## INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received __✓__
16. Other _____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

# THE EFFECT OF THE COUNTERCULTURE OF THE SIXTIES IN WOODSTOCK, NEW YORK

by

ROSALIND EICHENSTEIN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1987

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 24, 1987
Date

Chair of Examining Committee

April 27 1987
Date

Herbert D. Saltzstein
Executive Officer

Lindsey Churchill

Charles Kadushin

Howard Ehrlichman

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Acknowledgements

This work is dedicated to the memory of Professor Stanley Milgram's creative spirit.

To my committee, Lindsey Churchill, Charles Kadushin and Howard Ehrlichman and readers George Fischer and Florence Denmark, thank you for advice and support.

With affection, I acknowledge Nava Lerer, who has been all that a friend is supposed to be and a patient SPSSX teacher besides.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

## Culture and Counterculture

In its time the counterculture of the sixties was considered to be a response to the most widely experienced dislocations of values and lifestyle of our era ( Roszak, 1969; Reich, 1971; Davis, 1971). Two decades later that counterculture had been redefined by many as a youth-led rebellion which faded as its generation grew older. A consciousness and values based solely on generational experience survives only if its values come to be relevant to a wide segement of a population (Mannheim, 1952). This study was designed to assess in what forms the dislocations themselves and the counterculture's responses have lasted. The study was carried out in Woodstock, New York, a community which came to symbolize the spirit of the sixties: the 'Woodstock Generation'. Rather than considering the counterculture in a pure form, such as a commune, Woodstock, a community composed of diverse groups, provided a way to assess the effect of the sixties in a pluralistic setting.

Two frameworks were used: the idea that culture and counterculture function as a dialectic that produces syntheses was a way to look at the evolution of the community as a whole. The reciprocal relationship between individual and social world (Milgram, 1978) provided a smaller, more specific framework. The time called "the sixties" was defined as the years between 1966 and 1974, when the ideas and ways of life of the counterculture were widespread.

What dislocations formed the countercultures of the sixties? The salient view in its time was that it was the response of a generation that rejected materially-based values and the intense pressure to perform generated by an increasingly complex society. This was a counterculture formed and organized in opposition to technology and specialization (Davis, 1971, Yinger, 1980). In his influential The Making of a Counterculture (1969), Theodore Roszak spoke eloquently for those who saw opposition to "technocratic society" as the major issue of the sixties. A narrow focus on scientific method as the single road to knowledge had caused mainstream culture to promote "repressive rationality" and to neglect direct experience (Roszak, 1968). The results were compulsive consumption, passive spectatorship, and a future-orientation useful for specialization but requiring long arduous training (Davis, 1971).

The view that the counterculture was a response to real social problems was not universally held. Some said that the protesters were few: youth "really" accepted the system; and "youthful radicalism" was balanced by "youthful backlashers" (Lipset, 1971). Others defending mainstream values, argued that the counterculture's emphasis on self-actualization was demoralizing to the Protestant ethic and counterproductive to the needs of rational goal-directed behavior (Bell, 1978). Many highlighted historical events, for example, opposition to the war in Vietnam. Critics of this historical view pointed out that if the war in Vietnam was a major focus, it was mainly so for the activist not the introspective wing of the counterculture (Keniston, 1971). For the counterculture as a whole, particular focal events could not in themselves explain the international scope of the

alienation and protests of the sixties (Musgrove, 1974).

Rather than the expression of a small number of dissident youth or an aberration caused by the war in Vietnam, the consensus was that the sixties was the time when new social values formerly obscured by World War 11 became visible.

Social and economic dislocations

The new values that peaked in the sixties grew out of the changed experience of life and work resulting from the upheavals of World War 11. Taking men to war and sending women to factories, the war created an atmosphere of "hedonism in the shadow of death" (Costello, 1986). The effect on conventional morality was drastic: by the third year of American involvement in the war, the divorce rate had soared (Costello, 1986). After peace came, pre-war morality returned full force but it gradually was undercut by a turn toward self-involved concerns. Post-war Psychology itself turned to studying the individual rather than society and in doing so influenced the process by which personal growth came to be a key value (Sarason, 1977).

In the post-war economic expansion and reorganization, individual entrepeneurship was replaced by corporate organization (Bell, 1978) while higher education and career opportunities and widened. With the G.I. Bill, academics and professionals came more closely to represent the larger society (Sarason, 1977).

Major social and economic changes usually bring new values and expectations. These, however, proved strongly in opposition to one another. On the one hand, the turn toward self-involved concerns; on

the other, the need to prepare for a specialist career which required narrowing ones range of activities and interests. At the same time that individualism was taking center stage, corporations were promoting the idea that fitting individuals to their needs had a great potential to promote affluence. The increase in affluence was itself having a disruptive effect so strongly affecting values that "The traditional virtues of thrift, self-denial and living by one's sweat and wits seemed not only absurd but actually dangerous to prosperity" (Flacks, 1971).

Competing values and expectations produced a group within the middle class which, assessing the contradiction between specialist work and experience-based growth, constructed values with regard to work and consumption which opposed those of the previous generation.

Formation of the counterculture

How did so many young people form a distinct coherent counterculture in the sixties ? The process is, itself, of interest. It can be mapped in two parts; the components of the 'sixties generation' and their formation into a cohesive entity which crossed geographic and socioeconomic boundaries.

As recently as the fifties, there were various subcultures to which young people could belong. High school students who were deprived of or who rejected social and occupational mobility could choose the blue-collar subculture of rebellion with its distinct style of dress and behavior and its own role models; Marlon Brando and James Dean. Middle and upper class high school students developed a lighter style opting for parties, sports, and dating. For those who went to

college in the fifties there was a deeper polarization; 'collegiate' students oriented toward fraternities and athletics versus "intellectuals' concerned with aesthetics, philosophy and values.

A visible counterculture was formed by this last group, intellectual middle-class young people, as they became alienated by the social indifference of the post-war middle class and its stereotyped conventions (Flacks, 1971). Like earlier Bohemias, the fifties youth culture came to define itself with highly visible dress and behaviors: beards replaced clean cut grooming; white bucks and chinos were replaced by jeans. Women abandoned makeup and adopted 'natural' hairstyles, dark clothes, black tights and flat shoes. Jazz and folk music replaced "commercial" popular music; marijuana replaced alcohol. Social relationships were defined by 'serious' talk about philosophy and culture. Dating was replaced by intense friendships and love relations. Some of these symbols were adopted from the lifestyle of Bohemian artists, others from Black culture. By the late fifties, the opposition of the 'Beat' generation of poets and writers was being vividly publicized. While several of its literary figures, Ginsberg, Kerouac, and Leroi Jones became widely known, it was the symbolic voices of the sixties who in 1969 would call 500,000 to the Woodstock Festival. As literature carried the message of the fifties, music expressed the sixties.

Different in expressive style as well as in content from the protests of the fifties, the oppositions of the sixties reached many more young people. Several developments allowed this to happen: first, an increase in numbers; these were the 'baby boom' children of the post-war college generation (Sarason, 1977). Second, they were

middle-class children who had been encouraged to think critically by parents who had themselves developed intellectual, aesthetic and humanistic ideas in college. Third, and perhaps pivotal, these were the "...few brief giddy years in which pop music's commercial fortunes and the cutting edge coincided" (Palmer, 1986). It was "...a highly atypical period when, for a brief time, many of the more adventurous performers were also widely popular" (Palmer, 1987). As a result, white, middle-class young people were listening to music based on a "...denial of respectability" (Pielke, 1986). Meanwhile, a mass media had developed that could package and diffuse the visible and audible elements of a style. The mass media speeded the new values and styles from the forerunners to the less committed (Yankelovich, 1974). These three elements, increased numbers, a critically-thinking middle class and media dissemination of music which was both creative and critical of the mainstream cohered a counterculture and helped it overflow the boundaries of geography and parental values.

The new values and lifestyle

Writing during the sixties, many theorists catalogued the counterculture's oppositional values and choices. Davis' description is especially complete: immediacy as against preoccupation with future or past, the natural in most facets (natural childbirth, nudity, organically grown food) against the processed or manipulated. Aesthetically the preference was for the colorful and baroque against the classical, contained, and symetrical; the direct against the mediated; hand tools versus machines, direct communication versus the mannered and seductive, primitive not sophisticated, mystical not scientific, egalitarian not hierarchical, communal against private,

polymorphous, androgynous not singular. diffuse not categorical. In overview, Davis concluded, "...it is a sentient not an intellectual mode, an impulsive not a calculated sensibility, a quest for ecstacy rather than a concern for security" (1971).

Reflecting his insight that "There are an almost infinite number of polarities by means of which one can differentiate between the two cultures... Slater (1970) provided an overview rather than attempting an exhaustive list: property rights over personal rights, technological requirements over individual needs, competition over cooperation, violence over sexuality, concentration over distribution, the producer over the consumer, means over ends, secrecy over openess, social forms over personal expression, striving over gratification. The counterculture tended to reverse these priorities".

Yinger catalogued "...an emphasis on community as opposed to the anonymous city, on peace and love as opposed to a society that they saw as riven by conflict, and, on egalitarian participation as opposed to virtuoso standards for the few combined with passive spectatorship for the many" (1980).

The values that underlay the changes in lifestyle in the sixties are summed up well in the phrase "redefinition of gratification" (Davis, 1971). Pursuit of property and all it entailed was viewed not only as ideologically incorrect but as unsatisfying. Surveying members of a counterculture community in California, Weider and Zimmerman (1974) concluded that for the counterculture the important satisfactions are "direct, inexpensive, and readily at hand; food, sex, affection, dope, watching a sunset, making music, and engaging in a

craft". These choices, reflecting a "...romanticism of the direct, the real and the intense emotional experience", were " the same for both the radical student and the freaked-out hippie" (Bensman and Vidich, 1971).

"Redefinition of gratification" also meant an unwillingness to 'pay the price' of career success. As central as ideology was the fact that a career is not easily contained in a corner of one's lifestyle; with it comes the obligation to maintain at least the appearance of conventional morality and manners. Social forms however were viewed by the counterculture as impulse-controlling and were rejected as being repressive.

Comparing a counterculture individual with his mainstream counterpart may make concrete the magnitude of these changes. In the middle class, a mainstream individual spent a large part of each weekday working or studying. Valuing the opportunity to have a career, to acquire material goods and to make a contribution to the culture, time was divided systematically between work and leisure.

For the introspective, the committment to spontaneity and open ended time meant that work and leisure were not separate; instead hours of work were flexible and goals short term. For the committed social activist, 'work' was somewhat structured; attendance at meetings and demonstrations, discussing "new" political theory and planning ways to disseminate it. If the counterculture individual worked for money, it was at handcrafts, art or music. More desirable than working for money was 'energy exchange', giving time to a 'free store', 'head shop', or clinic in exhange for goods or services.

Mainstream people spent leisure time as spectators: watching television, listening to music, dining out, attending the theatre, concerts, sports. Rather than 'passively' developing connoisseurship or supporting 'specialist' art by attendance at performances, counterculture people were making pottery, painting and playing music because they believed creative expression shouldn't be given over to specialists.

In the mainstream one drank liquor to relax. The intended effect was to mitigate preoccupation with work and domestic routine. The counterculture preferred marijuana and hashish, or consciousness-altering substances such as LSD, Mescaline, and Peyote in order to heighten awareness of everyday life.

A mainstream individual wore clothes in subdued colors, choosing different items for work and leisure. Since the counterculture individual preferred to merge work and leisure, he wore the same clothing for both; bright colored, loose-fitting garments customized with embroidery, paint or beads to reflect an individual style. Handmade garments from India or Central America replaced indigenous mass manufactured shirts, jackets and pants. Sexual differentiation by appearance was minimized; long hair, bright colors and jewelry were worn by men as well as women.

The rich, varied diet of a mainstream middle-class American symbolized affluent consumption most literally; it was rejected by the counterculture. The counterculture limited range and style of preparation to a few simple choices. Meat and fish, restricted by many, were eliminated entirely by some in favor of organically grown

grain, and simply-prepared vegetables and fruit.

Problems of measurement: demographics and cohesiveness

Clearly the counterculture of the sixties included many elements of the protest movements, Bohemias, and rebellious lifestyles of the past. Yet, it was distinct from these earlier movements in two important ways: its size was much larger, and its demographics were much wider, that is, it came to transcend economic and geographic boundaries (Gold et. al, 1978) and it was able for a period of years to maintain cohesiveness across these wide boundaries (Yankelovich, 1974). These two interrelated elements, demographics and cohesiveness, proved particularly difficult to measure. As a result, estimates of the size and scope of the counterculture varied widely and its very existence as a coherent entity could therefore be questioned by social sxientists (Lipset, 1971) as well as lay observers who were opposed to its values.

First, the problem of definition confounded measurement. Each investigator had his own scheme for categorizing the counterculture: activist versus introspective (Keniston,1971), forerunners versus various degrees of sympathizers and latecomers (Yankelovich, 1974), and as those who only professed the counterculture's values versus those living an alternative lifestyle (Musgrove, 1974).

Second, many individuals adopted only a part of the counterculture's values and lifestyle. Dress and behavior, for example, did not necessarily differentiate counterculture from the mainstream; often if functioned only symbolically to demonstrate opposition (Matza, 1969) or to create a sense of belonging (Bensman and

Vidich, 1971) rather than correlating necessarily with other counterculture values or behaviors. A survey of counterculture values among a cross-section of young people found "strong sympathy" for counterculture values among one-third of males, one-sixth of females, a considerably larger percentage than were involved in aspects of counterculture lifestyle, suggesting to one investigator a "considerable though variable penetration of deviant and conventional culture" (Musgrove, 1974).

Third, the fact that the counterculture waxed and waned over a span of several years further confounded measurement. Although media dissemination of values, music and style speeded exposure, it nevertheless took time for the the counterculture to spread from a small, middle-class urban nucleus to a large international movement. And as the sixties became the seventies, the counterculture did not end abruptly; it waned. By the early seventies researchers began to document a feeling within the counterculture that there had come to be less distinction between being 'in' and being 'out' (Yinger, 1980).

The particular year a scale or survey was administered, therefore, affected the amount of generational cohesiveness found. An overview of 10 surveys of values in the sixties found considerable overlap between self-described counterculture members and their parents: opposed findings were attributed to differences in scaling (Thomas, 1971). But in later studies of values and lifestyle in counterculture communities (Weider and Zimmerman, 1974, Musgrove, 1974) and among college students (Gold et. al. 1976), researchers reported considerable differences from the mainstream in both lifestyle and values.

Studies using repeated measures confirmed that affirmation of counterculture values was a function in part of the time a given survey was administered. One scale of "New Left" values administered to college students and their parents found significant differences between sons and parents and none between fathers and mothers but only in the second, post-1968 administration (Gold et. al., 1976). A trend analysis using data points from 1967, 1969 ,and 1973 confirmed that counterculture members were a waxing and waning number made up of overlapping groups of counterculture introspectives, activists and sympathizers (Yankelovich, 1974). When the counterculture was relatively small in the early sixties, the relationship between family background, radical values and political activity was significant. As the movement spread, demographic, religious, and ethnic differences diminished and generational cohesiveness increased.

While the edges were blurred, the counterculture of the sixties contained a clearly recognizable core which had opposed itself to the mainstream in deliberately visible ways (Matza, 1969). Despite difficulties of definition, numerical markers can be cited. The Woodstock Festival of 1969 was estimated to have drawn 500,000 people. The 1970 Isle of Wight Festival in England was estimated to have drawn 150,000. Circa 1970, student radicals were estimated at about 2 percent of the college population but the numbers of sympathizers who were drawn to support a given 'event' far exceeded this percentage (Bensman and Vidich 1971). The fact that 'sixties generation' named not only an age-specific group but a class further enhanced cohesiveness. It was estimated that over 70 percent of active participants in counterculture activities were socialized in the middle

or upper-middle class (Yablonsky, 1968).

The theoretical base

For a theoretical framework, many social scientists writing about the sixties (Flacks, 1969, Davis, 1971, Weider and Zimmerman, 1974, Yinger, 1980) referred to Mannheim's analysis of "the problem of generations" (1952). Each new generation has unique characteristics explained by its particular historical time. Societies which continuously change economically and socially, therefore, should continuously generate discrete age-specific subcultures. But Mannheim pointed out that, because a generation (or a class) has common experiences, this does not itself imply an enhanced awareness of either its difference from other generations or its common "lot". Other factors of social organization resist development of such a consciousness . What is distinct about each generation's base of experience is merged with factors held in common with members of other generations. (Weider and Zimmerman, 1974). Further, an age group is inherently an unstable entity since its solidarity and thus its opposition can only be extended by refusal to move on to a way of life appropriate to the next stage. It is considered unlikely, therefore, that a conciousness and values based solely on generational experience can endure in its original form (Yinger, 1980). If aspects of a specific generational consciousness endure it is because they resonated to values held by larger segments of the population.

Generational conflict, in the sense of large-scale opposition between parents and offspring, is not characteristic of industrial societies. Unlike third world cultures, Western educated young people

haven't had to be the force carrying modernism forward against tradition (Flacks, 1971). This is not to say that industrialized societies have not experienced generational conflict. Educated middle-class writers and artists created a "Bohemia" in New York's Greenwich Village before World War One and again in the fifties while artists migrated to Paris. In the sixties, however, Western countries experienced the kind of widespread youth-led social opposition previously seen only in those traditional societies in which technological change had rendered traditional values and institutions irrelevant (Flacks, 1971).

A dialectical framework

Within the upheaval of a countercultural era, culture and counterculture are seen as opposed entities. "A counterculture that would be satisfied with some modification of the wider culture is no counterculture at all" (Westhues, 1972). A "reversal of values" is central to the very definition of a counterculture (Yablonsky, 1968). Viewed as part of a larger dialectic, countercultures function as "latent alternatives", as one way societies solve the problem that a culture must satisfy contradictory needs (Slater,1971). The most useful overview, therefore, is one which respects the "social utility of disorder" (Peckham, 1976).

Culture and counterculture are therefore most usefully viewed as a dialectic of two social forces "bound together in linked evolution" (Yinger, 1980) with margins of interaction. For the evolution of the sixties counterculture, this "horizontal" dialectical view provides a theoretical structure which can account for syntheses of values and

lifestyle as well as for separate encampments no less than does the "vertical" dialectic, the individual in a social world (Milgram, 1978).

Predictions from the sixties

The consensus both in the theoeretical and the empirical literature was that the values of this counterculture were more likely than its predecessors to persist (Davis, 1971). It was held to be unlikely that sixties values and behaviors would transform mainstream society, but that for segments of the population, specific values and behaviors would endure. The reasoning was that both the benefits of a technologically based economy and its harms; pollution, illness, exhaustion of irreplacable resources, and disatisfaction with the narrowed experiences available to those who pursued specialist careers, were all likely to continue (Reich, 1971, Roszak, 1974).

Views diverged around the forms in which the counterculture would endure. Some believed that counterculture values and behavior would continue as opposed groups reflecting existing differences in values (Weider and Zimmerman, 1974, Davis, 1971). This was to say that the revolution had already come. Davis envisioned three groups: a technologically-oriented middle working class, numerically dominant, a large segment of dropouts, and a larger, economically subsidized minority, so that the effect of the counterculture would be to further pluralize the mainstream (Davis, 1971).

Another category of prediction was that counterculture values would percolate into the mainstream in a diluted form; opposed values such as counterculture "expressive" versus mainstream "instrumental" would shift balance so that there would come to be more "expressive" in

the mainstream (Levin and Spates, 1971). From surveys of trends in values and behaviors from 1967 to 1973, Yankelovich (1974) predicted a variation on the latter form; a continuing process of syntheses of mainstream and counterculture values and behavior. Proceeding from a "forerunner" group, counterculture values would diffuse next to career-minded college students, to other young people, to the upper-middle class, to older people in urban settings, then to the mass of the population. At each stage in the process there would be a synthesis of old and new.

A longitudinal study of activists "10 years after", reported in 1974 that counterculture members were concentrated mainly in social science, creative work, and mental health and had not as yet had a major effect on mainstream culture (Fendrich, 1974).

A relatively recent survey of self-selected sixties participants was conceived as a response to the assertion that the sixties counterculture had allowed itself to be absorbed into the mainstream (Weiner and Stillman, 1979). While admittedly of a biased (self-selected) sample, their findings indicated that respondents who professed nostalgia for the counterculture also affirmed its values and lifestyle. Yet, when those respondents were asked to compare specific values held in the sixties to what was affirmed in the present, differences were marked. Further, few reported a complete sixties lifestyle although many reported that some aspects had endured.

## METHOD

### The scope of the study

The effect of the sixties was operationalized as a series of question based on predictions from the literature:-

- has the counterculture continued to generate opposed groups? Are there introspective and activist wings of the sixties counterculture which remained separate from a 'technologically-oriented' working middle class? (Davis, 1971).

-do sixties activists try to affect mainstream institutions in the eighties? (Fendrich, 1970)

-are there values which were considered counterculture in the sixties which are accepted in the mainstream of the eighties (Levin and Spates, 1971).

-have local syntheses of mainstream and counterculture values developed which are acceptable to individuals with diverse lifestyles (Yankelovich, 1974).

The unit of study chosen was the interrelation of individual and community. Several kinds of information were therefore obtained:

-demographic and other quantitative data; by means of a questionnaire for each of 60 subjects, and from the 1970 and 1980 United States Census,

-qualitative information; utilizing a structured interview for each of 60 subjects, reading local newspapers and local history and by participant observation of town meetings, activist meetings and other community events;

-historical information; utilizing documents from the Woodstock Library's local history collection and interviws with older residents in addition to those in the sample.

Sampling Instruments

Quantitative and qualitative data was collected utilizing a questionnaire and a structured interview (Appendix). The questionnaire was closed ended. The structured interview contained both closed and open-ended components and was designed to collect information about the individual in the context of the community. Both were developed by piloting successive versions with the cooperation of Woodstock residents.

Population sampled

Of Woodstock's total population of 6,823 (U.S. Census, 1980) a sample of 60 residents was chosen from a subpopulation of 2098 males and females aged 35-64 in 1986 who were full-time residents within the boundaries of Woodstock Township as ascertained by Zipcode. The subpopulation was designed to include only those residents who, by virtue of age, had the opportunity to participate in the sixties counterculture.

Sampling Method

Three sites were selected and four subjects chosen randomly at each site. Subsequent subjects were chosen by 'snowball' that is, each individual chose the one to follow. There were several reasons this method was adopted: It was necessary to compare specific subsets of the population. A random sample would have had to be very large to ensure age-approriate members of Woodstock's many subgroups. There was also reason to believe that former members of the sixties counterculture as well as third and fourth generation rural residents of Woodstock would be reluctant to participate if contacted randomly.

The three sites selected were:

-a Methodist Church whose congregation includes corporate employees as well as rural families,

-'Family of Woodstock' a volunteer-run social service agency which began as a response to the influx of young homeless people to Woodstock in the sixties,

-Woodstock's Village Green, where self-styled hippies, musicians and marginal community members congregate and socialize.

These sites were selected in order to ensure the participation of subjects who had been involved in the sixties counterculture in various ways as well as those who had not been involved at all.

At the Methodist Church site, the Minister was contacted first. Having secured his cooperation, four members of appropriate age and Zipcode were selected from the membership list of the church by taking

every appropriate tenth name. These constituted the first four subjects. After the questionnaire and interview were administered, each was asked to supply the name of a person within the previously defined parameters. This process was repeated until twenty persons had been interviewed. In this group, one subject moved from the area before he could be interviewed. A replacement was provided by the subject who had suggested his name. Several subjects refused to be tape recorded but permitted the interviewer to transcribe responses in longhand.

At the Family of Woodstock site, permission to consult the membership list was obtained from the 'Head of Day', the coordinator of services on the day the request was made. Four members of appropriate age and Zipcode were selected from the membership list by taking every appropriate tenth name. These constituted the first four subjects. After the questionnaire and interview were administered, each was asked to supply the name of a person within the previously defined parameters. This process was repeated until twenty persons had been interviewed.

On the Village Green, four members were chosen by first approaching a person known to the interviewer as being a Woodstock resident in the appropriate age group. His cooperative presence facilitated securing appointments with three other age and Zipcode appropriate subjects not known to the interviewer. These constituted the first four subjects. After the questionnaire and interview were completed, each subject was asked for the name of a person within the previously defined parameters. This process was repeated until twenty persons had been interviewed. In this group, one person, after

initially acceding, refused to be interviewed. A replacement was provided by the subject who had suggested his name.

Interview Method

The interview consisted of a set format in which each subject was first informed that the research was for the the interviewer's doctoral disertation and that anonymity was assured. Subjects were offered a period of discussion about the project on the condition that it take place at the conclusion of the interview. After the questionnaire was filled out, permission to tape record an interview was requested. In all of the cases in which permission was refused the interviewer was permitted to record those subjects' responses in writing.

Data from the questionnaire were analyzed utilizing the SPSSX statistical package. Results are reported in the sections titled 'The Sample'. Information from the interviews are reported throughout this document and have been given the citation '(I)'.

## THE COMMUNITY

Many residents of Woodstock indicated that their pattern of life and work, their social involvements and their leisure activities have been shaped by unique aspects of this community. For the considerable number of immigrants from New York City and other urban places, 'what Woodstock symbolized' (I) is no small part of why they chose to live in Woodstock. Reciprocally, Woodstock in the 20th century has been shaped by waves of immigrants whose activities, values and way of life differed from and then shaped the community's norms. To gain an overview of the individual in this particular social world, it is therefore useful to describe the evolution of Woodstock's norms in the

context of its unique history.

1787 to 1900: Woodstock Township is formed

Settled on 20,000 acres of land owned by Robert Livingston, Woodstock became a township in 1787 (Evers, 1984). From its beginning Woodstock was not organized like other towns in the Hudson Valley. In the others a farmer could give his land to his heirs. Woodstock was organized on the tenant-landlord system; its settlers farmed land they leased from Livingston but could not own. Woodstock's settlers could start farming with no capital but their descendents could not inherit. From the first years of settlement to about 1850 no Woodstock farm was sold. The tenant-landlord system came to cause so much resentment that a law was passed in 1850 outlawing leases that ran more than 12 years. By 1855 many former tenants of the Livingston brothers owned their farms. In that year the population of Woodstock was 1806 of which 1.72 percent were Black (Evers, 1984). The 1980 Census recorded a population of 6823 of which 2.4 percent were Black (Ulster County Data Book, 10th Edition, 1983). While the population had increased 377.8 percent, the percent of Blacks remained small.

Woodstock kept much of its 19th century appearance and homogenuous way of life into the early 20th century. It was one of the few towns in the Catskills that had not become a crowded summer resort (Evers, 1984) and it was said to do so by excluding minorities (I). Thus the earliest settlers in Woodstock were renters rather than owners and were less open to social change than the farmers who settled the surrounding townships.

The gradual entry of outside groups with different ways were a novelty, especially for children. As a fourth generation Woodstocker described those days "My mother was probably the first to take Jewish boarders. We also had Russian and Armenian boarders. It was all very exciting. The experience of Jewish people was how they raised their children. They were a part of the family...their desires were considered and they were asked what they think. You had an opinion. They gave me books and took me with them on outings" (I). Various schemes for industrial development were tried in the area. Glass making was successful until the hardwood used to stoke the furnaces gave out. Quarrying and mineral hunting provided some employment. Hopes were pinned on a raiload but it did not come to the area. As a result, the community remained a bucolic one.

1903; the first counterculture

Eventually the failure of of industrial development together with its beautiful mountain setting brought an unusual kind of tourist to Woodstock; the artist. Rural art colonies are said to have originated in France in the early 19th century in response to a growing interest in landscape painting (Jacobs, 1985). As early as 1870 Easthampton on Long Island attracted painters who first boarded at local inns and later established homes and studios in the community (Easthampton Guild, 1976). A similar interest in the landscape of the Hudson Valley brought Thomas Cole, George Inness and George Bellows to paint in nearby Catskill Mountain towns and Bellows to live and work for a time in Woodstock itself. In the 1880's, Mead Mountain House, a local hotel, was said to have attracted architects and painters unlike the doctors and lawyers that populated other Catskill resorts (Evers,

1984).

In 1903 an art colony was founded in Woodstock. Unlike most others in the United States and in Europe, Woodstock's art colony did not grow out of visits by artists who favored a particular scenic area but was a planned project. As Woodstock's founding had been in the hands of a single wealthy man, Robert Livingston, its art colony was founded by another: Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead. Born and educated in England, Whitehead was an advocate of the Arts and Crafts Movement, a reaction to the competitive technologically-oriented society produced by the Industrial Revolution. Led by John Ruskin and William Morris, the Arts and Crafts movement's solution to the social and ecological problems that industry had caused in England was to simplify life. They believed that hand-made objects could compete in the marketplace and by doing so demonstrate a lifestyle counter to the forces that had crowded workers into factories and polluted the landscape. It was therefore on ideas much like those of the sixties counterculture that Ralph Whitehead founded 'Byrdcliffe', Woodstock's first art colony. By 1911, art magazines were listing a 'Byrdcliffe Summer School' offering courses "...primarily in painting but instruction also was given in decorative design and handicraft" (Ludwig, 1983). Also listed was the Thatcher Summer School of Metalwork which featured courses in "...hand-wrought metalwork, jewelry and enamel taught by Edward J. Thatcher a former member of Byrdcliffe as well as an instructor at Teachers' College of Columbia University (Ludwig, 1983). The Arts and Crafts philosophy was the underpinning of Woodstock's first art colony and the same ideology focused the counterculture that congregated there in the sixties. The two major rebellions against the machine age of

the twentienth century; Arts and Crafts and the sixties counterculture both found a home in Woodstock.

Before founding 'Byrdcliffe' Whitehead and his American wife had organized an art school for children in Santa Barbara which included living quarters and studios for painters, craftspeople and writers (Evers, 1984). Here Whitehead met Hervey White, a writer and social worker and the painter Bolton Brown. Deciding to establish an art colony in the Arts and Crafts spirit, Whitehead sent Brown and White to look for a site. They travelled the East Coast from the the Adirondacks to the Appalachians of Georgia. Brown, it is said, was "captivated by the Woodstock he saw from the summit of Meads Mountain" just outside of Woodstock village (Evers, 1984). Whitehead agreed and decided to found the colony there.

Brown and White bought 7 farms totalling 1200 acres in order to protect Byrcliffe against real estate speculators (Handcraft,1903). In all Byrdcliffe came to comprise an art school and studio, work spaces for artists and craftspeople and houses for the Whiteheads and Brown so that "...furniture, textiles and color prints would be produced in a pleasant country setting by people for whom the aimless hurry of most Americans' lives had been removed" (Handcraft, 1903). Soon after Byrdcliffe's opening, Brown was discharged as Byrdcliffe's director. He became the first artist to build himself a studio in Woodstock outside the art colony's limits. Hervey White left shortly after Brown, founding an art colony he called 'The Maverick'. Houses and cabins on Maverick land were built inexpensively to allow creative people to spend more time on their work than on earning money. Its Maverick Press turned out books of poetry and job printing. A

self-styled "old Woodstocking" elaborated the relationship between Byrdcliffe and the Maverick: "The way they tell it in my family is that the whole concept of Byrdcliffe fell apart when people realized that the communal thing was one-sided. The Whiteheads were the lords of the manor. Even though they provided the wherewithall to do all these things: they had the little forge, the little weavers...these people were basically serfs. They ended up making stuff for nothing for the main house, 'White Pines'. They were invited to the house on Sundays to do little Morris Dances and have tea....The Whiteheads sat up there, lords of the manor. They owned all the horses and the carriages and if you wanted to go into town they'd rent it to you. That's why Hervey white and that whole bunch broke away to the Maverick. They wanted a looser life style" (I).

From all accounts, looser is what the Maverick was. The Maverick Festivals which lasted until 1931 provided a marketplace for art and crafts and also music, and dancing. In photographs one sees bright-eyed costumed revelers. "The Maverick Festivals ended in 1931 because of pressure by locals who objected to the nudity and carousing" (I). While they lasted the Maverick Festivals attracted thousands of people each year who patronized local business and increased the resident population.

1920-1960: artists, locals and corporate employees

By the twenties, many painters who had arrived as students had settled in town. The Art Students League had established a summer school of landscape painting in Woodstock. Each year a few who came to take classes in Woodstock would decide to stay (I). The artists all

knew each other and although quarrels were continual, so was mutual support. "Soon after I came, I joined the Woodstock Artists' Association. I had heard they had a fund. If you were an artist and you needed money they just gave it to you. So just for drill I asked them for $100. I needed it for rent and they gave it to me. I paid it back, of course" (I).

Artists continued to move to Woodstock and have done so to the present. Many descendants of rural farming families also remained, leaving agriculture to become tradesmen and town employees. Until the 'invasion' of the sixties, locals and artists maintained good relations. "The first party we went to when we came here in 1957 was given by the people we bought the house from. They were locals and had just sold their cattle and they did what we heard was done: A local family would adopt an artist who had moved up. And they would visit us and we would visit them. She would teach me to can. Tom would plow out and tell us what to plant and when to plant. So we had both sides when we came here" (I).

"There was some initial standback certainly from the farmers but when they saw we didn't have horns.... (I). "(an artist) told me that Mower's store would extend credit the whole year and you would pay in the summer when you sold. Three thousand dollars they would owe....That's why she would never enter the Grand Union when it opened. She went to Mower's her whole life" (I).

By the early nineteen fifties, Woodstock village had developed water and sewage problems and some felt the old system of district schools was no longer adequate. At the same time the larger political

atmosphere of Cold War mistrust and MCarthyism polarized the township. The result was a period of hot debate without many solutions. By the mid fifties a new force, industry, was finding it profitable to move to the country. 'Rotron', a company that made blowers used for cooling electronic equipment, began and grew in Woodstock. IBM built a plant in nearby Kingston and many of their employees lived in Woodstock. Corporate employees tended to want sewers, central school systems and a more suburban way of life. "They tended to lobby hard for their views. That's why a central school system was implemented. My father, after he got Rotron running, put a lot of effort into town planning" (I).

With the completion of the New York State Thruway, the time from New York City to Woodstock was shortened considerably. With it came a rush of building, mainly straightforward split-level housing. Meanwhile the pivotal generation of artists was getting older and fading. There was a sense that Woodstock had become a suburb with an interesting past. A fourth generation Woodstocker reminisced that "It was very dull here in the fifties. It was beginning to feel like blah when the young people came" (I).

1966-1974 the second counterculture

From its beginning as an art colony, music and its political character had played an important part in Woodstock life. Whitehead himself had advocated both peace and folk music and had published a book of folk songs of Eastern Europe in 1912 (Evers, 1984). Later Leadbelly and Pete Seeger performed and spent time in Woodstock. By the fifties, folk musicians had also settled in Woodstock and played at local nightspots. Literature and poetry had carried the spirit of the

Beat Generation of the fifties: music embodied the particular spirit of the sixties. "It was the music that revitalized this town; music, popular music that did it" (I). Bob Dylan's arrival in Woodstock in the mid sixties focused the attention of the counterculture. "I remember the kids were always trying to show him something they had written...it was like his house was a holy place...just to be near it...." (I) Many well known musicians followed Dylan. The hippies, looking for an inexpensive, rural and sympatico place to drop out, followed the musicians. Tourists came to hear the music and to see the hippies and flower children. But what was to some a renaissance to others was an invasion. The hippies had joined an art colony which had retained its locals. As the locals saw the newcomers, "...we felt invaded and we wanted our town back" (I). Woodstock was polarized once more.

The 'Woodstock' Nation

Looking back at the Woodstock Festival, it seems inevitable that some form of music would focus the spirit of the times. But why name it 'Woodstock' only to hold it 60 miles away in Bethel? The answer to this question leads back to Woodstock's particular way of evolving and the complex relationships among its subgroups. Small festivals had been happening in Woodstock for five or six years, gathering people and energy. "The original idea for the Woodstock Festival came from 'Sound Outs' held on Pam Copeland's farm. Richie Havens, Tim Hardin, lots of local people were there but nobody knew it. That went on for about 4 or 5 summers. It ended in '69 with the big one" (I). The 'big one', however, was not simply a big 'Sound Out'. Because Woodstock was not receptive to the counterculture's minimal spending and earning way of

life, hippies were reluctant to let their concerts grow in size. "Well, we could see they were just looking for a reason to get on us, so we tried to keep it low key. But more and more people would hear about them and come over" (I).

A major music festival, then, was an idea from outside the community although "...the promoters knew Woodstock and the Sound Outs" (I). In 1969 a group called 'Woodstock Ventures' began to look for a place to hold a concert called the 'Woodstock Music and Art Fair; an Aquarian Exposition'. They did not look in Woodstock (I). True, opposition to the counterculture, both official and unofficial, was strong in Woodstock. Others said it was because "...Woodstock just didn't have a large enough piece of land to hold a festival of the size its organizers were planning" (I). The organizers tried Walkill in southern Ulster County. Here permission was granted and then withdrawn. Next they applied to hold the festival in Sullivan County. While not unanimous in its approval, this area, unlike Woodstock which had a history of anti-semitism and exclusionary practices, was the home of a good number of Eastern European Jews who supported the idea of a minority with a right to be different (Evers, 1984). Max Yasgur rented the organizers his 600 acre dairy farm in the town of Bethel. The Festival that came to symbolize the counterculture of the sixties kept the name it had taken from a town known for festivals and a way of life that was at the same time rural and bohemian.

The festival was Woodstock's in spirit. Woodstock was the home of the Woodstock Nation. But the closest hospitable site the Festival organizers could find was sixty miles away.

After the Festival

The impact of the Festival on Woodstock was enormous; the media ignored Bethel but put Woodstock on the map. Large numbers of young people without money or plans poured in. "The Friday afternoon bus came to be known as the 'Runaway Express'" (I) More than ever, music was this counterculture's cohesion and one of the first symbolic battles between locals and hippies was about music. As a sympathizer remembered it, "There was an attempt to pass a noise ordinance; no music or something stupid. Someone who lived across from the "Expresso" had complained. There was a tremendous public meeting. The ordinance was never passed because the process was flawed; somehow the copies passed out were different from what was decided before. But many people did stand up and say it was a stupid thing to do. I remember one person had just returned from a long trip and he talked about all the towns he had gone to and ended up: 'you're going to make a Saugerties (the conservative neighboring village) out of Woodstock'. Half hissed; half applauded" (I).

As a local described that same event, a different perspective emerged. "They were playing music on the Village Green till all hours. The Dutch Reformed Church which had been at that site for 400 years - the Minister and his family couldn't sleep. People LIVED in the Village. All of a sudden the Village was becoming unlivable" (I). While the 'no music' ordinance didn't pass, others passed which were aimed at the hippies "...one man was seized on the charge of playing the flute while sitting in a tree" (Evers, 1984).

Another way to control the growing influx of hippies was the move to get the town to close 'Big Deep'. This traditional Woodstock swimming hole had been owned by a woman who gave it to the town for recreational purposes. "The town closed it because the police chief said he couldn't control it; people are smoking dope and swinging from the trees. There was was a 'swim in' where a number of people were arrested...then some of us wanted to open a road to it so the police could patrol it and they wouldn't have that excuse. There were still people who just didn't want to open it but they did put a road in and then it was open" (I).

As a result of the arrival of so many indigent young people, Woodstock saw its welfare rolls rise. After the festival, the town hired a welfare officer "whose job it was to get people off welfare" (I). But the young people just kept coming. Several respondents recounted that locals frustrated by the failure of their attempts to stop the wave of immigration took the law into their own hands. "There were places that were burned down...the town fathers more or less, they actually went out and burned down hippie camps" (I). But the locals were not united in their opposition. "There WERE excesses but a lot was like when you learn too soon and haven't gone through the steps" (I). Another kind of response to the arriving hippies was provided by a group of Woodstockers who "were annoyed at how we were treating the homeless drifters. People would come off the bus and they'd think they're gonna see Bob Dylan... we asked ourselves how can we absorb that?" (I). Their response was to found 'Family of Woodstock' a 24 hour help center staffed by volunteers who dispensed information, practical help and emotional support. "Hippies who had nowhere to go

were given shelter in the 'Roadhouse' and those who had tripped out on acid were helped to recover" (I). In the sixties, however, "...the town was fighting with Family, brutally. They felt that the presence of help only encouraged the hippies to come" (I). At present this organization, still called 'Family of Woodstock', is a "wholistic social services agency with 24 hour help centers in several Ulster County communities" (I). Their motto remains what it was in the sixties; 'Any problem under the sun' (I).

Gradually some of the counterculture's values and lifestyle permeated the mainstream. In the past two decades Woodstock has attracted older, urban college-educated people who wanted a viable alternative. From 1960 to 1970 the increase in population was 49.0 percent; from 1970 to 1980, an additional 19.4 percent arrived. Comparing Woodstock's population increase to Ulster County as a whole: the county population increase 1960 to 1970 was 18.9; its 1970 to 1980 increase was 12.0 percent (United States Census; 1970 and 1980).

For some of these immigrants, Woodstock combined the best of city and country, a place "...that was rural and beautiful yet where I can feel at home because it's like Manhattan north" (I). But employment opportunities in a rural area could not keep up with an influx of college-educated immigrants. Jobs in state and local government and in the schools were limited. Rotron and IBM were still the two major industry employers. Woodstock's proximity to the New York State Thruway together with its beautiful mountains and its core of former city people helped it become popular as the site of second homes for prosperous New Yorkers and as first homes for people who earn their living elsewhere. These arrivals together with the liberalizing social

trends in the culture as a whole are the most recent influences on the town's character.

1986: THE INDIVIDUAL IN A SOCIAL WORLD

Woodstock's groups

Woodstock is unusual as a social world and as a community in that it is rural yet heterogenuous in populations. Each of its subgroups has a self image, values and interests which differ from the others in major ways. Seven groups can be identified:

1. Corporate employees, called 'the IBMers' regardless of employer.

2. Descendants of rural farming families, called 'locals' or, uncharitably, 'rednecks'.

3. Immigrants who arrived in two large waves circa 1960-1970 and circa 1970-1980. For reasons of dress or lifestyle, some are identified as 'old hippies'. Later immigrants, more often having college degrees and city habits, are called 'city people' or 'transplants'.

4. Artists; those who show their work locally and those who show in New York City.

5. Marginal individuals; alcoholics, bag people, drug addicts, the emotionally unstable and the unemployed are collectively called 'street people' or 'skidders'. Some marginal individuals have been in Woodstock since the fifties and sixties and are said to be 'acid burnouts'.

6. People who have a country house in Woodstock but live and work in New York City most of the year, called 'second homers' or 'weekenders'.

7. People who derive a sense of identity and/or employment from a 'new age' belief system. This groups includes members of Woodstock's two Buddhist Temples, the Zen and the Tibetan, and variously-trained therapists, philosophers and enthusiasts.

Corporate employees.

This group, of which IBM is the largest employer, has an influence on community-wide issues larger than its numbers because corporate employees tend to lobby as a group. It was this faction that, in the fifties, wanted centralized schools, town planning and sewers. They are resented by those who disdain their lifestyle and by those who envy it. Locals complain that they support projects which raise taxes, are transferred out after three years, leaving others to pay. City people complain that they promote the suburbanization of the community.

IBMers are both in and out of the community in complex ways: Most corporate families live in an area called 'Zena' or the 'IBM Ghetto', a neighborhood of substantial, conventionally-designed houses facing the road in neat rows. Further separating Zena from other Woodstockers, it is divided into two school districts so that half of the community is involved in the Woodstock School system but the other half sends their children to the Kingston school system.

Many 'IBM families' or 'corporate families', as they call themselves, socialize almost exclusively within Zena. The expectation in Woodstock is that all corporate families choose to affiliate only with each other. An atypical IBMer described encountering this attitude upon looking for a house. "When the real estate agent heard we were IBM she took us right to Zena. My husband told her 'no, we don't want to live here where all the houses face the road and our friends are chosen for us. We'll chose our own friends'" (I). While some IBMers were willing to say that they socialize exclusively within Zena, most denied that similarity of values was the reason for it. "It's because we get transferred out we think of Zena as home, not Woodstock" (I). The perception that Woodstock's 'atmosphere' is at odds with family-oriented values was expressed indirectly. IBMers, like locals, shied away from voicing negative perceptions of the community openly. Instead, disapproval was expressed as a past state of affairs "I used to think the artist types were strange but I think I'm getting used to them" (I); in terms of the welfare of children "I'm fine here. I get nervous when my son goes to Houst (the local hardware store) unsupervised" (I); and in myths about the lives of other Woodstockers. For example, in response to the question whether people in Woodstock look different from people in other communities: "Most people in Woodstock don't have jobs where they have to wear suits and ties, they wear costumes. They say Halloween is the national holiday of Woodstock" (I).

Socializing between groups happens when the concerns of children or civic issues bring group members together. "We met this couple when we were both working on the Library Fair and she invited us over. He

takes care of their daughter half the week. I guess it's okay. They seem to work it out somehow" (I). As the culture as a whole assimilated some of the values of the sixties, attitudes changed. As an IBMer described the present attitude in his workplace: "You know, it's now considered to have prestige to live in Woodstock, whereas before they would have thought there was something wrong with you" (I).

Locals

Descended from the rural farming families who founded Woodstock, locals are today the tradesmen and officials of the Township and the County; plumbers, contractors, building inspectors and police constables. One branch of young to middle-age locals, male and female, including a number of transplants who have affiliated with them, have adopted a distinctive image to compete with the town's hippies, rock musicians and PhDs; the cowboy look; faded flannel shirts, battered western hats, jeans and boots. They affect an exaggerated salt-of-the-earth competence. "The girls find out that rock musicians are fine to hang around with but to get your car fixed they're helpless" (I). Shy of initiating social contact, locals talk easily only with a good amount of encouragement. Their perennial complaint is that "...no one can afford to live here anymore" (I), meaning that taxes and expenses are too high. While the escalating cost of real estate is not referred to directly, complaints about taxes are an indirect reference to locals' major source of status: land. As real estate prices rose in the last five years, living on what was once the family farm came to involve sitting on a considerable amount of potential cash. Some locals have sold acres for ready money, but the prevailing mode remains 'land rich but cash poor'. One seventy year

old local continues to cut and deliver firewood although he owns 200 mountaintop acres. "When I look out the window, I want to be looking at my view, not someone else's view", (I) he reasoned.

Other locals the same age were brought to Woodstock as children. Some are indistinguishable from transplants and do not observe particular social boundaries, others have affiliated strongly with 'born and raised' locals.

Older locals, disinclined to compete for status, are conservative in dress and demeanor. Not for them the 'ad hominem' sparring carried on weekly in the pages of the 'Woodstock Times'. A town official noted that "the group that I see the least participation from is native locals. They'll talk one-to-one but they won't do it in front of someone else. They see some of these people, this one's got his Master's, this one's got his PhD, articulate people. Locals, maybe a high school education at most. Does he know that he can take these people on verbally?" (I)

With a few beers, locals recount their 'city people' anecdotes. So as not to offend unwittingly, stories are twice distanced by attributing the worst of them to newly-arrived second homers. Anecdotes turn on the point that the transplant is incompetent in the 'real' world, defined by locals as competence with material things rather than, as city people define it, as involved in culture and as sensitive to human relations. A story might turn on the point that 'good money was thrown at' a fancy version of what was available for less in a plain, utilitarian form. "Finally I had to tell him I could have made him two bathrooms for just what the imported tile cost him

for the one" (I). More common is the complaint about the city person's incompetence with tools. "He must be good at what he does but that son of a gun can bust a chain saw four times in one month" (I).

Transplants

A salient yet surprisng finding about transplants is that to a subject they expressed considerable ambivalence about life in Woodstock. It seemed as if many never made their peace with the tradeoffs inherent in a move from city to country. Ambivalence was expressed in several ways: as aloofness from politics, as critical comparison between Woodstock's cultural life to what is available in New York City and as comparison between a city and country sense of friendship.

"I divide my energy" a former sixties activist noted ruefully, "I don't take my stand here. I remember going to a political meeting and most of it was who should sit where. Should we rotate the chair every 15 minutes...I never went back. I should have gone back till I got the chair to stop rotating" (I) Activists who have been in Woodstock since the sixties seemed the most uneasy with their divided loyalties and tried to see the locals' point of view. "I think the people who have been here three generations resent us because we haven't fit in. We're not a melting pot and diversity doesn't appeal to them...It was partly the times. In the sixties we didn't want to fit in...we could have gotten involved in schools...politics" (I). "Integration should have happened a long time ago. Now it's too late" (I). "The influx from the city didn't really integrate itself and that's why there's that sense of different armed camps...who came when...oldtimers and

newcomers...there's a lot of usses and thems" (I). "We don't really invest in each other. Maybe we did earlier on but we don't do it as much anymore. It's the times but it's also Woodstock" (I).

For culture, transplants have New York City to which they unfavorably compare Woodstock. "If they gave a Messaiah and I had nothing else to do on a Saturday night I probably wouldn't go. I think we have a sense that it would probably be mediocre" (I). Popular music remains the form of cultural expression that transplants attend. "You can still hear Richie Havens here because he comes to see his kids, and a few guys from 'The Band' too. I should go more often" (I).

The quality of friendship is measured against what was available in New York City and perceived to be lacking the City's intensity. "In Woodstock you tend not to have close friends but a large circle of potential friends; people whom you're real comfortable with sitting at a table at Duey's but you wouldn't pursue it. Another noted: "There are literally 50 people who if I ran into outside of Woodstock, I know I'd be delighted to be with but I don't seek them out and they don't seek me out" (I).

"In New York we were more emotionally involved" (I) another transplant noted, but "Maybe you can't have that kind of intensity without anonymity. You can't spill your guts on the floor and then wave in the Grand Union" (I).

As a group, transplants view locals the way locals view them: as incompetent in the 'real' world. For transplants, the real world is measured by involvement in culture and in sensitivity in human relations rather than in competence with material objects. Anecdotes

describe the stereoptype of the well-meaning but socially oblivious local. "My girlfriend joined the Ladies Auxiliary of the Fire Department. All 36 locals who grew up in the town, but her. Someone starts telling an anti-semitic story and another woman stops her. 'Marcia here is Jewish'" (I). Given the stereotype, when a transplant finds himself spending time with locals, he feels he has to explain himself. "...after a short amount of time you find yourself spending time with people you'd never have given 5 minutes in the City. They may have some special knowledge, know a hell of a lot about woodstoves and come over and you spend a Saturday afternoon talking about the stove and if you see them in Duey's you might sit down and have coffee with them. In the City You would have never dreamed of talking to them. It's one of the artifacts of Woodstock life" (I).

Former sixties introspectives, of which all but one were transplants, tended to look back on that time as a high point of their sense of community. "I feel like I'm in the underground. I came out in the sixties and then I went back in. That's because of how it is out there. Inside I feel the same as then and I know that there are other people too. I still recognize them and they me and we have quick communication. It's this real minority and in fact I'm convinced that most of those people haven't changed and they'll go all the way to the end still being the way they became and I'm one of them" (I). Another introspective described the way the ideology of the sixties allowed him to rearrange his personal life: "I was divorced and remarried in the sixties. Now my wife and I are partners in a business (a flower shop) and partners in a child. We each work in the store half a week and do child care half a week. I still can't get used to the idea of making a

profit- it doesn't feel right- but other than that I think I learned in the sixties that I could remake my way" (I).

Activists described the experience of the sixties on the way they did professional work. "I worked for the Mental Health Information Service in the city. Then I decided I wanted to be a country lawyer but no question I practice law from a sixties head. Even as a lawyer, I consider myself a better person having lived through and lived-the experience" (I). Looking back at the social changes of the sixties, activists saw lasting effects: "True, a lot of the counterculture has been coopted; you can see it on the major networks. But the social consciousness of the sixties stayed as consciousness of the environment, consumerism, the women's movement, it had its roots then...and I think the government gets away with less" (I).

Sympathizers described the indirect or delayed effect of the sixties: "Even though I felt too old to participate directly, I had a young child, I think the sixties left a mark on people; myself, others. It was good to speak up and speak out and people shouldn't be afraid to champion unpopular causes. It left a mark on the way I raised my family. I have a son in Portland, Oregon. He grew up in this environment and he's a community organizer. I subsidize him with words amd money" (I). Another described a ten year process of "...looking at the sixties from a CEO's life in New Jersey" (I). Selling his business in 1979 and moving to Woodstock, this man divorced, remarried and now works part-time for Family of Woodstock, practices the piano and gardens.

Woodstock is also home to those who continue to livthe life of a classic sixties d dropout. "I'm not part of the Woodstock economy, I live on whatever comes in. I don't try to generate money; it comes. When I put up my cabin on a couple of acres in 1968, it was $1100; $400 for the wood. I spent $8 a week on yogurt and almonds and broccoli, $200 a year on kerosene and $250 taxes. We rent now but we live on $1000 each" (I). The process of talking about larger issues poignantly heightened this subject's awareness of time passing: he is now 45 years old. "But what happens if you need an operation? If you think about it, it brings on illness. Sensitivity is not a good thing to have in the modern world unless you live in a Utopian community" (I). 'Old hippies' described the sixties as "culturally, a high point" meaning widespread anti-technology sentiment: "My consciousness remains raised from the sixties even though the focus has changed somehow. Machines, machines, the humanistic lessons of the sixties which I still carry with me and always will were forgotten by a majority of people so I see the world as having gotten worse. You go to the Supermarket and they pass everything over this beam...you look up to see the price and this little voice comes out...and artificial voices on the telephone...the car talks to you...somehow I don't like that" (I).

Artists

Woodstock in the eighties remains a first or second home to a considerable number of nationally known artists. Those who have a 'reputation' work in their Woodstock studios but show and sell in New York City. Local galleries are few and the work they show is considered to be of uneven quality. Crafts shops aimed at tourists

outnumber galleries. Like transplants which many are, artists express ambivalence about Woodstock as a place to live. "As an artist I look for some sense of stimulation in the City that isn't here" (I). Others find the critical standards too lax. "I used to write art criticism for the paper but they wanted to tear me apart. They all took it so personally" (I). Another artist noted that "As an art colony, Woodstock is mediocre; it's a retirement community for people of all ages" (I). To a transplant "There's no real art in Woodstock, just packaged summer stock and inferior crafts. Its packaged diluted tourotrash" (I).

'Local' artists belong to the Woodstock Artists' Association and do show their work in Woodstock and around the County. Their point of view is that "We have curators come up from New York City to jury our shows but no matter what we do they'll say it's wrong. We get an audience that doesn't trust their taste. They have to see it in New York before they'll buy" (I).

Marginal people.

'Street people', 'skidders' or 'greenies' are Woodstock's name for unemployed and marginally employed individuals who, in style of dress and vividness of expression, recall the sixties. By long, hard fought tradition street people lounge on the Village Green in the center of Woodstock, delighting some and dismaying others. Transplants and artists take the street peoples' civil rights as their 'cause celebre'. "As long as —— can still sit on the Green, we're all right...." (I). Many expressed outrage at street peoples' deliberate acts of provocation. "Do YOU think its all right that —— knows he can 'moon'

a tour bus whenever he feels like it?" (I)

The ideology expressed by street people, like that of the 'old hippies' from whom they are difficult to distinguish, is that it's been downhill in Woodstock, and in the larger culture, since the sixties. Their forms of expression are at the same time vividly poetic and polemical: "The town was full of beautiful people with beautiful eyes and glowing faces. And they've all been replaced by these living corpses tonguing their ice cream cones and taking pictures of each other and gaping at all those weird artifacts in the stores that have no real value. You can't buy a pair of shoes here but you can buy all these weird three pronged 'bluties' from Afganistan" (I).

Weekenders.

Woodstock has had 'second homers' since the twenties. These people, mostly from New York and New Jersey, are ignored by some and resented by others. They rarely integrate themselves into the life of the community. Woodstock's weekenders differ from 'summer people' in other rural areas in that their interests are not completely different from the interests of the resident population. Their needs for culture and friendship however are met in New York City and this is seen by locals as elitism. "When they come to the country, they don't want to mix, they're ready for a rest" (I). Locals tend to resent the affluence of 'second homers' although these families pay taxes and hire tradesmen who most often tend to be locals. Someone seems always to be saying that "Woodstock has changed into a bedroom community, a second home community" (I). A constable noted that "...these new expensive homes are all alarmed and when the alarm goes off and we respond it's

always Dr. So and So or Lawyer So and So who lives in the City" (I).

New Age philosophers and healers

In contrast to its high percentage of college-educated population, Woodstock contains a subculture of astrologers, therapists, gurus and philospohers. Their offerings and points of view appear regularly in the Woodstock newspaper and are woven into daily conversation. Many remember the man who "...filled the Kleinert Gallery at six dollars a head to hear the philosophy he called 'Breatharianism'. The fellow, Brooks was his name, promised to reveal the secret wherein nourishment could be extracted directly from the air so there would be no need to eat food unless it was for sport" (I). At a recent breakfast in one of Woodstock's restaurants, 'treatments' were offered which, it was promised, would intensify the activity of the right side of the brain. In the 'Woodstock Times' one finds advertisements under the heading 'Creative Services' for 'reliving your previous lives', 'color therapy', 'homeopathy' and 'foot reflexology'. The newspaper's publisher pronounced it"...a mystery why there's so much astrology and all that here when the per capita education is so high " (I).

Images of the past

In 1986 views of the sixties come in many colors. Locals tend to pass over the influx of hippies and the Festival itself as if it had never happened. They describe Woodstock as the country village that existed before the sixties and deplore Woodstock's 'yuppie' image in the eighties. "You had a town then where you'd go into Schneider's and sit down at an old marble-topped counter on a stool and have a cup of coffee and talk to somebody. It was sleepy and Walter had a lot of

junk over to one side that hadn't been sold in the last 25 years. Allen Electric had a store in that building and the only thing in the window was the backs of old washing machines. It's true. It was totally different. It wasn't the Bloomingdale's image that we have today" (I). When locals do talk about the sixties they describe a siege. "We were invaded, which is a word you'll hear a lot. People came in with a back pack and nowhere to stay, living where they could. They didn't think about private property. At that time we made a lot of trespassing arrests and loitering arrests and drug related arrests. They would come in and camp on somebody's lawn. Prior to that everybody knew everybody. This was a small town" (I).

When former hippies and artists described Woodstock, one heard nostalgia for the sixties. "We had a bookstore that had a room for meditation. We had a restaurant where you could stay over if you had no place to stay. You could cook there if you knew how to cook. One day a man came in and made all the tables and chairs. It lasted five years" (I). Others reminisced about the social mores of the sixties. "Sex, drugs and rock 'n roll. Literally meeting a whole room of people in one night that I'm still friends with 15 years later...." (I). "From the early 1900's on, artists were running around here in Russian clothes with liquor bottles....it was a permissive town, you could be odd in this town. It was different than being odd in Saugerties or odd in Mount Tremper" (I). Many missed the Woodstock Nation. "We used to have a connection with the West Coast. Every Spring and Fall they would come in. There would be tie dyed motor homes, vans and broken down cars. There was coming and going... from here to Santa Cruz banded together in caravans" (I). "The tourists here now...are looking

for the mystique that is 'Woodstock'. The name conjures up...the feeling. The name of our town became part of the language" (I). "They expect to come in and see not the routine thing. Did you see the rainbow buses this week and the hippies got out and they were all my age, in their early forties. It's the first time I've seen them since when? The seventies?" (I).

Images of the present

When asked to describe how Woodstock differs from other towns its same size, individuals mention various aspects; the interesting conversations to be had on the main street, the involvement in art, music and theatre, the tolerance, even support for alternative lifestyles, the comfortable quality of living among city people, the beauty of Overlook Mountain as seen from the parking lot of the Grand Union Supermarket. Invariably the diversity in values and background of Woodstock's populations is mentioned and their effect on the community discussed.

Diversity is viewed both as Woodstock's strong point and as its undoing. The positive side is that it's a "...very accepting community, a tolerant community. You know the people on the Green, and the ones on Welfare, here we wouldn't let anything happen to them" (I). Social liberals understand that tolerance of alternative lifestyles is not universally valued. "They may have some secret thoughts but relatively everyone is polite on the street. They realize that all of us have to live in this town together and do the best we can. Woodstock has been at this artist community kind of thing for 60 years" (I). Others see the positive side of diversity as cultural. "Our

artists may make their living elsewhere but because of them and the city people we get more than our share of concerts and shows..." (I). Whether Woodstock is still an art colony is hotly contended. To a corporate employee "The Village Green is quaint. The shops are pretty. When we have vistors it's nice to take them through Woodstock. There's lots of art and crafts and there's the Woodstock Playhouse" (I).

The negative side of Woodstock's diversity was described as its inability to achieve consensus. ""It's fairly well understood that no one will ever agree on an issue so it just has to be who yells the loudest" (I), and the community's acrimonious 'ad hominem' style of debate. "I would never run for office in this town and have my name dragged through the mud in the Woodstock Times every week" (I). Many of the Township's institutions are periodically involved in intense internal conflict. Recently the Woodstock Artists Associations' two Boards each attempted to remove the other from office. Many attributed the intensity with which issues are argued to the kind of people Woodstock attracts. "These are people here who came here to build their own world. Some are people who take pride in the fact that nothing gets done. The drawback is that the community has a hard time functioning as a whole" (I). Locals, whose style tends to be low keyed, attribute the heated arguing to the fact that a large part of the community is comparatively recent immigrants. "It tends to make public discourse more abusive that the people who are arguing are relative strangers" (I).

The Police Department, under the leadership of a local, seemed for a while to have found a way to remain effective. "This is probably the most low-key laid back Police Department that I'm aware of. We're more of a service organization than anything else -as opposed to a strict law and order kind. You screw up and you'll get arrested but I think we select the guys here pretty well. We get applications from all over the country... They say 'I can't wait to get to Woodstock and I'll come up and clear the Green' and whatever. I don't want them around. We put old people back into bed and get the cat that's up the tree. It's much more than just arresting people. That's why I say I have a relationship with the people on the Green. I have no trouble with that. I've worked a long time to develop a Police Department like that. If we have a serious crime, within minutes we have the State Police in here" (I). In July 1986, however, a scandal erupted. Several policemen were found to have been sleeping during the night tour of duty. Controversy centered on whether to make their names public. Accusations flew for almost 6 months. Then the Police Chief retired.

It is the older residents who expressed positive feelings of community. "All of us in Woodstock have a comraderie. Being it's a small town we stay in touch. It's easy to say I'll see you at the next party at the Artist's Association or at the Library Fair. Christmas we all come into town to the Green here and watch Santa Claus come down out of nowhere. He comes off a building down with his sleigh" (I). "As for the IBMers I think their children are probably enjoying this town more than they are. They're very busy working" (I).

Planning the future

It may be useful to describe Woodstock's diversity in terms of the current polarizing issue; zoning and growth. In the fifties, town planning for centralized schools, sidewalks or the size of the recently completed sewer system could proceed at the pace that Woodstock's battling forces could manage. With the rapid appreciation of Woodstock's real estate in the eighties, developers are increasingly petitioning the Town Board with projects for high density housing and hotels. As a result, "It's a town that's groping in the eighties; how to change in order to stay the same. We have a sewer system that was designed to allow for no growth yet everwhere you look someone wants to make it grow" (I).

One point of view is that a planned, orderly transition from present to future best serves the community as a whole. "This town has no clearly defined policy of how to grow and still be harmoniously what it wants to be. You have to look at it as a whole; this is worth preserving, this could be changed. If we don't, people with money from outside are going to swoop in and take advantage of that paralysis" (I)

The notion that planning is necessary for an orderly transition or to stop external forces from eroding Woodstock's character is opposed by those who see it as the door to change, meaning growth. "There was a time you could sit on the Green and feel you were in the woods. There wasn't as much traffic but especially commerce....just the ringing of cash registers is psychically annoying and knowing that people have to generate a certain amount of business just to stay afloat. It never was that way. A person could rent a store for $200

and make a go of it as a head shop or selling handcrafts. Today you couldn't do it. You should be able to sell one beautiful thing a day, pay the rent, and walk in the woods. Now we have out of town landlords...they don't care who they rent to...look alike businesses... I'm kind of anti progress" (I).

There is another group against planning but with the aim of permitting growth rather than stopping it: "They want to be the last ones in, then we shut the door. We've been poor a long time. Now there's the chance to have something; jobs for the young people, affordable houses..." (I). This faction is often accused of taking a position to serve their own rather than the community's interests. "If I owned a lot of land in Woodstock it would really shape my interest too. I'd be looking to take the lid off" (I).

Social mobility

For families with children and transplants who have lived in Woodstock long enough to put down roots, this community is perceived as socially mobile. An artist married to an attorney described "...very discrete communities within the larger community but there is a nice overlap. It's not as pronounced a division as in other communities but maybe I just like to think that. If you're an attorney or a carpenter or a man who delivered wood you might be more isolated in another community, Also what strikes me about Woodstock is that there is an inter age community here. Maybe that's because the generations seem to stay on. If you go to a party there'll be a real mix in ages" (I).

For recent arrivals and single adults, the perception is that there are no places in Woodstock to socialize. "There isn't a social scene up here. In the Hamptons, there is socializing, a party circuit. Here people tend to come up and hide out and see a small group of friends" (I). While many noted that "The real life of Woodstock takes place in people's living rooms" (I), special interests can open the door. "As a professional astrologer I know that there are many of us in the area. I'm interested in exploring the psychic and occult field and find a lot of people who are compatible in that way" (I). The consensus was that "...Woodstock is a very hard town to break in to. Socially there are few avenues and people tend to be guarded with newcomers because so many come and go. We were lucky because we had friends who were involved with 'Family'. We ran therapy groups for them and they stayed for years in my circle of friends but I think my experience was atypical, there are few activities so most people tend to work in some isolation unless you're into Disco" (I).

Comparisons between counterculture-involved and uninvolved residents; a sample of 60 individuals

The present character of Woodstock, its groups and their interactions were documented by interviews with a cross-section of community residents and by participant observation of community events and processes. Another way to understand the effect of the sixties on the eighties in Woodstock was to compare counterculture-involved to counterculture-uninvolved Woodstock residents as individuals in a social world. To do so, a questionnaire was administered to a sample of 60 individuals.

To ensure that both those who were and those who weren't involved in the sixties counterculture would be represented, the sample was selected from a subpopulation of Woodstock residents; those who could have participated in the sixties counterculture by virtue of age and who live full-time in Woodstock. To further ensure that the desired groups would be obtained, three specific sampling sites were chosen.

Comparing the sample to the array of Woodstock's groups two differences emerged. By design,'second homers' and residents younger than 35 and older than 63 are absent. The sample was also found to be weighted toward 'transplants'; 27.7 percent of the sample arrived 1960-1970; 45.0 percent arrived 1970-1980.

Grouping the sample

The first step was to ascertain how much of the sample had been involved in the counterculture of the sixties and whether this part of the sample would cluster into the groups described in the sixties.

Social scientists in the sixties saw the counterculture as consisting of three groups. Two of these were categories for those who adopted a counterculture lifestyle; introspectives, involved in spiritual or religious study, or activists, involved in social issues. (Keniston, 1971; Kerpelman, 1972; Yinger, 1980). A third group "sympathizers", was those professing counterculture values but adopting few or no elements of activist or introspective behavior (Manoff and Flacks, 1971; Musgrove, 1977). These three categories together with a fourth, those who had been uninvolved in the counterculture's lifestyle and unsympathetic to its values were used to group the sample. The Cluster routine of SPSSX was employed to sort subjects according to

these four categories. Question 43 of the questionnaire (see questionnaire, Appendix) asked subjects to respond yes or no to a list of items about their values and lifestyle in the sixties. From this list, items were selected to test the hypothesis that the 60 subjects of the sample would aggregate into four groups: introspectives, activists, sympathizers, and uninvolveds. The items chosen were:- item A to represent the category 'sympathizer', item E, to represent the category 'introspective', items I, J, K, L, M, X Y, AA the category 'activist' and items BB, CC uninvolved.

The sample was found to contain all four groups. There were 13 'introspectives', who were also sympathetic to the values of the counterculture but were not activist; 16 'activists' sympathetic but not introspective, 19 'sympathizers' who were sympathetic but neither activist nor introspective; and 12 'uninvolveds', neither introspectives, activists, nor sympathizers. Of the 60 subjects, therefore, 48 were sympathetic to the counterculture, and a subset of 29 of these 48 were involved in some aspect of counterculture lifestyle.

Another way to group the sample with respect to behaviors and beliefs in the sixties was by means of an all-inclusive question. During the piloting of the questionnaire, several individuals had described their lifestyle in the sixties with the phrase 'sex, drugs and rock and roll'. This phrase was added to the questionnaire (Questionnaire, Appendix) as Question 234. Looking at responses to this item in terms of the four groups described above, 12 of the 13 introspectives, 8 of the 16 activists but only 4 of the 19 sympathizers and 0 of the 12 uninvolved described themselves as having adopted the

'classic' sixties lifestyle. Using this method of grouping, 24 individuals described themselves as having adopted the classic sixties lifestyle.

Tradeoffs

The following four items were selected to understand the tradeoffs of values and lifestyle made by sixties-involved as compared to sixties-uninvolved individuals. The issue was whether the values and choices considered pivotal in the sixties continued to shape individual lives in the eighties.

Why came to Woodstock

Given that Woodstock has the highest percentage of individuals in Ulster County who have completed 4 years of college (Ulster County Data Book, 1983) together with its rural setting, it is a reasonable assumption that, in coming to live in Woodstock, the tradeoff for many was economic gain and career objectives for other aspects of lifestyle. Woodstock had its largest population increase in the sixties. In the period 1960-1970 its population increased from 3836 to 5714 an increase of 49 percent; in 1970-1980, from 5714-6823 or 19.4 percent (U.S. Census, 1970 and 1980). Many of the immigrants from both decades described coming to live in Woodstock without a plan for earning a living. Of the 36 immigrants from New York City, 20 described the move to Woodstock as a gradual change from weekend visitor to resident (I), a style that the proximity of New York City to Woodstock made possible. For the entire sample, only 11 respondents came to Woodstock with a specific job offer in hand and 6 of these were from the uninvolved group. For those without a specific job, finding employment in the

Woodstock area was not easy. One woman reported working part-time for 9 months for the plumber to pay his bill. Others described 'falling into' their present employment or creating a way to earn a living that was unrelated to previous employment (I). It is therefore not unexpected that the responses of the three counterculture-involved subgroups of the sample to the question 'why did you come to Woodstock' show that values relating to style of life and ideas about community predominate.

The most frequent response made by 29 respondents, almost half the sample, was 'to have a more rural lifestyle'; 7 introspectives, 9 activists, 11 sympathizers and 2 uninvolved. This response reflects the ideology of the sixties in which a return to a simple way of life was an ideal as well as reflecting the large number of dissafected immigrants from New York City. Marginally, more sympathizers than activists and introspectives came to Woodstock for a rural lifestyle, indicating that sympathizers had closed the gap with the sixties-involved. Yet those who reported being uninvolved in the sixties did not change their values; they did not base their decisions on issues of lifestyle and community in the eighties. The second most frequent response 18, was 'to live among like-minded people'; 3 introspectives, 8 activists, 6 sympathizers and 1 uninvolved. The low number of introspectives choosing this category is due to the fact that the artists fell into "introspectives" and chose the response "to do art". The two largest response categories accounting for 47 responses were, therefore, related to lifestyle rather than career or employment.

As will emerge when employment is considered, the three sixties-involved groups, by coming to live in Woodstock, traded employment and/or career objectives for style of life while the sixties-uninvolved came for reasons of employment. 'To do art' received 12 responses; 6 introspectives, 1 activist, 5 sympathizers and 0 uninvolved. 'To take a specific job offer' received 11 responses of which 6 were from the uninvolved group. These were the people who came to Woodstock not for reasons of lifestyle but to work in a corporation or to start a business. To 'live near family' and 'to live near friends' each received 8 responses. Next, 7 persons responded that they had come for 'what Woodstock symbolized'; 6 sympathizers. This finding confirms what was elicited in the structured interviews; for sympathizers, the Festival and indeed the entire counterculture of the sixties was viewed as a missed opportunity.

Why stay in Woodstock

The reasons people said they stay in Woodstock were not the same as why they reported they had come, nor can the two sets of reasons be considered in strict counterpart to one another. The 'why stay' responses tended to elicit consideration of the larger issues of community and style of life; the 'why came' tended to elicit an attempt to reconstruct the time period of the move to Woodstock.

The largest response category to 'why stay', 24 responses, was 'to live among like-minded people'; 3 introspectives, 11 activists, 8 sympathizers and 2 uninvolved. This response shows the importance placed on a sense of community by activists and sympathizers as compared to introspectives and uninvolveds. 'Rural lifestyle' was

second with 22 responses; 7 introspectives, 6 activists, 7 sympathizers and 2 uninvolved. Family reasons received 12 responses, 2 introspectives, 3 activists, 5 sympathizers and 2 uninvolved, indicating, as had been stated in the interviews, that the needs of children weighed against moving back to New York City for those ambivalent transplants who have children. To do art received 11 responses: this category remained stable. 'What Woodstock symbolized' 10 responses; 0 introspectives, 2 activists, 8 sympathizers and 0 uninvolved. Sympathizers, who had not participated in the sixties lifestyle, responded positively to questions that were phrased so as to evoke the spirit of the sixties, 'like-minded people' and 'what Woodstock symbolized', while introspectives, involved in the sixties lifestyle but in their own work, ideas, or spiritual development were low responders to these choices.

Disadvantages of living in Woodstock

In order to look at stated disadvantages broadly responses were divided into two categories; economic (Q65,66,68,69,70,77) and lifestyle (Q64,67,71,72,73,74,75, 76). The four groups by these two categories showed that 55 responses were lifestyle ones and 29 were economic. Economic concerns were not neglected although disadvantages of lifestyle were considered to be more important.

Looking at responses by group allowed another perspective. Introspectives gave 15 lifestyle responses and 6 economic; activists gave 24 lifestyle and 12 economic; sympathizers gave 14 lifestyle and 7 economic; uninvolved gave 6 lifestyle and 15 economic. Summing up, introspectives and sympathizers gave approximately twice as many

lifestyle as economic responses. Activists had the same ratio of lifestyle to economic responses as the other two groups, that is, twice as many lifestyle as economic responses but the total number of items chosen was considerably less. This may indicate that activists had considered these issues for a longer time or in a more thorough way. Uninvolved respondents showed the opposite pattern from the other three groups, twice as many economic as lifestyle responses.

Disadvantages of the place where lived before

The largest response category was 'too urban': 13 responses, of which 2 were introspectives, 7 were activists, 2 sympathizers and 2 uninvolved. This response is consistent with the high number of respondents who came to Woodstock for a more rural environment from an urban one. 'No sense of community' received 9 responses of which 8 were from the three sixties-involved groups. 6 responses were given to 'too hectic' and 'a bad place to raise children'. Disadvantages were therefore viewed in terms of sixties lifestyle issues in which a rural, peaceful environment and a strong group affiliation were highlighted.

Education and Employment

Education level for the sample and for Woodstock is high compared to the county as a whole. For the sample 19 (31.7 percent) completed high school, 7 (11.7 percent) had a degree from a two-year college; 16 (26.7 percent) from a 4 year college; 14 (23.3 percent) had a graduate degree and 4 (6.7 percent) a graduate professional degree. For Woodstock as a whole, 23.4 percent completed high school, 23.7 finished 1-3 years of college and 37.7 percent completed at least 4 years of college (Ulster County Data Book, 1983).

Of the municipalities in Ulster County, Woodstock's 37.7 percent completing 4 years of college gave it the highest percentage in the County to have done so. As a comparison, New Paltz Village, (a smaller entity than a township containing the State University of New York at New Paltz) was second to Woodstock with 34.0 percent completing 4 years of college (Ulster County Data Book, 1983).

Of the sample, 23 subjects were self-employed. Looking at the distribution of these self-employed individuals by level of education; all but 4 had some college while 12 had a graduate degree. Amount of formal education therefore varied directly with self-employment. In terms of sixties involvement the 23 self-employed aggregated as follows; introspectives; 7, activists; 10, sympathizers; 8, uninvolved 1. The self-employed were therefore almost all connected to the counterculture by lifestyle or sympathies. This may reflect the fact that counterculture uninvolved individuals came to Woodstock either with job in hand, for economic reasons or for family reasons, while former counterculture-involved individuals came for reasons of lifestyle with a less clearly defined employment plan. Looking at the self-employed by where they came from, 18 of the 23 came from New York City. To sum up, the largest group of self-employed subjects was involved in the sixties, had a college degree and came from New York City for reasons of lifestyle. From interviews the picture that had emerged wwas that self employment was most often different from previous employment and was a response to the scarcity of options.

Looking at the remaining categories of employment responses, of the 13 introspectives 6 responded that they 'work as little as possible'. No other group members gave this response. 'Introspectives' includes artists as well as others with self-involved concerns and showed the fewest number involved in conventional employment. Activists had 10 self-employed respondents and 1 in government, 2 in nonprofit/school, 1 in a religious community. Sympathizers had 9 self-employed, 4 nonprofit/school, 1 government, 1 in a large business. Self-employed sympathizers showed the same employment pattern as introspectives and activists indicating, as Yankelovich predicted, the spread of formerly radical values from the more to the less committed (Yankelovich, 1974). As a group, the uninvolved showed no concentration in a particular category of employment; 3 each in government and small business, 2 in large business, 1 each in nonprofit/school, religious community and self-employed.

To compare subjects' job held now to the job held before coming to live in Woodstock, job descriptions were aggregated into 4 categories; white collar, blue collar, artist and unemployed. In the category job now; 20 white collar, 16 blue, 9 artists, 3 unemployed. Job then 24 white collar, 14 blue collar, 10 artists 2 unemployed. Therefore, while many changes in employment category were reported in the move from urban to rural living situation, the breakdown by category of work remained surprisingly consistent.

Leisure Time

One of the most strongly-defended values of the sixties was that leisure time should be spent in active rather than passive pursuits. Responses to direct questions about use of leisure time showed that the largest category of responses, 46, were to the 'hiking and camping' item. Since this activity also reflects Woodstock's rural setting, another way was needed to understand whether sixties ideas about leisure time had continued into the eighties. Responses to questions about alternative education were used as a way to understand use of leisure time. This category had been defined as participation in: informal classes, self-instruction, apprenticeships and on the job training. The range of topics studied were collapsed into two categories; career-oriented and avocational.

The finding was that 23 respondents were involved in avocational study; 7 in career-oriented study. By group, for avocational study; 7 introspectives, 8 activists, 8 sympathizers and 0 uninvolved. For career-oriented study; 3 introspectives, 0 activists, 3 sympathizers and 1 uninvolved. Thus the three groups sympathetic to or active in the counterculture contributed 23 people involved in study as a a hobby, 6 as a career, while the uninvolved group, markedly different, contributed only 1 career-oriented and no avocational student. Thus the sixties idea that avocational time should be used actively rather than passively can be seen to have continued into the eighties for the sixties-involved groups but not for the uninvolved group.

Social Activism

Have those who were activists in the sixties remained so in the eighties? Of the 60 subjects, 25 reported no form of social activism at all. These aggregated as 7 introspectives, 4 activists, 10 sympathizers and 4 uninvolved. Of the 35 subjects who reported social activism, introspectives accounted for 9 responses; activists provided 23 responses, sympathizers 14 and uninvolved 10. The largest number of positive responses was made, therefore, by those who were activists in the sixties. The pattern of responses suggested also that sympathizers were latent introspectives rather than latent activists, and that a greater percentage came to be concerned with issues of personal development and lifestyle rather than with the social good.

Discussion

In looking at the effect of the sixties in Woodstock two frameworks shaped the inquiry: culture-counterculture as a ongoing dialectic capable of producing syntheses organized the large view of the community's evolution. The ways in which individuals affect and are affected by a particular social world provided the smaller, more specific view. Fit together they provided complementary snapshots of the lasting effect of a time of great social upheaval on a community.

The effect of the sixties on Woodstock's pluralism in the eighties was major but the hippies were a seed that fell into prepared soil. Settled by individuals who did not own their land, Woodstock's first major upheaval was the 'rent wars' of the mid nineteenth century. The rebellion reinforced the natural conservatism of a rural mountain community (Evers, 1984) and may have contributed to Woodstock's

resistance to the wide scale tourism that transformed other Catskill communities. In 1903 when the founders of Byrdcliffe were looking for a site, Woodstock was chosen because it had kept its rural charm. The first artists gained a foothold by bringing in capital and providing jobs and an art colony cohered slowly around this nucleus. Locals and artists are said to have mingled. There must have been some affinities of temperament and style between the self reliant locals and the artists. Industry in the early fifties brought corporate employees with a taste for a suburban way of life. While they participated in shaping the future of the community, for the most part they were transients. By the time Dylan arrived in the sixties bringing the first wave of the counterculture, Woodstock was practiced in accomodation.

In the sixties, not only social scientists but many theorists both in and out of the movement predicted that dissatisfaction with technologically organized specialist work would continue to produce alternative life-work arrangements (Davis 1971: Roszak,1969; Reich, 1971). By the mid seventies, midlife career disatisfaction among professionals was being illustrated as a conflict between expressing a range of interests and aptitudes versus the "one life-one career imperative" (Sarason and Krants, 1977). But not all dissatisfied professionals opted for midlife career change. A segment chose the 'redefinition of gratification' of the sixties, rethinking the value of a career in the context of a whole life.

In Woodstock, many of the permutations of life and work that were conceived in the sixties are represented; those who opted for a whole life rather than a professional definition of success found in Woodstock an alternative to midlife career change; a way to avoid the frustrations of a fast-paced, career-centered urban lifestyle without totally dropping out. Those with less of acommittment to change also developed routes; some traded work in a large organization for self-employment, others accepted work that provided less of an income or a reasonable salary without a career ladder. Yankelovich had predicted that self-actualization would be sought by rearranging professional work but in the context of career achievement. This category describes those who claim Woodstock as their home but work elsewhere. Considered the 'yuppies' of the community, they have managed to rearrange work to accomodate lifestyle without sacrificing too much income or career possibility. One way is to work in the specialized markets of New York City but to condense the work week or to take work home allowing an 'alternate' lifestyle during extended weekends and holidays. Another solution, available to consultants for example, is to split the work week between seeing clients in an urban area and producing output in Woodstock. Writers and artists, of course, can work in Woodstock for urban markets.

For those who traded specialist work for what is available locally Woodstock represents downward mobility and less economic security. The benefit is that a sort of non careerist status comes with getting away from success. "...you give up a ladder and a place on that ladder so there is a certain indeterminacy to your fate. But you trade that for certain kinds of things, sensitivity and self expression which are

esteemed in (the larger) society when they're accompanied by success" (I).

Many who arrived in the late seventies and eighties remained ambivalent about the tradeoffs they made in moving here. It wasn't easy to trade New York City's highly charged culture for a vision fueled by memories of one's youth. Alas, despite the emotional charge and the promise of that time, the sixties faded, even in Woodstock, never entirely a hippie town to begin with.. The changes are noted sadly. "We're comfortable here but it makes tradeoffs. We didn't know the extent of it till we came here. I did give up a job to come here... but were still here. Seasons are very distinct...you're more connected with cyclical changes... there's a different kind of rhythm to your life...but not without a cost" (I).

Looking at the United States as a whole, Yankelovich (1974) had envisoned the way the counterculture would permeate the mainstream. Ongoing syntheses of counterculture and mainstream values would continuously reshape the range of permissible choices (1974). In Woodstock, one sees this process in a microcosm. In the early nineteen hundreds, the first groups of artists and anti technology advocates came to this rural mountain town. By all reports they received a guarded reception. Slowly each group accomodated a certain amount to the values and ways of life of the others. Rather than a 'melting pot' Woodstock produced a mixture. Coming in to this dilution of rural village and artists' colony, the hippies of the sixties also received a mixed reception. Again the 'pure' form of each group's values and lifestyle was reshaped by the opposition of the others'. These synthesis formed a community in which many accomodations are possible:

for the unreconstructed hippie Woodstock provides a tolerant if increasingly expensive place to practice the classic sixties lifestyle. Artists and craftsmen can still work in Woodstock and market their work locally and in the City. Transplants can practice mainstream professional work against a background of sixties ideology or split work from lifestyle by freelancing or consulting in New York City. Those who accepted the sixties 'redefinition of gratification' can trade in their urban wage scale and career ladder. Few locals are able to farm as a way of life but they can remain in Woodstock as tradesmen, builders and government employees, supplementing their income with logging, hunting and truck farming. Shaping a commonly acceptable way of life for its disparate groups has meant diluting some of what each considered important. As a result, the aspects of Woodstock which satisfy some, entail the drawbacks which displease others. More important, perhaps, no one subgroup seems to have been able to chart this community's future.

To new arrivals, the salient image of Woodstock is of an unsettled community whose groups are in constant conflict (I). Only after some years does the larger, more complex pattern emerge. One begins to appreciate the fact that the zest for battle remains ever fresh and, more salient, that Woodstock's groups have managed the feat of accomodation without assimilation.

The counterculture of the sixties contributed in a major way to Woodstock's pluralism by providing waves of urban immigrants that were dedicated to the ideals of community. Having come of age in turbulent times, sixties involved transplants had a good amount of practice considering many sides of an issue. In addition, they had paid for the

privilege of living in Woodstock by trading career and economic security for style of life and tended to involve themselves in local issues and to protect community values. From life in New York City, these immigrants also brought a more fractious style of debate to Woodstock. As a result, conflict tends to be out in the open. With the push and pull of interests taking place in public, it becomes difficult for a single agenda to prevail. Another contribution to pluralism is that transplants tend not to vote as a group but to cohere around issues. Agendas don't always follow 'party' lines. When locals and transplants with children, for example, expressed ambivalence about wanting Woodstock to stay small and rural, each used the same arguments. On the one hand "We've all seen what happens to communities that can't keep rampant development out" (I). On the other hand "Can Woodstock provide a life my daughter would want ? (I). "I sent my son to a good college to come back and do what ?" (I). This shifting pattern of alliances together with Woodstock's acrimonious and public style of debate has made it difficult for a single power structure to achieve control.

From the founding of Byrdcliffe in 1903, when Woodstock first assimilated immigrants whose values and lifestyle differed from the norm of its rural mountain population, it has continued to evolve. Those first artists' settlements within the farm community set the tone: rather than drawing into separate encampments, artists and locals wove together -but not entirely. When the counterculture of the sixties arrived, it found a diluted artists' colony on which it was able to impose its image -but not entirely. Ironically, the locals held the line at becoming the literal Woodstock Festival only to become

the figurative Woodstock Nation.

In contrast to pure but fragile utopias, Woodstock's history in the 20th century has been a process of accomodating many voices. So far the process works. Given its early history as an art colony and its later heterogenous populations in a rural setting, Woodstock is not a typical American community. Yet, in its process of social development by compromise, Woodstock does resemble the country as a whole: waves of newcomers do continue to make for new syntheses. Perhaps it is communities that retain but temper the literal vision of any single generation of its founders that manage not to fade away. In a hardy setting, disparate groups and individual members can aspire to a sense of community without doing violence to personal truths.

APPENDIX
QUESTIONNAIRE

MALE__ FEMALE__ ZIPCODE_____ DATE OF BIRTH_____

NAME (optional)_____TELEPHONE NUMBER (OPTIONAL)_____

This questionnaire is part of a research project sponsored by the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. It is focused on the ways Woodstock has been and continues to be home to a variety of people with different views of life and work.

Because of Woodstock's history, some of the following questions are about aspects of your life in the sixties. (We use the term "sixties" to mean the years approximately 1966-1974 when counterculture ideas and ways of life were widespread.)

In accordance with research policy at the City University Graduate Center, your responses to this questionnaire and to the interview which follows will be kept confidential.

---

Please circle the letter in front of the answer you choose.

1. When did you come to live in Woodstock ?

A. before 1960
B. 1960-1965
C. 1966-1970
D. 1971-1975
E. 1976-1980
F. 1980-1985
G. I grew up here

2. Was the place you lived before Woodstock most similar in size to:

A. Bearsville
B. Woodstock
C. Kingston
D. Albany
E. San Francisco
F. New York City.

3. At present, do you live in:

A. A house by yourself

B. An apartment by yourself
C. A house with others
D. An apartment with others
E. A community or a commune
F. The Tibetan monastery
G. The Zen Buddhist monastery.
H. other (specify)_____

4. If you answered question 3 as C. a house with others, D. an apartment with others, or E. a community or a commune, for each person you live with, please write in the spaces below their:

| | Age | Sex | Relationship to you | Time lived together |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| B. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| C. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| D. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| E. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| F. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| G. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| H. | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |

(If there are more than eight people in your household, please continue below.)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |

5. Do you: A. own B. rent the place you live in now?

6. When did you buy or rent it?

A. before 1960
B. 1960-1965
C. 1966-1970
D. 1971-1975
E. 1976-1980
F. 1980-1985

7. From the time you came to Woodstock to the present time, in how many different houses or apartments have you lived?

A. one
B. two
C. three
D. Four
E. five

F. more than five (How many?)_____

8. Why did you come to Woodstock? From the list that follows please check the THREE MOST IMPORTANT reasons that caused you to come live in Woodstock:

_____ to have a more rural lifestyle than you had before
_____ to have a more cosmopolitan lifestyle than you had before
_____ to earn a better living
_____ to take a specific job offer
_____ to do art (visual art, music, writing, crafts)
_____ to start a business
_____ to change your career or job
_____ because of what Woodstock symbolized
_____ to join a religious or spiritual community.
_____ to get married
_____ to live with a lover
_____ to live near friends
_____ to live near family
_____ to live among like-minded people
_____ to make a good life for your children
_____ others (specify)_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Of these three reasons, which was the single most important ?
_____

10. Are some of the reasons you first came to Woodstock different from why you live here now? ___yes ___no

11. If yes, please go back to question 8 and check the THREE MOST IMPORTANT reasons you live in Woodstock NOW.
(To separate these answers from your first set, please circle).

11a. Of these three reasons which was the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ?

12. What were the major disadvantages of the place you lived before?

_____ lifestyle too hectic
_____ community too urban
_____ community too rural
_____ no sense of community
_____ not earning enough money
_____ not a good place for me to do my artwork
_____ job was unattractive
_____ not a good place to raise children
_____ not enough of a social life
_____ others (specify) _____
_____
_____

12a. Of these, which was the MOST IMPORTANT ? _____

_____

13. What are the disadvantages, if any, of living in Woodstock?

_____ no disadvantages
_____ the spirit of Woodstock has changed or diminished
_____ its difficult to find work in my field
_____ its difficult to earn a living
_____ too many street people
_____ rents are too high
_____ taxes are too high
_____ too many regulations
_____ opportunities for social life are limited
_____ many good people have left
_____ Woodstock's no longer a real center for the arts
_____ not enough like-minded people
_____ Woodstock's become too commercialized
_____ Woodstock's become too built-up
_____ there's not enough industry to supply jobs
_____ others (specify) _____
_____
_____
_____

## WORK AND EMPLOYMENT

14. Are you employed at present? ___yes ___no ___retired.
If "no" or "retired", go to question 21.

15. If yes, what do you do for work ? _____

16. For approximately how many hours per week do you work ?

A. more than 50 hours
B. 40 hours
C. 35 hours
D. 20 hours
E. less than 20 hours
F. other (specify) _____

17. Do you work for:

A. Town, County, State or Federal government
B. a non-profit organization
C. a small business such as a bookstore or a restaurant
D. a large business like Rotron or IBM
E. a religous community
F. yourself
G. as little as possible
H. other (specify)_____

18. How long have you worked at your present job?

A. A year or less
B. 2-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. 11-15 years
E. 16-20 years
F. more than 20 years

19. How far (in miles) do you commute to work round trip? _____

20. How often do you commute to work ?

A. 5 days per week
B. 4 days per week
C. 3 days per week
D. 2 days per week
E. 1 day per week
F. twice per month
G. once per month
H. I work at home
I. other (specify) _____

21. What work did you do at the job before this one ? _____

22. How long did you work at that job?

A. 1 year or less
B. 2-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. 11-15 years
E. 16-20 years
F. more than 20 years
(please go to question 26)

23. If you are unemployed or retired at present, what work did you do at your last job ? _____

24. When did you last work there ?
(month and year that job ended)_____

25. How long a time did you work there?

A. 1 year or less
B. 2-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. 11-15 years
E. 16-20 years
F. more than 20 years

25a. Did you live in Woodstock when you worked at that job ?

A. yes
B. no

26. If not, where did you live ? _____

27. If you moved to Woodstock from somewhere else, what was the last job you held there ? _____

28. How far (in miles) did you commute to work round trip?_____

29. How often did you commute to work?

A. 5 days per week
B. 4 days per week
C. 3 days per week
D. 2 days per weel
E. 1 day per week
F. twice per month
G. once per month
H. not at all
I. other (specify)_____

30. How long had you held that job ? _____months _____years

EDUCATION

31. Are you a student at present?

A. yes
B. no

If no, please go to question 33.

32. If yes,

What is your field of study?_____

How long have you been a student?_____

Where, or with whom do you study?_____

33. What level of formal education have you completed ? Circle all that apply.

A. Grammar School
B. High School
C. 2 year college
D. 4 year college
E. Masters Degree
F. any of the following: MSW, DDS. Phd, MD, LLB, JD.
G. Others (specify) _____

34. For question 33, if you answered C., D., E., F., or G. What was your field of study ? _____

35. Have you studied or trained outside of formal school ?

A. yes
B. no

36. If yes, what form of study was it ? (for example, an apprenticeship, self-instruction, informal classes, on the job training) _____
_____

37. What was your field of study outside of formal school?
_____

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

38. Please check the THREE items that describe what you do with MOST of your leisure time.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| __play cards/games | __draw/paint/sculpt | __go to concerts |
| __play bingo | __play an instrument | __go to movies |
| __play video games | __read | __go to the theatre |
| __work in garden | __sports | __go to galleries |
| __cook/bake | __do crafts | __watch T.V. |
| __hike and camp out | __sing | __meditate |
| __write | __landscape | __work taken home |
| __cut wood | __build furniture | __church services |
| __fix things | __church socials | __first aid squad |
| __around the house | __town government | __political work |
| __talk with friends | __missionary work | __fire dept |
| __computer program | __make films/videos | __volunteer social services |

Others (which ?)_____
_____
_____

39. Do you find that you tend to spend your leisure time at the same activities as during your work day?

A. yes

B. no

40. If yes, is this so because you:
(Circle ALL the reasons that apply)

A. need a lot of time to maintain a high level of ability (for example, many hours of practice to draw well)
B. have to work extra to make ends meet
C. don't draw a sharp line between work and leisure
D. these are your favorite activities
E. work at home makes it hard to separate work and leisure
F. others (specify) _____

41. If you spend most of your leisure doing the same one or two activities, is it because:
(Circle all the reasons that apply)

A. you don't have much leisure time
B. these are your favorite activities
C. they are activities that take a lot of time
D. this is your main interest and "work" is secondary
E. others (specify) _____

42. Do you participate in any of the following:

A. town government
B. nuclear freeze committee work
C. Board Meetings of a social service agency
D. voter registration
E. organizing for your political party
F. religious missionary work
G. religious study or meditation
H. social services organized by your church or another religious or spiritual group.
I. social services organized by a lodge
J. ecological issues (for example, clean air)
K. organizing around a foreign policy issue
L. womens' issues

## THE SIXTIES

Please circle the letter for ALL of the items that apply:

43. In the sixties (approximately 1966-1974) did you:

A. sympathize with counterculture values
B. live in a commune or community
C. regularly or frequently read "counterculture" literature (for example, the East Village Other, the Berkeley Barb)
D. take LSD, or other "consciousness altering" substances
E. involve yourself in spiritual or religious practice

F. sympathize with an anti-war postion
G. sympathize with a civil rights position
H. smoke marijuana or hashish regularly or frequently
I. attend protest meetings on a college campus
J. attend civil rights demonstrations
K. attend demonstrations against draft boards
L. attend demonstrations against the Pentagon
M. join civil rights marches in the South
N. support antiwar activities with financial contributions
O. support civil rights activities with financial contributions
P. drop out of school
Q. drop out of work
R. wear your hair long
S. decorate your clothing by hand
T. decide not to use your last name or change your name
U. change your diet (specify)_____
_____
V. change your means of earning a living (specify) _____
_____
W. involve yourself in social projects such as free stores, health clinics (specify)_____
_____
X. aid draft resisters
Y. refuse to pay all or part of your taxes
Z. participate in other aspects of the "counterculture" ? (specify)_____
_____
AA. involve yourself in other political activity (specify)_____
_____
BB. had nothing to do with any of the above
CC. was opposed to all that nonsense

44. In the sixties (approximately 1966-1974) where did you live? (circle all the answers that apply) If your neighborhood(s) had a name, for example, Bearsville in Woodstock or the Lower East Side in New York City, please write it in.

A. New York City
B. Woodstock
C. Bay area of California (San Fransisco, Berkeley,)
D. Los Angeles
E. Venice, California
F. Boston/Cambridge
G. others (specify)_____

45. If you changed cities or communities between 1966 and 1974, please write in cities and dates as closely as you remember (if your neighborhood(s) had a name, please include)
_____
_____
_____

46. Were you employed between 1966 and 1974?

A. yes
B. no

47. If yes, please describe below:

| | Dates employed (1966-1974) | Kind of work |
|---|---|---|
| A. | _____ | _____ |
| B. | _____ | _____ |
| C. | _____ | _____ |
| D. | _____ | _____ |
| E. | _____ | _____ |
| F. | _____ | _____ |
| G. | _____ | _____ |
| H. | _____ | _____ |
| I. | _____ | _____ |

48. Whom did you live with during 1966-1974? Before you answer this question, please read question 49.

| | Dates | Age | Sex | Relationship to you | Time lived together |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| B. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| C. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| D. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| E. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| F. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| G. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| H. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| I. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |
| J. | _____ | ___ | ___ | _____ | _____ |

49. If you lived in too many places, or with too many people to list, omit question 48. Instead, please write below a few sentences to describe your living arrangements during 1966-1974.

_____
_____
_____
_____

50. As near as you can remember, please check the three items that describe what you did with most of your leisure time in the sixties.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| __play cards/games | __draw/paint/sculpt | __go to concerts |
| __play bingo | __play an instrument | __go to movies |
| __play video games | __read | __go to the theatre |
| __work in garden | __sports | __go to galleries |
| __cook/bake | __do crafts | __watch T.V. |
| __hike and camp out | __sing | __meditate |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| __write | __landscape | __work taken home |
| __cut wood | __build furniture | __church services |
| __fix things | __church socials | __first aid squad |
| around the house | __town government | __political work |
| __talk with friends | __missionary work | __volunteer fire dept |
| __computer program | __make films/videos | __volunteer social services |

Others (which ?)_____

_____

_____

51. Did you tend to spend leisure time then at the same activities as during your work day ?

    A. yes
    B. no

52. If yes, is this because you:
    (circle All the reasons that applied)

    A. needed a lot of time to maintain a high level of ability for example, many hours of practice to play a musical instrument well)
    B. had to work overtime as a requirement of the job
    C. had to work extra to make ends meet
    D. didn't make a sharp divison between work and leisure
    E. enjoyed those activities a lot
    F. working at home made it difficult to separate work and leisure
    G. others (specify)_____

53. If you spent most of your leisure time doing the same activities, was it because: (Circle all the reasons that applied)

    A. you wanted to develop a high level of ability
    B. you didn't have much leisure time
    C. this activity was your main interest and "work" was secondary
    D. others (specify)_____

    Thank you very much for your help.

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. What is your image of Woodstock as compared to other communities?

2. What did the Woodstock Festival mean to you? At the time? In retrospect?

3. What did you think of the effect of the sixties in Woodstock? Was it a factor in your decision to stay here ?

4. Today, is Woodstock different from other towns of its same size? In what ways?

IMAGES

(for those who moved to Woodstock)

11. What image did you have of Woodstock before you moved here? Do you still feel that way?

22. Did you know about the Woodstock Festival before you moved here? If yes, what did it mean to you at the time? In retrospect?

33. Did you think about Woodstock as a center of alternative lifestyles? Did that affect your moving here? In what ways?

44. Today, is Woodstock different from other towns of its same size that you might live in? In what ways?

SOCIAL LIFE

5. What aspects or activities that Woodstock offers do you participate in?

6. Do you have a circle of friends in Woodstock? If not, do you have a circle of friends from where you last lived? How would you describe your friends in Woodstock?

7. Are there people in Woodstock whom you regard as being particularly obnoxious How would you describe them?

STYLE OF LIFE (for those who moved to Woodstock)

88. When you moved to Woodstock what kind of life did you expect to live? What kind of work did you expect to do? Now that you moved here how did your expectations work out?

STYLE OF LIFE (for those who grew up in Woodstock)

8. Growing up in Woodstock what kind of life did you expect to live? What kind of work did you expect to do?

In what ways have you yourself changed in the past 20 or so years? Are these changes due to the fact that you've grown older or to the fact that your environment including Woodstock has changed?

SOCIAL ATTITUDES

What are the major issues in American society today? (for each one: Why?) Has society as a whole gotten better or worse since the sixties? (Why? Why not?)

Did the events of the sixties raise or lower your personal or social hopes? How do your points of view look in retrospect?

Do you think sexual patterns are different from what was being advocated in the sixties? In what ways?

Do you think sexual patterns in Woodstock are different from most other places? How?

Do you think there's more drug use in Woodstock than in other places? More or different than in the early sixties?

Do you think people dress and appear different in Woodstock than in other towns its size? How?

What do you think of the Reagan administration ?

WORK

In a social situation, if someone asked you what you "do" how would you answer?

Is your work meaningful or does it just pay the bills? Does living in Woodstock contribute to making your work meaningful?

Do you feel like you're not yourself at work, that you have to adopt a different way of behaving?

Compared to how you are at work, do you feel like your real self at home or with friends?

What would an ideal job be like?

LEISURE TIME

How do you spend most of your leisure time? Do you think of leisure time as escape from work?

Are there things about Woodstock that makes your leisure meaningful?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Howard, Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Bell, Daniel, The cultural contradictions of capitalism. New York:Basic Books, 1978.

Bensman, Joseph, and Arthur J. Vidich. The New American Society Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Brown, James W., The values and norms of the expressive student subculture. Youth and Society. 4, June 1973, 483-498.

Costello, John, Virtue under fire; how World War 2 changed our social and sexual attitudes. Boston: Little, Brown, 1986.

Davis, Fred On youth subcultures: the hippie variant New York: General Learning Press, 1971.

Evers, Alf., Thee Catskills; from Wilderness to Woodstock New York: Overlook Press, 1984.

Fendrich, James M. Activists 10 years later: a test of generational unit continuity. J. of Social Issues, 30, no. 3 (1974), 99-118.

Flacks, Richard, Youth and social Change. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1971.

Gold, A.R., Christie, R. and Friedman, L.N. Fists and flowers; a social psychological interpretation of student dissent. New York: Academic Press. 1976.

Guild Hall of Easthampton. Artists and Easthampton: a 100 year perspective. Easthampton, New York: 1976.

Jacobs, Michael. The good and simple life; artist colonies in Europe and America. Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1985.

Kadushin, Charles. Mental health and the interpersonal environment: a reexamination of some effects of social structure on mental health. American Sociological Review,48, (1983) 188-198.

Kavolis, V. The social psychology of avant-garde cultures. Studies in the 20th century,6, Fall 1970b 13-334.

Keniston, Kenneth, Youth and dissent; the rise of a new opposition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971.

Kerpelman, L.C. Activists and non-activists; a psychologcal study of American college students. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1972.

Levin, J.,and Spates, J.L. Hippie values: an analysis of the underground press., in Rosenberg, B.,and White, D.M. New York:

Van Nostrand Reinhold Co. 1971.

Lipset, S.M. Youth and Politics in Robert K.Merton and Robert Nisbet Contemporary Problems 3rd ed. New York; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich. 1971.

Ludwig, Coy L. The arts and crafts movement in New York State 1890s to 1920s. New York: Gallery Association of New York, 1983.

Macklin, e.d., and Rubin, R.H., (eds.), Contemporary families and alternative lifestyles; Handbook on research and theory. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publishing Co. 1983.

Matza, D.Subterranean traditions of youth. The Annals, 338, Nov 1961, 102-118.

Matza, D. Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersy: Prentice-Hall 1969.

Milgram, S. The individual in a social world. Reading, Mass,: 1977.

Musgrove, Frank. Ecstacy and Holiness: the counterculture and the open society. Bloominton: Indiana University Press, 1974.

Manoff, M. and Flacks, R. The changing social base of the American student movement. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 395 1971 54-57.

Palmer, Robert. The Pop Life. New York Times , August 17, 1986 and January 5, 1987.

Peckham, Morse, The Rage for Chaos; Biology, behavior and the Arts New York: Chilton Books, 1963.

Pielke, Robert G., You say you want a revolution: rock music in American Culture, New York: Nelson, Hall, 1986.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America New York: Bantam, 1971.

Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Wash, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Reinhold, Robert, Tony Schwartz, and Robin Herman. After Woodstock; the impact of the counterculture. NY Times Aug 12, 1979 1-38, Aug 13, 1979, August 15, 1979, A-20.

Rokeach, Milton, The nature of human values, New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Roszak, Theodore The making of a counterculture Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Sarason, S.B. Work, aging, and social change New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Sennett, R. Authority. New York: Alfred Knopf 1980.

Slater, Phillip, The Pursuit of Loneliness; American culture at the breaking point. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Thomas,L.E. Family correlates of student activism., J. Dev. Psych. 4, 206-214, 1970.

Ulster County Data Book, Kingston, New York, 10th edition., 1983.

U.S.Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Families and Living Arrangements, Washington,D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.

U.S Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 and 1980.

Weider,D.L., and Don H. Zimmerman, Becoming a freak; Pathways into the counterculture. Youth and Society, 7 (March 1976) 311-44.

Weider, D.L. and Don H. Zimmerman, Generational experience and the development of freak culture. J.Soc. Issues, 30, No 2 (1974) 137-61.

Weiner, Rex, and Deanne Stillman, Woodstock Census; the nationwide survey of the sixties generation. New York: The Viking Press, 1979.

Westhues, Kenneth, Society's Shadow; studies in the sociology of countercultures. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson 1972.

Yablonsky, Lewis, The hippie trip. New York: Pegasus Press, 1968.

Yankelovich, D. What they believe: a Fortune survey., in Youth in turmoil, New York: Time-Life, 1969.

Yankelovich, D. The changing values on campus; political and personal attitudes of today's college students. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

Yankelovich, D. The new morality: a profile of american youth in the seventies. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Yinger, J. Milton,Countercultures. New York: The Free Press, 1982.