁸ If the tool for freedom in sexuality – the contraceptive pill – existed, it took time to adapt to the new abilities to create a different kind of sexuality for women rather than creating an easier way for men to use them for mere sexual pleasure.

³³⁴ Ibid, p.25 & 76

³³⁵ Ibid, p.46

³³⁶ Ibid, p.45

³³⁷ Bottoms, *Playing Underground*, 2004, p.212

³³⁸ King, Balswick, Robinson, *The Continuing Premarital Sexual Revolution*, August 1977, p. 457

Sheila's introductory song 'I Believe in Love' is arguably the most positive and realistic introduction. Where Claude sings about being from Manchester, and Berger about looking for a 'sixteen year old virgin' in 'Donna,' Sheila suggests that it's 'the time for all good men to/believe in love.'³³⁹ The burden of hope is put on Sheila – where others are internally bitter and angry, she is the one that marches in protests and creates the signs they wave, interested still in an emotional relationship despite resistance from those around her. Arguably Claude and Berger act largely out of selfish motivations, yet Sheila as the matronly figure is the one that sacrifices her desires to placate the male leads. Her desire for more personal connections beyond physical relations is one more revealed, in the lead up to Claude's 'Where Do I Go?' when she states that 'sex isn't love, it isn't even a pleasure anymore.'³⁴⁰ In this confession Sheila reveals the pressure she is under to maintain the image of the free and open countercultural woman, something many countercultural women faced as the promise of sexual freedom became instead a pressure to submit rather than an appreciation of female sexuality.³⁴¹

Whilst the characters of *Hair* were more explicitly sexual than in other shows of the time, the fact that this sex was presented on stage may be one of the most significant aspects of the show. Where the women in *How To Succeed...* and *Sweet Charity* were utilising their sexuality, it in *Hair* where this sexuality was presented. This shown most explicitly in the nude scene, *Hair* was more open on the stage causing controversy in some places, highlighting the significance of sex in 1960s society. Gender roles did indeed change in the sixties and this change is reflected in *Hair*, but it remains clear that the place of women in

³³⁹ Rado, Ragni, *Hair*, 1995, p.7 & 16

³⁴⁰ Ibid, p.55

³⁴¹ George Lipsitz, "'Who'll Stop the Rain?'; Youth Culture, Rock 'n' Roll, and Social Crises" in David Farber, (ed.) *The Sixties; From Memory to History*, North Carolina; University of North Carolina Press, 1994 p.223

society had not changed that much despite other advances, suggesting that *Hair* was not as inclusive and accepting as it claimed to be.

CONCLUSION

This study has analysed the Broadway musical *Hair* and its representations of prominent social issues of the 1960s – national identity, race and gender. These analyses are introduced by interrogations of other musicals and performances that used the same thematic devices, therefore setting the precedence for discussions on stage. In this examination of *Hair*, the significance of aspects of the show is uncovered – for example the acceptance of the hippie characters by middle aged audiences suggest that the introduction to the counterculture that *Hair* provided was more palatable than fringe performances that had more of a claim to the countercultural title.

In the First Chapter national identity is explored largely in relation to the generation gap and the Vietnam War. An analysis of *1776* and *Maggie Flynn* contextualises the state of the Broadway that *Hair* was released into – one in which American history was lauded compared to the torn identity that characters in *Hair* claimed. The alienation felt by the characters on stage linked to real world fissures in society as baby boomers strayed from the life that their families expected of them. The large adult audiences of *Hair* suggested that older generations were at least partially willing to listen to the problems of the young adults, portrayed themselves by young actors. *Hair* also tapped into the countercultural zeitgeist through its interrogation of the Vietnam War and what that meant for American citizens, calling for peace as the anti-war movement was increasing in significance. The combination of conflicting ideals of ‘Americanness,’ the culture of Vietnam, and the generation gap presented in *Hair* created a picture of a moment in American youth culture that was transposable across borders, as well as generations, making it a significant piece of 1960s culture.

The Second Chapter argues the significance of race in performance, analysing representations of non-whites historically on stage before focussing on *Show Boat* and then leading to a further discussion about the musical *South Pacific*. The discussion of minstrelsy and performative African Americans that precedes the analyses of the two Broadway shows indicates how certain representations of black characters in *Hair* challenged conventional and stereotypical figures that had pervaded culture in the years before. Both *Show Boat* and *South Pacific* presented African Americans and Polynesian people respectively as inferior others to the white characters, fitting with the times of their release. Contextualising the issues raised in *Hair* with discrimination present in America textured the racial aspects presented in the show by explaining the reasoning behind the actions and sentiments of certain characters. This chapter, like the one before, ultimately relates back to the Vietnam War as a prominent symbol of racial and social injustice.

The third and final chapter explores gender in both Broadway and society, focussing on the changing dynamics of sex and sexuality, the use of nudity to reinforce both sexuality and vulnerability and newly formed gender roles. In this chapter *Hair* was compared to *How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying* and *Sweet Charity*, two shows in which women were largely in control of their own sexual destiny. The nature of sex in the 1960s changed rapidly, as discovered when comparing the open sexuality of the latter half of the decade with reports released in the years before. This change was shown in *Hair* as characters swapped partners and became more open to homosexual and interracial relationships, significantly inspired by the authors. Nudity was an important facet of the show, and the countercultural ideology, as being stripped of clothing created a more human collective beyond societal restrictions of race and gender. Finally, gender itself is discussed as ideals of masculinity were challenged through the paradigm of long-haired anti-soldiers, yet women still remain in their stereotypical role of being subservient to the males, fitting of the remaining patriarchal

tendencies of the counterculture movement. What this chapter shows is that although there was more sexual freedom in the decade, that freedom was largely the domain of men, whereas in a show like *How To Succeed....* it was the woman that held the power. *Hair*, and by extension the counter culture, may be read therefore to be less progressive than it implies.

Beyond the three themes discussed in this thesis, there are many other issues that could be further researched in relation to *Hair*. An example of this would be an analysis of class and the hippie – Claude coming from a Polish family in a working-class immigrant town may have influenced his acceptance into the army and shaped his views, making them different to those of the college educated Sheila. This theme may open a different lead into class and the theatre as the typically middle-class Broadway was experienced by the people that would not have otherwise gone – for example, the fact that *Hair* was a popular show for African American audiences that would not have otherwise seen a musical on a stage that did not represent them. Another aspect of *Hair* that warrants further research is the use of drugs in the show – whilst the trip scene is the most prominent example of this, references to recreational drugs are repeatedly made throughout as psychedelic drug use became a favourite habit of the countercultural youth. The use of drugs could be examined in light of both the content of the show and rumours of drug use backstage – the reaction of audiences who had never experienced drugs may give further insight into public opinion of the counterculture.

Whilst in this study an original version of the Broadway libretto has been used, further information could have been gleaned from study of the script for the Off-Broadway production, as well as developments notes. These sources were unavailable and therefore proved limiting in thorough understanding, however secondary sources have provided some insight into the changes the show went through in the years between inception and opening on Broadway.

The emergence of rock musicals in the early 1970s was inspired by *Hair*, and the popularity of these may have inspired more contemporary styles of musical that diverged from traditional book shows. The use of different theatre styles to create a more varied production brought off-Broadway and fringe performances to prominence, especially in terms of the touring productions that sprung from the original show, bringing alternative styles to national attention through a more acceptable mainstream medium. The social issues brought to the forefront in *Hair* and highlighted in performances around the globe proved that mainstream entertainment could be a way to spread messages and encourage change. *Hair* altered the American musical in many ways, its content shocking at the time and its style unique, therefore it became a very significant musical in regards to the Broadway stage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alter, Nora M., *Vietnam Protest Theatre; The Television War on Stage*, Bloomington; University of Indiana Press, 1996

Appy, Christian, 'A Working Class War' in Robert J. McMahon (ed.) *Major Problems in the History of the Vietnam War*, Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003

Appy, Christian, *Vietnam; The Definitive Oral History, Told From All Sides*, St. Ives; Ebury Press, 2008

Baldwin, Brooke, 'The Cakewalk; A Study in Stereotype and Reality', *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (Winter, 1981), pp. 205-218

Barnes, Clive, 'The Theater: 'Hair,' a Love-Rock Musical, Inaugurates Shakespeare Festival's Anspacher Playhouse,' *New York Times*, October 30, 1967 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT10-30-67.html>)

Clive Barnes, 'Theatre: 'Hair' – It's Fresh and Frank', *The New York Times*, April 30, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT4-30-68.html>)

Barton, Ruth, *Hedy Lamarr: The Most Beautiful Woman in Film*, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2010

Bender, Marilyn, 'Hair – Topless, and No Bottoms, Either,' *The New York Times*, April 28, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT4-28-68.html>)

Berkvist, Robert, 'He Put Hair on Broadway's Chest,' *The New York Times*, May 11, 1969

(accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,')

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT5-11-69.html>)

Berkvist, Robert, 'Melba Changes Color of Hair,' *The New York Times*, September 14, 1969

(accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,')

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT9-14-69.html>)

Beynon, John, *Masculinities and Culture*, Buckingham; Open University Press, 2002

Biggsby, C. W. E., *A Critical Introduction to Twentieth Century American Drama – Beyond*

Broadway; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1985

Billboard, 'Hair Songs Too Hot to Handle, Authors Claim,' December 28 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,')

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard12-28-68.html>)

Billboard, 'CAPAC Member's Single Was Most Performed' 1970, December 11 197

(accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,')

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard12-11-71.html>)

Bordman, Gerald; Thomas S. Hischak, *The Oxford Companion to American Theatre*, Oxford;

Oxford University Press, 2004

Borstelmann, Thomas, *The Cold War and the Color Line; American Race Relations in the*

Global Arena, Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 2001

Bottoms, Stephen, *Playing Underground; A Critical History of the 1960s Off-Off-Broadway*

Movement, Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 2004

Brantley, Ben, 'A Frizzy, Fizzy Welcome to the Untamed '60s,' *The New York Times*, March 31, 2009 (accessed 05/02/2015 via *nytimes.com*,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/01/theater/reviews/01hair.html?pagewanted=all>)

Brecht, Bertolt, *Brecht on Theatre; The Development of An Aesthetic*, London; Methuen &

Co, 1964

Brecht, Stefan, 'A Poor Theatre' *The Drama Review; TDR*, vol. 14, No. 3 (1970), The MIT Press

Breon, Robin, 'Show Boat: The Revival, The Racism,' *TDR (1988-)*, Vol. 39, No.2 (Summer, 1995), pp.86-105

Brien, Alan, 'Alan Brien Takes an Advance Look At a Frontal Attack on Broadway,' *The London Sunday Times*, April 28, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/LonSunTimes4_28_68.html)

Brook, Peter, *The Empty Space*, London; Penguin Books, 2008

Brustein, Robert, 'From Hair to Hamlet,' *The New Republic*, November 18, 1967 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NewRepublic11-18-67.html>)

Buchen, Irving H., 'Is the Future Hair?,' *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Volume III, Issue 2, pages 324-333, Fall 1969, p.326

Buckley, Cara, 'Another Year, Another All-White Ballot,' *The New York Times*, January 15th, 2016 (http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/16/movies/oscar-ballot-is-all-white-for-another-year.html?_r=0 accessed 04/04/16)

Buckley, William F., 'Broadway Review,' *The National Review*, May 21, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NationalReview5-21-68.html>)

Bunce, Alan N., 'Hair Arrives on Broadway,' *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 3, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/ChristianScienceMonito.html>)

Burrows, Abe; Jack Weinstock; Willie Gilbert, *How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying*, 1961

Carmichael, Stokely, April 5, 1968 Press Conference, (Speech accessed on 11/06/2015 on history.com, <http://www.history.com/speeches/stokely-carmichael-on-assassination-of-martin-luther-king-jr>)

Carter, Marva, *Swing Along; The Musical Life of Will Marion Cook*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2008

Casey, Caitlin M., 'Beyond Shining, Gleaming, Streaming; Hair Revival Reflects a Complex Sixties,' *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture*, Vol. 2 Issue. 2 2009

Cohen, Lola (ed.), *The Lee Strasberg Notes*, New York; Routledge, 2010

Cohen, Robby, 'Berkeley Free Speech Movement: Paving the Way for Campus Activism', *OAH Magazine of History*, Vol.1, No.1, Teaching About the 60s, (April 1985), pp.16-18, Oxford University Press

Colangelo, Lisa L., '1964 World's Fair: When the World Came to Queens,' *The New York Daily News*, 2014, (accessed 03/12/2014 via nydailynews.com, <http://creative.nydailynews.com/worldsfair>)

The Confessions of a Taxi-Dancer: Intimate Secrets in the Lives of Girls Who Dance for a Living, Detroit; Johnson Smith & Co, 1938

Copans, Sim, 'Some Reflections on the American Musical Theater', *Revue Française d'études Américaines*, No.7, *Arts Et Société Aux États-Unis*, (Avril 79), pp.79-88, Editions Belin

Crosman, Coral, 'Broadway Hit Stirs Public; Hair is Exciting,' *Schenectady Union-Star*, May 18, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SchenUnSt5_18_68.html)

Dare, Stephen, 'Interview with Jim Rado, Co Creator of *'Hair'*,' February 11, 2013, *metrojacksonville.com*, (accessed 09/07/2015,

<http://www.metrojacksonville.com/article/2013-apr-interview-with-jim-rado-co-creator-of-hair->)

Davis, Peter,(Director) *Hearts and Minds*, 1974 (film)

Decker, Todd, *Show Boat: Performing Race in an American Musical*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2013

De Groot, Gerard J., *A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War*, New York; Longman, 2000

De Jonah, Nicholas, *Not In Front of the Audience; Homosexuality on Stage*, London: Routledge, 1992

Deloria, Philip J., *Playing Indian*, New Haven; Yale University Press, 1997

DeVine, Lawrence, 'The Perils of 'Maggie',' *New York Magazine*, October 14, 1968

Dolan, Jill, *The Feminist Spectator in Action; Feminist Criticism for the Stage and Screen*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013

Dowling, Colette, 'Hair – How a Small Time Musical from Lafayette Street Found Fame and Fortune on Broadway,' *Playbill Magazine*, September 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via

'The *Hair* Online Archive,

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Playbill9-68.html>)

Dowling, Colette, 'Trusting the Kids and the Stars,' *Playbill Magazine*, May 1971 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Playbill5-71.html>)

Elam, Jr., Harry J., 'The Black Performer and the Performance of Blackness; *The Escape; or, A Leap to Freedom* by William Wells Brown and *No Place To Be Somebody* by Charles Gordone' in Krasner, David; Elam Jr., Harry J. (eds.) *African-American Performance and Theater History: A Critical Reader*, New York; Oxford University Press, 2001

Esquire, 'Optional Nudity in Hair,' September 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Esquire9-68.html>)

Fitzgerald, Michael Ray, 'The White Savior and his Junior Partner: The Lone Ranger and Tonto on Cold War Television (1949-1957), *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 46, Issue 1, pp. 79-108, February 2013

Foeman, Anita Kathy; Teresa Nance, 'From Miscegenation to Multiculturalism; Perceptions and Stages of Interracial Relationship Development,' *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 4, (Mar., 1999), pp.540-557

Furedi, Frank, *Mythical Past, Elusive Future; History and Society in an Anxious Age*, London; Pluto Press, 1993

Garfield, Simon, 'Hair Restorer,' *The Guardian*, September 4, 2005 (accessed 20/05/2015 on theguardian.com, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2005/sep/04/theatre>)

Garfinkle, Adam, *Telltale Hearts; The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement*, London; Macmillan Press, 1995

Golden, Joseph, 'Patterns of Negro-White Intermarriage,' *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Apr., 1954) pp.144-147

Goldensohn, Barry, 'Peter Schumann's Bread and Puppet Theater', *The Iowa Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1977)

Grammy Awards Past Winners, Grammy.com

Green, Alan W. C., 'Jim Crow,' 'Zip Coon': The Northern Origins of Negro Minstrelsy, *The Massachusetts Review*, Vol.11, No.2, (Spring, 1970), pp.385-397,

Greenberg, Cheryl, 'Black and Jewish Responses to Japanese Internment' *Journal of American Ethnic History*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (Winter, 1995), pp.3-37

Greenfield, Josh, 'The Man Who Gave Us Hair; How a Cool Loser became a Connection,' *Life Magazine*, June 27, 1969

Grode, Eric, *Hair; The Story of the Show That Defined a Generation*, London; Goodman, 2010

Gross, Mike, 'Hair Sets the Stage and Broadway Now Accepts Pop Musicals as First Class Attractions,' *Billboard magazine*, November 6, 1971 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The Hair Online Archive', <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Billboard11-6-71.html>)

Hall, Simon, *Peace and Freedom: The Civil Rights and Antiwar Movements in the 1960s*, Philadelphia; University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005

Halliwell, Martin, *American Culture in the 1950s*, Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2007

Hammerstein II, Oscar, *Show Boat*, 1927

Hammerstein II, Oscar; Richard Rogers, *Oklahoma!*, 1943

Hammerstein II, Oscar; Joshua Logan, *Rodgers & Hammerstein's South Pacific*, New York; Rodgers and Hammerstein Theatre Library, 1978

Hardie, Daniel, *The Ancestry of Jazz: A Musical Family History*, Lincoln, iUniverse Inc., 2004

Hass, Kristin Ann, *Carried to the Wall; American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial*, Berkeley; University of California Press, 1998

Havoc, June, *Marathon '33*, New York; Dramatists Play Service Inc., 1969

Heale, M. J., *The Sixties in America; History, Politics and Protest*, Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2001

Hellman, John, *American Myth and the Legacy of Vietnam*, New York; Columbia University Press, 1986

Hering, Doris, 'Old Faces and New Hair', *Dance Magazine*, July 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Dance7-68.html>)

Hewes, Henry, 'The Theater of Shattered Focus,' *Saturday Review*, January 13, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SaturdayReview1-13-68.html>)

Horn, Barbara, *The Age of Hair: Evolution and Impact of Broadway's First Rock Musical*, New York; Greenwood Press, 1991

Howe, Neil; William Strauss, 'The Next 20 Years: How Customer and Workforce Attitudes Will Evolve,' *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 2007

International Broadway Database, ibdb.com

Inverne, James, *The Faber Pocket Guide to Musicals*, London; Faber and Faber Limited, 2009

Isherwood, Charles, 'The Aging of Aquarius', *The New York Times*, September 16, 2007 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via *nytimes.com*, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/16/theater/16ishe.html?_r=0)

Jewell, K. Sue, *From Mammy to Miss America and Beyond; Cultural Images & the Shaping of US Social Policy*, New York; Routledge, 1993

Jezer, Marty, *Abbie Hoffman; American Rebel*, New Brunswick; Rutgers University Press, 1993,

Johnson, Jonathon, *Good HAIR Days: A Personal Journey with the American Tribal Love-Rock Musical HAIR*, New York; iUniverse Inc., 2004

Jones, John Bush, *Our Musicals, Ourselves: A Social History of the American Musical Theatre*, Lebanon; University Press of New England, 2003

Kane, Melinda D., 'Timing Matters: Shifts in the Casual Determinants of Sodomy Law Decriminalization, 1961-1998,' *Social Problems Vol.. 54, No 2*. Society for the Study of Social Problems, Oxford University Press, May 2007

Karnow, Stanley, *Vietnam; A History*, London; Random House, 1994

Kenrick, John, *Musical Theatre; A History*, New York; Continuum, 2008

Kim, Linda, 'A Law of Unintended Consequences: United States Postal Censorship of Lynching Photographs,' *Visual Resources*, 28:2, 171-193, May 2012

King, Helen H., 'Hair – Controversial Musical is Biggest Outlet for Black Actors in US Stage History,' *Ebony Magazine*, Johnson Publishing Co. Inc., May 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015

via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Ebony5-70.html>)

King, Karl; Jack O. Balswick; Ira E. Robinson, 'The Continuing Premarital Sexual Revolution among College Females,' *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 39, No. 3, August 1977

King, Jr., Martin Luther, '*I've Been to the Mountaintop*,' April 3, 1968

Kislan, Richard, *The Musical; A Look at the American Musical Theater*, New York; Applause Theatre & Cinema Books, 1995

Knapp, James F., 'Primitivism and the Modern.' *Boundary 2*, Vol.15, No.1/2, (1986-1987), pp.365-379

Kramer, Paul A., *The Blood of Government; Race, Empire, the United States, and the Philippines*, Chapel Hill; The University of North Carolina Press, 2006

Lambert, Sheela, 'The Man Behind the *Hair*,' August 13 2008, *Advocate.com* (accessed 09/07/16, <http://www.advocate.com/arts-entertainment/theater/2008/08/13/man-behind-hair>)

Lewis, Anthony, 'Londoners Cool To *Hair*'s Nudity; Four letter Words Shock Few at Musical's Debut,' *The New York Times*, September 29, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT9-29-68.html>)

Lipsitz, George, "'Who'll Stop the Rain?'; Youth Culture, Rock 'n' Roll, and Social Crises" in David Farber, (ed.) *The Sixties; From Memory to History*, North Carolina; University of North Carolina Press, 1994

Livingston, Guy, 'Nudity and Flag 'Desecration' Figure in Appeal Against Hair in Foldo in Hub,' *Variety*, April 15 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Variety4-15-70.html>)

Lovensheimer, Jim, *South Pacific: Paradise Rewritten*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2010

Lyman, Stanford M., s 'The "Yellow Peril" Mystique: Origins and Vicissitudes of a Racist Discourse', *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 13, No.4 (Summer, 2000), pp. 683-747

Martin, Carol, 'The Open Theatre's The Serpent, Terminal, and the Mutation Show' in James M Harding, Cindy Rosenthal (eds). *Restaging the Sixties; Radical Theaters and Their Legacies*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2006

Mason, Susan V., 'San Francisco Mime Troupe Legacy; Guerrilla Theater' in James M. Harding, Cindy Rosenthal (eds.) *Restaging the Sixties; Radical Theaters and Their Legacies*, Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press, 2006

May, Elaine Tyler, *Homeward Bound; American Families in the Cold War Era*, New York; Basic Books, 1988

McEyla, Micki, *Clinging to Mammy; The Faithful Slave in Twentieth-Century America*, Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press, 2007

McGrath, John, *A Good Night Out; Popular Theatre: Audience, Class and Form*, London: Nick Herm Books, 1996

McGirr, Lisa, *Suburban Warriors; The Origins of the New American Right*, Princeton; Princeton University Press, 2001

- Middleton, Sue, *Disciplining Sexuality; Foucault, Life Histories and Education*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1998
- Miller, Timothy, *The Hippies and American Values*, Knoxville; The University of Tennessee Press, 2011
- Mills, John A., *Hamlet on Stage; The Great Tradition*, London; Greenwood Press, 1985
- Milson, Fred, *Youth in a Changing Society*, London; Routledge, 1972
- Mishkin, Leo, 'Hair Explodes on Broadway', *New York Morning Telegraph*, May 1, 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/MorningTelegraph5-1-68.html>)
- Muchembled, Robert, *Orgasm and the West; A History of Pleasure from the Sixteenth Century to the Present*, Cambridge; Polity Press, 2008
- Mullen, Robert W., *Blacks in America's Wars*, New York; Pathfinder, 1973,
- Murray, Braham, *The Worst It Can Be Is A Disaster: The Story of Braham Murray and the Royal Exchange Theatre*, London; Blomsbury, 2007
- Newsweek*, 'Hair Around the World,' July 7, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Newsweek7-7-69.html>)
- Ogbar, Jeffery O. G., *Black Power; Radical Politics and African American Identity*, Baltimore; The John Hopkins University Press, 2004,
- Peretti, Hugo; Luigi Creatore; George David Weiss; Morton DaCosta, *Maggie Flynn*, 1968
- Piersen, William D., 'Puttin' Down Ole Massa: African Satire in the New World,' *Research in African Literatures*, Vol.7, No.2 (Autumn, 1976), pp. 166-180, Indiana University Press

Rado James; Gerome Ragni, *Hair – The American Tribal Love Rock Musical*, New York; Pocket Books, 1968

Rado, James; Gerome Ragni, *Hair – The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical (revised)*, New York; Tams-Witmark Music Library, 1995

Rado, James, 'Hairstory; The Story Behind the Story,' *hairthemusical.com*, February 14, 2009 (Accessed 08/07/15)

Reay, Barry, 'Promiscuous Intimacies: Rethinking the History of American Casual Sex,' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol. 27, March 2014

Reiss, Ira L., 'The Double Standard in Premarital Sexual Intercourse; A Neglected Concept,' *Social Forces*, Vol.34, No.3, (Mar., 1956), pp. 224-230,

Reynolds, Simon; Joy Press, *The Sex Revolts; Gender, rebellions and Rock'n'Roll*, London; Serpent's Tail, 1995

Richards, Stanley, *Great Rock Musicals*, New York; Stein & Day, 1979

Ringnalda, Donald, *Fighting and Writing the Vietnam War*, Jackson; University Press of Mississippi, 1994

Roby, Steven; Brad Schreiber, *Becoming Jimi Hendrix: From Southern Crossroads to Psychedelic London, the Untold Story of a Musical Genius*, Cambridge; De Capo Press, 2010

Rockwell, John, 'Long Hair? Can 'The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical' be the Opera of Tomorrow?' *Opera News*, December 20, 1969, (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/OperaNews12-20-69.html>)

- Rosenberg, Bernard; Ernest Harburg, *The Broadway Musical; Collaboration in Commerce and Art*, New York; New York University Press, 1993
- Rosenthal, David H., *Hard Bop: Jazz and Black Music, 1955-1965*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1992
- Roszak, Theodore, *The Making of a Counter Culture; Reflections on the Technocratic Society & Its Youthful Opposition*, New York; Anchor Books, 1969
- Schaffer, Dana Lanier, 'The 1968 Washington Riots in History and Memory' in *Washington History*, Vol. 15, No.2 (Fall/Winter, 2003/2004),
- Schwartz, Barry, 'Collective Memory and History: How Abraham Lincoln Became a Symbol of Racial Equality' *The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 38, Issue 3, pp.469-496, June 1997
- Shakespeare, William; Philip Edwards (ed.), *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2012
- Shank, Theodore, *Beyond the Boundaries: American Alternative Theatre*, Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press, 2002
- Simon, John, 'Living Theatre or Twitching Corpse,' *New York Magazine*, November 11, 1968
- Simon, Neil, *Sweet Charity*, 1966
- Smith, Sherry L., *Hippies, Indians, & the Fight for Red Power*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2012
- Sote, William M., 'Damned Funny: The Tragedy of Bert Williams' in *Journal of Popular Culture; Summer 1976, Vol. 10, No.1*

Starr, Larruy; Christopher Waterman, *American Popular Music; From Minstrelsy to MP3*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2010

Steyn, Mark, *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight; Musicals then and now*, London; Faber and Faber, 1997

Stone, Peter, *1776*, Music Theatre International, 1968

Stowe, William M., 'Damned Funny: The Tragedy of Bert Williams', *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol X., Issue 1, pp.5-13, Summer 1976

Strasberg, Lee, *A Dream of Passion: The Development of the Method*, Boston; Little, Brown and Company, 1987

Suskin, Steven, 'On The Record: Maggie Flynn, and Solo Albums from Ann Hampton Callaway and Jill O'Hara,' *Playbill*, March 1, 2009 (accessed 06/02/2015 on [playbill.com](http://www.playbill.com), <http://www.playbill.com/article/on-the-record-maggie-flynn-and-solo-albums-from-ann-hampton-callaway-and-jill-ohara-com-158439>)

Sydney Daily Telegraph, 'Bomb Scare at Hair,' June 6, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/SydneyDailyTelegraph2669.html>)

Taubman, Howard, 'Theater: Review About Death Penalty; 'Hang Down Your Head and Die' at Mayfair,' *The New York Times*, October 19, 1964 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archives,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/prepost/gerry/NYT10-19-64.html>)

Taubman, Howard, 'Hair and the 20s; Pert Musical on Lafayette Street Recalls Another Eras Off-Broadway Revues,' *The New York Times*, November 14, 1967 (accessed on 05/02/2015

via 'The *Hair* Online Archive'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/NYT11-14-67.html>)

Teachout, Woden, *Capture the Flag; A Political History of American Patriotism*, New York; Basic Books, 2000

Terry, Megan, *Viet Rock; A Folk War Movie*, The Tulane Drama Review, Vol. 11, No.1 (Autumn 1966)

Thomas, Clarence, 'The Virtue of Defeat: Plessy v. Ferguson in Retrospect,' *Journal of Supreme Court History*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, pp. 15-24, December 1997

Time, 'Hairzapoppin', December 12, 1969 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,' <http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Time12-12-69.html>)

Tirella, Joseph, *Tomorrow-Land: The 1964-65 World's Fair and the Transformation of America*, Lanham; Rowman & Littlefield, 2013

The Tony Awards, tonyawards.com

Traubner, Richard, *Operetta; A Theatrical History*, New York; Routledge, 2003

Ture, Kwame; Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power; The Politics of Liberation in America*, New York; Random House, 1992

Unger, Irwin; Debi Unger, *The Times were a Changin'; the Sixties Reader*, New York; Three Rivers Press, 1998

US Bureau of the Census, 'Young Adults Living At Home: 1960 to Present,' census.gov, September 15 2004

Van Horne, Winston A., 'The Concept of Black Power; Its Continued Relevance,' *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol.37, No.3, *Sustaining Black Studies*, January 2007, Sage Publications

Variety, 'Baptists Hit Use of County Aud For Hair Two Nighter,' August 5, 1970 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/Variety8-5-70a.html>)

Vātsyāyana, *Kama Sutra*

Wallenstein, Peter, 'The Right to Marry: Loving v. Virginia,' *OAH Magazine of History*, Vol. 9, No.2, Taking a Stand in History, (Winter, 1995), pp.37-41

Warfield, Scott, 'From Hair to Rent; Is 'Rock' A Four-Letter Word on Broadway?' In Everett, William A; Laird, Paul R (Eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Musical*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Weeks, Jeffrey, *Sexuality*, New York; Routledge, 2003

Weightman, John, 'Bald Remarks on Hair,' *Encounter Magazine*, December 1968 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/EncounterMag.html>)

Welch, Michael, *Flag Burning: Moral Panic and the Criminalization of Protest*, New York; Walter de Gruyter, Inc., 2000

Westheider, James E., *Fighting on Two Fronts; African Americans and the Vietnam War*, New York; New York University Press, 1997

Whiteley, Sheila, 'Little Red Rooster v. The Honky Tonk Woman; Mick Jagger, sexuality, style and image' in Sheila Whiteley (ed.) *Sexing the Groove: Popular Music and Gender*, New York: Routledge, 1997

Wilson, Edwin, 'A Look at Hair Six Years After,' *The Wall Street Journal*, September 20, 1974 (accessed on 05/02/2015 via 'The *Hair* Online Archive,'

<http://www.orlok.com/hair/holding/articles/HairArticles/WallStJournal9-20-74.html>)

Wolf, Stacy, *Changed for Good: A Feminist History of the Broadway Musical*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011

Wollman, Elizabeth, *The Theater Will Rock; A History of the Rock Musical from Hair to Hedwig*, Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 2006

Wood, Amy Louise, *Lynching and Spectacle; Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890 – 1940*, Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 2009

Zia, Helen, *Asian American Dreams: The Emergence of an American People*, New York; Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001

Zinn, Howard, *A People's History of the United States, 1492 – Present*, New York; Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2005