

CHAPTER 9

Remaking Urban in the American West: Urban Environmentalism, Lifestyle Politics, and Hip Capitalism in Boulder, Colorado

Amy L. Scott

In 1969, Boulder plumber Russell "Bud" Chesebro was driving his brand-new truck down Broadway on his way home from work when he was stopped by 3,000 antiwar protesters. Watching them march down the middle of the street, blocking traffic, yelling, waving signs, and mostly having a good time, Chesebro was not happy. He also opposed the Vietnam War, but he refused to accept that a bunch of hippies and protesters had the right to block the streets of his city. He was not going to watch passively while misbehaving college students and hippie outsiders infringed on his right to conduct business. He slowly drove around the police barricade and into the crowd.¹

The demonstrators did not respond peacefully. They hurled insults and whatever was handy at the creeping plumbing truck. Pummeled by a bicycle frame, backpacks, and other objects, Chesebro conceded the battle and slammed his truck into reverse. As protestors gave chase, he sped away from danger . . . or so he thought. In forty years as a Boulder resident, Chesebro had never been on the wrong side of the law. But after spending \$1,800 to knock the dents out of his truck and repair his busted windshield, he found himself before a municipal judge, answering charges of reckless driving and interrupting a "peaceful protest."²

Chesebro could not have been more surprised at the new Boulder. As a forty-year resident, he had enjoyed the postwar boom that had restructured Colorado's economy and doubled its population. As the owner of his own plumbing business, he cheered on residential and commercial development. To Chesebro, growth was the key to his and Boulder's future; growth

meant more customers and more money; simply stated, growth was good for business. Most members of Boulder's postwar business community shared Chesebro's enthusiasm. That said, however, Chesebro and his fellow boosters had specific ideas about what type of people were welcome in Boulder. They expected new residents to share their core conservative values and to fit a particular social profile: middle-class status and a civic identity shaped by political moderation, and with traditional ideas about gender roles and sexuality and a trusting deference to elected officials and leaders in the business community.

Moreover, they expected the members of the ever-growing University of Colorado student population to confine their activities, as college students in Boulder traditionally had, to football, fraternities, wilderness recreation, and nearby ski resorts. The heated street encounter between Russell Chesebro and outspoken members of Boulder's youth culture emerged from these presumptions. Ultimately, as the showdown between a determined businessman and the protestors temporarily revealed, Boulder residents would become entrenched in a much larger fight over who had the right to define the city's politics, culture, and future.

Militant protestors marching in the city's streets exploded conservative residents' assumptions about their hold on cultural authority and political legitimacy in Boulder.³ So did the parade of long-haired hippies who had taken over parks and streets around the university and threatened to occupy retail and living spaces on downtown Pearl Street, the city's auto-friendly shopping district. Protest politics in Boulder mirrored what was happening in much of the rest of the nation. Young people concerned with national and global events acted locally to interrupt the ease of daily routines in university towns like Boulder, bringing local commerce to a standstill and forcing community leaders to accommodate their growing political and cultural power.

Proof of how much life was changing in Boulder was driven home in the 1971 city council elections when an environmentalist, a gay hippie entrepreneur, an African American human rights activist, and a feminist scholar won seats by defeating the old-guard majority of conservatives and moderates who had ruled the city for decades. By the early 1970s, Boulder boasted not only continued growth but also an activist, politicized citizenry. Activists expanded the boundaries of political life as they debated what kind of city they wanted to live in. A coalition of college students, hippies, and urban environmentalists—a group that I refer to as “lifestyle liberals”—began redefining Boulder, transforming the conservative western college town into a progressive micropolitan city.⁴

The remaking of Boulder did not happen quickly or easily. Old-guard conservatives were hardly eager to hand their all-American city over to a

new liberal political coalition. Instead, they began to articulate a competing vision for Boulder's future and construct a different narrative about the meaning of equality and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. They also, not surprisingly perhaps, questioned the political legitimacy of Boulder's liberal newcomers.

Consistent with the traditions of western boosterism, most of Boulder's postwar leaders believed that physical growth produced economic vitality. They hoped to capitalize on the increased federal government spending and military presence in the region. Like leaders in other western cities, they also hoped to attract middle-class home owners and consumers to Boulder by promoting suburban development and annexation. Indeed, in the two decades that followed World War II, promotion was the hottest game in town. Elected officials and businessmen used city resources and the Boulder Chamber of Commerce to sell their city. In promotional literature, they described Boulder as a business-friendly, amenity-rich university town, a promising investment site for federal dollars and for private firms engaged in scientific research and production, and a recreational paradise for middle-class home owners. Conservatives had no intention of giving up on that vision and relinquishing political control of Boulder. Economic growth was celebrated and promoted by conservatives; cultural transformation was not.

By the late 1960s, Boulder's progrowth boosters faced a serious challenge. In the political atmosphere of the 1960s and the decades that followed, an alternative model for building and governing cities seemingly superseded the power of old-fashioned western boosterism.⁵ Newly empowered activists selectively applied the politics of the New Left, the counterculture, and the rising environmental movement to the redefinition of their city and began to invent a politics of lifestyle liberalism. The new liberal government laid the plans for a human-scale, environmentally sustainable city by continuing to develop a system for open-space preservation and growth management. Activists in Boulder began to argue that lifestyle difference, or the freedom to “do your own thing,” was a basic individual right. Lifestyle politics had broad appeal and could be claimed by student radicals, hippies, rebel rock climbers, environmentalists, Buddhist poets, gays and lesbians, and even by the New Right. In Boulder, both newcomers and old-timers like Bud Chesebro began to understand that leaders who convincingly promised to protect quality of life and to create space for authentic lifestyles in Boulder would claim the authority to define Boulder's future.⁶

The emergence of a liberal coalition dedicated to the creation of human-scale, micropolitan western cities not only complicates our understanding of post-1960s social movement activism but also has implications for the way we think about western urban history. Lifestyle liberals' rise to power in cities

like Boulder; Eugene, Oregon; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Carmel, California; and Austin, Texas, counters the declensionist "failure of the sixties narrative," which holds that following the implosion of the New Left, 1960s radicals abandoned social justice movements in favor of self-centered quests for personal liberation.⁷ Rather, many channeled their energies into local politics.⁸ In Boulder and its western counterparts (and even some midwestern cities, such as Madison, Wisconsin), activists organized politically to remake urban cultures and landscapes. Examining how activists tried to reconfigure patterns of urbanization, connect the environment to politics of lifestyle, and change the meaning of city life in the West by creating dense, human-scale, cosmopolitan urban spaces offers one way to understand these new approaches to liberal politics and Cold War radicalism. Boulder's lifestyle liberals, for instance, embraced the New Left's vision of expansive individual freedom through participatory democracy as well as the counterculture's lifestyle experimentation, and they worked to bring these ideas into everyday practice, or at least acceptance, through political experiments within their bounded urban space. Within this spatial creation of urban participatory democracy, actions from the most minute consumption decisions (such as choosing to recycle) to major life decisions (such as choosing to practice Buddhist-inspired "right livelihood") functioned simultaneously as sources of individual activism, community definition, and an acknowledgment that connections existed between one's local economy and the global environment.

As part of a larger project to create an ideal urban environment, Boulder's lifestyle liberals acted out their political beliefs each day. They rode their bikes to work, invested in recycling, declared the city a nuclear-free zone, battled to close the Rocky Flats plutonium-processing facility, and convinced the city council to disinvest city assets from countries and corporations that turned a blind eye to human rights violations. Activists founded organizations that brought people into the fight for peace, nuclear disarmament, and environmental sustainability. Boulder entrepreneurs marketed holistic and sustainable products that claimed to minimize environmental damage and maximize individual and community health, empowering consumers by offering them the opportunity to promote their chosen cause through product choice.

Lifestyle liberalism and the micropolitan urbanism it fostered became important elements in the creative social and political experiment that many Americans have conducted since the 1960s.⁹ Lifestyle liberals' quest for quality of life—their search to maximize individual freedom and human potential within the framework of urban participatory democracy and entrepreneurial capitalism—produced new politics, new markets, and new cityscapes in the American West.

This history of the micropolitan model for western urban living offers an understanding of postwar western cities as more than a cautionary tale of sprawl or an apocalyptic narrative of environmental disaster. Rather, activists redefined western urban spaces according to their political and cultural values, creating a post-1960s political coalition that situated small cities as sites of progressive political and cultural change.¹⁰ The freethinking spaces (often universities), creative entrepreneurs, citizen-diplomats, and tolerant populations that have defined micropolitan cities during the past thirty years fostered locally based yet nationally significant opposition to the growing conservatism of the West and the nation. Citizens of these culturally and politically creative cities generated a useful oppositional political ideology about the culture and economy of America, the future of American democracy, and America's role in the world.¹¹

Environmentalists' response to a growth economy based on Cold War militarism, rapid urbanization, population growth, and suburban sprawl represented a set of political conflicts that originated in western cities during the postwar period. In most urban spaces, post-1960s activists did not replicate the electoral victories that allowed lifestyle liberals to control Boulder's city government. Nonetheless, during the 1960s and 1970s, the interconnected issues of economic growth and environmental preservation and the degree to which lifestyle difference should determine urban culture informed political contests in almost every western city with large university populations. Boulder activists' plans for an innovative, creative, and sustainable city became an alternative development model that residents in cities like Burlington, Vermont, and Asheville, North Carolina, began to follow, encouraging cultural diversity and creativity, protecting the environment, and guaranteeing residents access to outdoor recreation.

BUILDING ECOTOPIA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

In many ways, the history of the modern American West is defined by westerners' response to massive urban migration and the reorganization of metropolitan areas during World War II.¹² After 1941, federal defense spending transformed the economic, physical, and human landscapes of the West and "shifted the American center of gravity westward." During the war 8 million Americans migrated to the West, and 22 million arrived over the next twenty-five years. More than 90 percent of these migrants chose to live in towns, cities, and suburbs.¹³ While drawing people to Colorado, wartime mobilization also integrated local economies along the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains from Colorado Springs to Boulder into a

160-mile-long linear regional economy centered on the rapidly growing metropolis of Denver. Within this emerging spatial and economic structure, Denver became Colorado's model city for economic expansion and diversification, postwar population growth, and suburban development. Looking to Denver as an example, Boulder's post-World War II leaders schemed to extract their next mother lode not from the gold mines and glacial waters of the Rockies but from Uncle Sam. Boulder promoters planned to bring peacetime prosperity by attracting federal research laboratories and private defense contractors who would collaborate on high-tech projects with research scientists at the University of Colorado.¹⁴

Micropolitan urbanism in Boulder emerged as grassroots activism in opposition to this business-government partnership dedicated to urban growth, decentralized suburban development, and the stratification of political power that characterized postwar metropolitan development in most of the West. When Boulder's population doubled between 1950 and 1958, many residents, particularly recently arrived University of Colorado professors, complained that Denver's expanding residential developments threatened to trap their community within an indistinct suburban web. In particular, the possibility that developers might build houses or resorts in the foothills that framed Boulder's western skyline prompted professors Al Bartlett and Robert McKelvey to push for a city ordinance protecting the foothills. Both avid hikers who found solace in high-altitude mountain wilderness, they recruited quality-of-life foot soldiers from the Colorado Mountain Club, an organization dedicated to the preservation of wilderness for individual recreation and leisure.

Appealing to a traditional booster strategy—capitalization and commoditization of the western landscape as an amenity and selling point—local environmentalists argued that wilderness access determined residents' quality of life and, therefore, Boulder's economic future.¹⁵ Yet, flipping the script on this traditional free-market strategy, urban environmentalists argued that livability, and therefore economic success, depended on local government's ability to safeguard Boulder's most important commodity: a view of the mountains and access to forests unmolested by suburbia. This could be achieved, activists argued, by limiting the physical size of the city and confining growth to developed areas. Their position—which raised questions about the difficulty of balancing economic growth with environmental preservation—foreshadowed the programmatic contradictions that confronted President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society technocrats: Could government simultaneously address Americans' desire for economic abundance and lives of individual meaning and qualitative value?¹⁶

Boulder's university-affiliated liberal environmentalists believed that local

regulations to preserve quality of life in Boulder were imperative. Bartlett, McKelvey, and their supporters organized a grassroots campaign to prohibit officials from granting city water service to mountain properties above a given elevation, designated on their maps with a blue line. Campaigning for a "Blue Line" amendment to the City Charter, environmentalists turned university classrooms and offices into organizing spaces, distributed information on street corners, knocked on doors, and organized day hikes into the foothills to convince residents of the individual and community benefits of environmental preservation. It worked; many in Boulder came to believe that immediate public access to pristine mountain wilderness was essential to quality of life in Boulder.¹⁷ In 1958, voters passed the Blue Line Charter Amendment, seriously harming the booster strategy of promoting suburban development. The foothills-preservation campaign opened a long-term debate about local government priorities, raising questions that Boulderites revisited frequently: Should the government stimulate the economy or protect the natural environment from development? In what ways were these tasks connected in Boulder, and was it possible to do both effectively?

In 1959, Bartlett and other veterans of the Blue Line campaign organized PLAN (People's League for Action Now)—Boulder, creating a permanent organization for Boulder's newly politicized urban environmentalists. Preventing sprawl was PLAN-Boulder's first priority. Environmentalists argued that slow growth, rather than the boosters' traditional program of promotion and growth, was key to Boulder's economic success. PLAN-Boulder's first newsletter explained the group's aesthetically based environmentalism: "We are for green belts, floodplain zoning, natural and developed parklands, underground utilities—in essence, a beautiful, well-planned community with special emphasis on retaining those characteristics which make Boulder unique. We are against haphazard growth, unsightliness, and ugliness in any form."¹⁸ Within ten years, PLAN-Boulder's platform for compact development became local law when residents approved the 1967 Greenbelt and Thoroughfares Program, taxing themselves to purchase rural, agricultural, and industrial land and designating it as permanently protected, natural open space.¹⁹ By creating a plan for a contiguous greenbelt of land around the city, voters rejected growth advocates' master plan for a decentralized city based on "scatteration" development of satellite suburbs. Instead, voters agreed to limit Boulder's physical size by restricting suburban development sites on the city's fringe. By 1967, contained development, urban infill, and greater density had become the operative planning principles of Boulder's micropolitan model of urban development.

Through the Blue Line Amendment and the greenbelt plan, Boulder environmentalists pioneered an alternative spatial design for western city

building. Within the micropolitan model of urbanism, the acquisition of open space was central to the physical design of the city and the culture developing within its borders. Environmental activists—concerned mostly with Boulder's scenic landscape—persuaded voters of the necessity of community oversight of land use, development, and design decisions. Under this model for community planning, the public, as well as property owners and developers, would have a say in determining the built environment and the social organization of their city. By limiting suburban development, urban environmentalists in Boulder offered an alternative path to city building, rethinking the relationship between density, social organization, and community definition: "Little boxes made of ticky tacky" where everyone was "just the same" would be minimized in Boulder.²⁰

Boulder's open-space policies represented a deliberate mapping out of an institutionalized space in which urban environmentalists, city planners, property owners, and developers resolved conflicts over the proper use of land on the city's borders. The conceptualization and adoption of an open-space program signaled an ecological turn in urban planning discourse through which urban environmentalists attempted to rethink the relationship between city and nature.²¹ Planners influenced by the postwar environmental movement were reacting to the growth of standardized, decentralized suburban communities and to a new system of regional-metropolitan politics in which central cities and suburbs competed for resources and power.²² Urban planners and environmentalists who took the ecological turn began to view decisions about land use, density, and urban design through the framework of community sustainability.²³ They recognized that decentralized development was economically costly and environmentally unsustainable. They concluded that development decisions were too important to be left solely to the discretion of developers. Rather, citizens and planners began to build into the urban landscape an acknowledgment of the connection between city and nature and a recognition of environmental limits.

With a planning vision for a centralized city surrounded by public open space and with a funding mechanism in place, Boulder's newest bureaucracy, the Open Space Department, shaped the city with elements of three iconic American landscapes: the wilderness (mountain parklands); the pastoral, "middle landscape" of small farms and ranches (prairie open space); and the pedestrian village (growth focused around the city center).²⁴ Since 1967, residents of Boulder have spent \$180 million to purchase 39,000 acres of open space and 7,000 acres of mountain parkland. By 2000, Boulder's environmental coalition included aesthetic preservationists, nuclear-freeze activists, dog owners, endurance athletes, animal-rights activists, and deep

ecologists. All claimed an interest in determining human use and access to Boulder's public lands.

FREAK CITY: BOULDER'S ARGUMENT OVER THE COUNTERCULTURE

Even as Boulderites used landscape elements to establish the spatial boundaries of their urban ecotopia, they discovered that an aesthetically driven agenda of environmental preservation could not guarantee the quality of life and urban culture they desired. The presence, visibility, and politicization of the counterculture after 1968 altered the nature of the debate over what urbanism meant in Boulder, forcing liberals to expand their quality-of-life politics beyond the preservation of a landscape aesthetic. In the late 1960s, achieving livability began to mean more than preserving the view; it also meant embracing the cultural dynamism and political diversity of national social movements. Specifically, radical politics at the university and Boulder's "hippie problem" forced permanent residents to accommodate counterculture definitions of quality of life. As a result, Boulder's liberals incorporated New Left ideas and counterculture experimentation into the redirection of Boulder's culture and government, expanding the boundaries of politics in Boulder while creating a new western urban ideal.

After the 1967 Summer of Love, many hippies left San Francisco for the interior West. In Colorado, they initially avoided cities and congregated in the mountains. Squatting on abandoned mining claims and holding "live-ins" in national parks, they romanticized the solitude of the Colorado backcountry and enjoyed more than one kind of "Rocky Mountain High."²⁵ Rifle-toting "rednecks and cowboys"—so named by the hippies—often patrolled the backcountry in jeeps, and they stormed campsites and beat hippie campers with shovels and tire irons. Mountain property owners made it clear that the Rockies would not host the next summer of love. The sheriff's department responded to vigilante attacks with a "hippie hunt" of its own, clearing hippies from private property and restricting their access to state and national parks. In the wake of violent attacks and run-ins with the law, hippies left the mountains for Boulder, swelling an already large population of summer transients and college-aged tourists who had arrived from across the nation.²⁶ At a meeting led by Boulder city manager Ted Tedesco, hippies asked for police protection and government sanctions against discriminatory business owners. After requesting thirty acres of Boulder open-space property on the edge of town, they announced their intention to stay in Boulder.²⁷

The city council's acknowledgment of hippies' concerns and the audacity of the newcomers, particularly their disrespect for private property rights, shocked Boulder residents, many of whom viewed counterculture migrants not as citizens deserving of a voice in local government but as "defiers of law, draft evaders, trespassers, destroyers of property, thieves and violators of dope and narcotics laws." The editor of the *Daily Camera*, Boulder's local newspaper, hinted that "freeloading hippies" were disruptive outsiders who did not meet conventional requirements for citizenship: "The issue is that persons coming into a community are legitimately expected to abide by its laws and not to sponge off those whose labors have created and sustained the community."²⁸ Pressured from the left by urban environmentalists and from the right by those who opposed government regulations on development, the city council offered policies of moderation. It appeased critics of the counterculture by vowing to prosecute all lawbreakers, and it placated hippies by promising to investigate civil rights violations.²⁹

The council's teetering posture signaled the beginning of four years of public debate over hippie's rights to live in Boulder. The hippie presence, along with a newly charged set of radical voices emanating from the University of Colorado, dominated local political discourse from 1967 to 1971. The very presence of hippies in public spaces provided a wedge issue between urban environmentalists, moderates, and conservative businessmen. Those seeking to implement PLAN-Boulder's program of small-scale centralized urbanism formed a natural alliance with university-affiliated urban environmentalists, human rights activists, and cultural liberals. As a result, many liberals tolerated the presence of hippies, or at least "peaceful hippies," whom they characterized as flower children.³⁰

Others, primarily businessmen, adopted an exclusionary position toward hippie newcomers. *Daily Camera* editorials, often the voice of conservative Boulderites, stereotyped all hippies as social misfits or deadbeats who drained the community chest. Such assessments misrepresented the diversity of the new population. Many hippies were neither transients nor street people; some were entrepreneurs who intended to stay. Despite opposition from those locals who characterized hippies as temporary nuisances, many counterculture migrants carved out a niche in the community, opening businesses, advocating political reform, and participating in city government.

One hippie collective, Endor Enterprises, founded by twenty-five-year-old Californian Arthur Armstrong, rented a warehouse and several studios near Boulder's busiest commercial district. Endor's presence hinted at the counterculture's potential agency for altering Boulder's economic, cultural, and political landscape. Like many hippie entrepreneurs, Armstrong's busi-

ness vision was utopian and experimental. He imagined Endor as an alternative community with institutions uncompromised by American capitalism or liberal politics. The very name that Armstrong chose for his experiment, however—Endor *Enterprises*—acknowledged that peace, love, happiness, and profits were not mutually exclusive. Endor opened seven shops that sold counterculture products, sponsored a health food store, and cleared a small profit by hosting local bands and traveling light shows. Paul Corey, a member of Endor's board of directors, described Endor as a new society whose mission was capitalism with a human touch. "We want to bring kids up here and turn them on to love. There's nothing else in town people can get involved in on a human level. The people at Endor are totally free and can feel."³¹

Endor contributed to Boulder's economy, renting downtown property that otherwise stood vacant, and it provided social space for the city's youth. Endor's consciousness-raising commerce, however, did not impress the business community; Endor, it seemed, did not represent the right kind of capitalism. City boosters had spent the 1950s and 1960s encouraging high-tech corporations to relocate to Boulder. Hippie capitalists muddied traditional booster visions for growth, progress, and economic viability. Conservatives were concerned not only about the economic competition that hippie capitalists and consumers posed to established businesses but also about what they assumed were dangerous connections between hippies and radical college students. What the Endor founders envisioned as a collective effort to establish a central-city business that provided goods and services to Boulder's growing counterculture community, many locals saw as a nuisance. Following a barrage of complaints, the city planning board suspended Endor's license based on a noise-pollution violation. Confrontations like those over Endor Enterprises and the provision of public services to hippies multiplied. Conservatives pressured authorities to drive hippies from public spaces, prevent them from gaining a foothold in town government, and keep them away from the University of Colorado.

The business community had reason to worry; university students had grown increasingly radical in the latter half of the 1960s. In fact, Paul Danish, editor of the radical student newspaper, put the number of committed student radicals at between 300 and 400. This group led protests against dormitory rules and campus policies, supported the civil rights movement, and, of course, protested against the war in Vietnam. In October 1967, students blockaded the placement center in an effort to prevent the CIA and defense-related corporations from recruiting on campus. In April 1968, students marched on Regent Hall to protest racism, end dormitory regulations, and promote student power in university affairs. In 1969, after two

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) members disrupted a speech by visiting San Francisco State University president S. I. Hayakawa, the board of regents disaffiliated SDS as a campus organization. Undeterred, twenty SDS members later stormed the Institute of Defense Analysis, vandalized the office, and stole documents. In March 1970, radicals bombed the Air Force ROTC Office, and in April, 400 students occupied Regent Hall to protest the Vietnam War. Soon enough, students took their protests off campus and onto Boulder's streets, where they alienated many Boulder residents. Imagine the horror many "respectable" Boulderites felt when they saw students flying a North Vietnamese flag and displaying on campus banners that read, "LONG LIVE THE VIETNAM REVOLUTION."³²

Make no mistake, most University of Colorado (CU) students eschewed radical politics. Still, local shop owners' reluctance to accommodate or even recognize the differences between the radicalized students and those college students who just wore their hair long added to the tensions on University Hill. As historian Beth Bailey wrote, "By the late 1960s America's 'youth culture' had come to *look* very much like the counterculture. Longhaired boys and braless girls. Psychedelic music. Pot. Sex. Certainly not everyone fit this mold, but these were the markers of belonging, of being 'hip.' The counterculture and its style purposely violated the tenets of 'respectability.'"³³ In Boulder, retailers near the university failed to realize that many CU students, like the national youth culture, had appropriated hippie aestheticism and fashion, such as flared blue jeans, long hair, headbands, scarves, colorful clothing, and acid-inspired art, without wholly adopting the counterculture's lifestyle or the politics of antiwar radicalism.

Instead of adjusting their inventories to match the desires of youthful consumers, University Hill merchants blamed hippies for decreased sales. "Dirty" hippies whose appearance, smell, and threatening demeanors frightened away respectable paying customers especially offended shop owners. Fred Shelton, owner of Fred's Restaurant, "tried to keep the middle ground" and lost business from straights as a result. He later described the disgust that many locals felt toward "dirty" hippies: "The horrible smell of patchouli, which makes me gag to this day, was part of their thing, because they may have wanted to be clean, but they didn't have the facilities to be clean, so as a result they were unwashed. So they used patchouli oil in quantities to camouflage the fact that they had terrible B.O."³⁴ Margaret Yeager, a Boulder resident since 1941, believed that Hill merchants had legitimate complaints. She described hippies as "filthy, disreputable, knocked-out, and threatening."³⁵ They congregated on sidewalks in front of Hill businesses, blocked store entrances, shouted obscenities at customers, fought with each other, and "urinated and defecated on sidewalks and in flower beds."³⁶

Yeager's observations confirmed what many of the more politically motivated hippies believed: that their visible presence on Boulder's sidewalks, their alternative lifestyle, their dangerous demeanors functioned as weapons against mainstream American culture. To members of the counterculture, however, such actions imposed new cultural meanings on urban spaces and created zones of public space liberated from the dominant culture.³⁷ Radical hippies, for instance, might have called such actions "deliberate obnoxiousness," "weapons of cultural aggression," "a total assault on the culture," or a "mind-fuck."³⁸ Loitering in front of a business, for instance, did not indicate laziness or a lack of effort or interest. Rather, it indicated that a "FREAK OUT" was in progress.³⁹

In addition to Endor, other counterculture-friendly businesses came to Boulder. In May 1969, Timothy Fuller, a hippie from California who had spent two summers in Boulder, purchased the Brillig Works—a former Beat bookstore in the University Hill district.⁴⁰ The Brillig Works' *raison d'être*—to offer a pastiche of goods, services, and welcoming social spaces to those engaged in experimental lifestyles—symbolized the emergence of a post-1960s liberal constituency that tied counterculture values and radical politics to personal economic decisions. Unlike its portmanteau namesake—"Brillig," from Lewis Carroll's nonsense poem "Jabberwocky"—Fuller's experiment had a clear purpose: to build an alternative entrepreneurial business model dependent on consumers whose purchasing decisions were determined by their left-leaning political positions, their counterculture lifestyle, and their concern for the environment. Boulder, with its growing contingent of lifestyle liberals and counterculture freaks, contained the combination of political ferment and experimental consumerism necessary to support a new entrepreneurial model of cause capitalism.⁴¹ Like other western cities with growing counterculture populations, Boulder's future would be determined by subcommunities of people determined to "create a lifestyle and defend it."⁴²

Fuller's Brillig Works became a cornerstone in the counterculture community. The Works sold leftist political texts, Eastern philosophical tracts, and Beat literature, and Fuller's publishing company released such titles as the *Pot Cookbook*. Patrons also had access to a crowded coffeehouse and a communal crash pad.⁴³ To meet the growing demand for hip social spaces, Fuller purchased a warehouse two blocks from the Brillig Works and requested a zoning variance for a combination coffeehouse, restaurant, art gallery, and theater company.

Hill businessmen, who had tolerated the Brillig Works and its clientele, simply could not stomach two warehouses of hippies, one at each end of the retail district. They feared long-haired young people would dominate

public and private spaces on the Hill. Consequently, the buttoned-down businessmen protested vehemently against Fuller's zoning request. In the spirit of compromise, the zoning board asked the city's Human Relations Commission (HRC) to mediate between Fuller and the Hill merchants and to make a recommendation on the proposal. Established by the city council in 1965 to address racial discrimination, the HRC by the late 1960s increasingly found itself smoothing tensions between Hill merchants and hippies; it had concluded that Boulder's "new minority race of the hippie" faced discrimination similar to that of the city's racial and ethnic minorities.⁴⁴

After studying Fuller's request, the commission decided in his favor, recommending that the city council approve his coffeehouse, art studio, and theater on a six-month trial basis. Director David Haas explained the commission's decision: "Our feeling as a commission was that the board of zoning adjustment is set up to control land uses, not people. . . . The key to our recommendation and the guidelines is we can't consider applications which are to the exclusion of a group of people and the application of a stereotype, i.e., hippies are all bad." The merchants, however, refused to accommodate. "It became very apparent to us," Haas told the *Daily Camera*, "that merchants were not willing to mediate except to get rid of hippies." Following the failed mediation session, the city gave in to Hill merchants' demands and denied Fuller's request for a zoning variance.⁴⁵

As they had done in the case of Endor Enterprises, prominent members of the business community manipulated the city bureaucracy, pressuring local officials to maintain the economic and cultural status quo. In effect, established business owners curtailed Fuller's investments in Boulder property and his attempt to capitalize on the local hip market. By working through city regulatory agencies to contain hippie economic power in Boulder's retail districts, the Hill merchants taught the young entrepreneur an essential lesson in urban politics: Organized citizens with access to city hall induced policies favorable to their interests, thus determining economic and cultural opportunities. After his encounter with the Hill merchants, Fuller decided to channel his influence with Boulder's counterculture community into a city council election campaign. Winning elections, Fuller realized, meant winning the right to reconfigure Boulder as a tolerant urban space with an economic future tied to creative individual enterprise and the open celebration of experimental lifestyles.

Beset by conflict between hippie newcomers and townspeople who wished them gone, city manager Ted Tedesco, a political moderate, began a series of public meetings to prepare for a massive hippie migration to Boulder during the summer of 1969. Frustrated by the toughest problem he had faced as a city manager, Tedesco quipped, "It's not something you send

to a municipal consulting service and say 'Please send me an answer for the hippie problem for twenty-five dollars.'"⁴⁶ Nonetheless, when the hippies headed for warmer climates and CU students returned to the Hill, Tedesco searched for pragmatic solutions to the culture war that dominated Boulder politics. He wrote 250 letters to mayors across the country asking how they had handled the counterculture migration to their cities. Boston, he discovered, had hired MIT students to mingle with hippies; Ann Arbor, Michigan, had organized activities and free concerts; Carmel and Monterey, California, had jailed hippies with tough vagrancy laws that the U.S. Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional. None of these solutions, Tedesco concluded, suited Boulder's situation. Tedesco and the majority of city council members opposed police harassment and tough sentencing laws and tried to convince Boulderites that the city would not solve the problem with extralegal actions designed to "run hippies out of town" or by passing harsh ordinances that discouraged hippies from spending their summer in Boulder. Instead, Tedesco defined the city's task as encouraging the acceptance of diversity in the community—as "smoothing the conflict of different values, the different lifestyles of the citizen and the hip."⁴⁷ With opposition building in the conservative business community, however, Tedesco's rhetoric of tolerance did not translate into social services for hippies.⁴⁸

In fact, the old guard struck back. The University Hill Merchant Association (UHMA) called for police raids on hippie hangouts. And in July 1970, after two months of frustrating confrontations with local hippies and summer visitors, the UHMA, members of Citizens for a Better Boulder, and the Boulder Taxpayers' League initiated a recall campaign against the city council, Mayor Robert Knecht, and Manager Tedesco. The conservative alliance threatened, again, to withhold payment of sales tax until the city removed hippies from Boulder's retail districts.⁴⁹

Despite their philosophical differences, city officials and liberal environmentalists agreed with Boulder businessmen on at least one issue: Violent members of the counterculture and hard-core drug dealers had to be controlled, and if necessary, law enforcement officers should use force. In April 1971, the city council expanded Boulder's drunk-and-disorderly ordinance, making it unlawful "for any person under the influence of any substance to be in any public place."⁵⁰ In May 1971, the city responded to a "meaner breed of transient" with a campaign to reclaim public spaces on University Hill. It doubled its law enforcement budget, added twenty-six officers to the force, and located a permanent police substation on the Hill. This increased police presence led to frequent skirmishes and even street brawls between police and radicals, and after a group of street people attacked an officer on the Hill, the city ordered fifteen officers in full riot gear to patrol the Hill

commercial district day and night.⁵¹ With so many police on the Hill to enforce city ordinances, arrests of hippies doubled. A reporter for the *Chinook*, Denver's underground newspaper, compared Boulder to a police state.⁵²

The city's adoption of strict vagrancy and loitering ordinances and its willingness to sponsor tough policing tactics demonstrated the limitations of the counterculture's pedestrian democracy. It would not be so easy to liberate, democratize, and occupy Boulder's public spaces through "freak outs." Boulder's antihippie ordinances also signaled the limits of the political alliance between liberals, urban environmentalists, and countercultural newcomers. Boulder's lifestyle liberals had begun to differentiate between good hippies (flower children) and bad hippies (street people and transients) when engaging in public discussions of the town's counterculture population.⁵³

The tensions finally boiled over on 22 May 1971 when the Hill erupted in a three-day riot. It began after a street person and a police officer engaged in a fistfight. Soon a crowd of street people, who claimed they "were willing to die" to hold on to their right to Boulder's public streets, ran wild and, joined by some hippies and university students, ransacked businesses.⁵⁴ Badly outnumbered, Boulder police retreated from the Hill but recaptured it three days later with heavy barrages of tear gas. Estimates of damages to businesses ranged from \$25,000 to \$50,000. Destruction was targeted. The Jones Drug Store, which had a reputation for high markups and "hostility to hair," incurred thousands of dollars in stolen merchandise, including its entire supply of uppers and downers. Street people claimed, "The stores that got it deserved it." Not surprisingly, Fuller's Brillig Works survived unscathed.⁵⁵

Enraged at hippie lawlessness and dismayed that their all-American city had become a haven for freaks, radicals, and scofflaws, businessmen created an umbrella organization called Citizens United to Restore Boulder (CURB). CURB vowed to take back the town by electing a law-and-order city council in the November 1971 election. As their slogan "Bring back '63" implied, CURB intended to turn back the clock to 1963, when *Look* magazine had named Boulder one of the top ten small American cities, before growth control and the right to develop the urban fringe had become contested political issues, and before hippies had demanded political and cultural inclusion. CURB labeled anyone—Boulder residents, CU students, and street people alike—who wore long hair and adopted the styles of the counterculture as irresponsible, un-American, and undeserving of citizenship in Boulder. Myron LaPointe, a realtor and member of CURB, voiced the frustrations of Boulder conservatives and echoed the polarizing law-and-order rhetoric of President Richard Nixon: "I'm concerned not only

for Boulder, but for America. We've got a lot of people running from coast to coast who are not Americans, not good Americans." The organization's primary goal was to drive hippies from Boulder, but its members also opposed city restrictions on development. CURB president James Hunter claimed that PLAN-Boulder, the primary organization of urban environmentalists, was "the number one enemy" of CURB. In a guest editorial in the *Boulder Daily Camera*, Hunter lambasted the agenda of CURB's liberal opposition, pointing to three primary culprits, who, if they united in a political coalition, threatened to transform Boulder city government: liberal professors at the university, the radical youth culture, and advocates of growth management. "We cannot," Hunter asserted, "afford the luxury of permitting Boulder to be a playpen for maladjusted and defiant young people or a laboratory for bleeding heart reformers."⁵⁶

LaPointe and Hunter, like other longtime residents of Boulder with ties to the business community, sensed that they were in danger of falling from the privileged position that granted them the right to control the terms of public debate and determine local standards of cultural permissibility. Conservative businessmen in Boulder held a narrow, traditional view of the proper and acceptable way to practice politics and conduct business; a coalition of liberals, radicals, freaks, and environmentalists—groups with diverse interests and ideologies, but that CURB conflated as "radicals"—threatened their long-standing control of local government. Political decisions and positions of power, they believed, rightly belonged to long-standing community members with propertied interests in the city. Primacy, permanence, and responsibility, rather than the counterculture values of mobility, experimentation, and tolerance of difference, represented their notion of an authentic community and grounded the right to participate in decisions that determined its future. In effect, LaPointe and Hunter argued, freedom and civil rights were rewards for responsible behavior; hippies, who were not "good Americans," deserved neither.

To publicize their campaign and to reach out to Boulder's "great silent majority," CURB ran a series of advertisements in the *Daily Camera*. Demonstrating that Boulder's businessmen no longer believed they could get their message across in meetings at city hall, CURB took off the gloves. They hammered home what they saw as a clear and unambiguous connection between the counterculture, CU radicals, and unpatriotic antiwar protestors who threatened the very fabric of the civic society of Boulder and of the nation. Their first ad, which quickly followed the Hill riot, was simply a large peace sign under which they printed in bold letters, "THE FOOT PRINT OF THE AMERICAN CHICKEN." A second ad, on 28 June 1971, likened cultural and political radicals to a deadly infectious disease, stating, "LAST SUMMER IT WAS BERKELEY,

THIS SUMMER IT IS BOULDER THAT IS INFECTED. . . . Mr. Mayor; What will it take to wake you up and take action to rid Boulder of these lawless elements?" The most creative CURB ad, "Recipe for Instant Slum," lambasted the counterculture for creating ghetto-like conditions in Boulder neighborhoods and called for the swift eradication of communal housing. CURB also ran ads that linked hippies to hitchhiking, shoplifting, bathing in Boulder Creek, and "welfare abuse."⁵⁷ An ad on 3 August 1971—"STAMP OUT FREE LUNCHES!"—criticized hippies for accepting welfare payments from the very system they criticized.

By August 1971, CURB claimed 2,000 members. The conservative attack was organized and well publicized, but in reality CURB had little support beyond the business community. Moreover, hippies, liberals, and university students countered CURB's campaign by organizing Boulder United to Register People (BURP). BURP registered thousands of eighteen-to-twenty-one-year-old voters, demonstrating that the majority of Boulder's youthful activists preferred local electoral drama to violent street confrontations with police. The November 1971 election, following the passage of the Twenty-Sixth Amendment in June 1971 making eighteen the voting age, was the first in which the majority of CU students could vote, and as conservatives had feared, 4,500 new voters between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, representing 13.6 percent of voter turnout, handed Boulder liberals a victory in a watershed election. A letter to the editor of the *Daily Camera* that "the freaks and their leftist CU allies [would] control the city within three years" rang true when all of CURB's candidates and four city council incumbents were defeated in 1971.⁵⁸ In their stead, Boulder residents elected hippie entrepreneur Tim Fuller, an outspoken advocate for gay rights; Penfield Tate, a civil rights activist and the first African American member of the Boulder City Council; Karen Paget, a twenty-six-year-old CU graduate student; and Ken Wright, an environmental activist and advocate of growth control.⁵⁹ Clearly, Boulder's new leaders did not fit CURB's definition of "good Americans." But in their cultural politics and social activism on behalf of the marginalized, the oppositional, and the alternative, the new leaders embodied the new politics of lifestyle liberalism that would define what some called "the People's Republic of Boulder" in the post-1960s era.

Although political battles over the counterculture were rooted in the immediate details of whether or not hippies and radicals had the right to occupy Boulder's streets, sidewalks, parks, and businesses, the significance of these squabbles was much larger. Events in Boulder were representative of similar competitions for cultural and political power that developed in western urban spaces during the 1960s. Urban historians have offered examples of how immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups engaged in similar struggles for

spatially derived political power at the neighborhood level during the twentieth century. In the western cities of postwar America, control of political and cultural power was determined in part by the youth culture's imaginations of a democratic society in which people could freely adopt alternative lifestyles. To residents of micropolitan cities like Boulder, the acceptance of lifestyle difference became measurements of democratic cosmopolitanism. Lifestyle liberals focused initially on making space for differences presented by the counterculture, and Boulder earned a national reputation as a place that encouraged lifestyle diversity—an urban space out west where anyone could let his freak flag fly.

In 1971, this unlikely group of political activists who had emphasized participatory democracy, authentic experience, and liberation politics raised a tie-dyed freak flag over city hall. By aligning their interests with the preservationist agenda of university-affiliated liberal environmentalists, they won an election and wrested power from moderates and conservatives. Perhaps more important, they created a political culture where environmental preservation *and* communitywide tolerance of lifestyle difference became a measure of quality of life and a policy tool through which Boulder residents imagined and shaped the cultural landscape of their city.

THE BUSINESS OF HIP: CONSCIOUSNESS COMMERCE SUSTAINS THE REPUBLIC

The new city council worked quickly. It accelerated the city's environmental preservation program, proposed a gay rights ordinance, and supported the construction of Pearl Street Mall—a downtown pedestrian market and entertainment space where freaks and straights could shop and mingle.⁶⁰ Liberal city council members like Fuller and Tate also worked with community activists to establish a local tradition of citizens' diplomacy, drafting resolutions that stated the community's official position on issues of national and global importance, such as antiwar resolutions and the declaration of a nuclear-free zone within Boulder city limits. Behind the city council's policy initiatives was an attempt to foster a community milieu that encouraged individuals to pursue meaningful, authentic experiences and to maximize their human potential.

The politics of lifestyle liberalism in Boulder depended in large part on activists' belief that they could create an authentic community. In fact, the concept of authenticity and its continuous contestation were central to the creation of a new political constituency, a new political style, and new corporate model in Boulder. To Cold War political and cultural radicals,

“authenticity” had several meanings.⁶¹ It described the ways that people should organize and govern themselves to create a genuine, ideal community. Achieving authenticity meant taking collective action toward social justice and demanding the right to live in communities where everyone participated in decision making. For many activists who participated in Boulder’s battle over the counterculture, authenticity became central to their expectations of local government.

When activists spoke of authenticity, they were also talking about economy. “Authenticity” became a benchmark term, a means of critiquing the saccharine organization of postwar work, production, and consumption. In this context, authenticity expressed people’s search for alternatives to a lifetime of meaningless toil for a bureaucratic corporation and the wasteful acquisition of unnecessary consumer products.

Enter hip capitalists—like Chōgyam Trungpa Rinpoche and Mo Siegel, who actualized dreams of authentic community and economy and in the process proved that “hip and business were not irreconcilable enemies.”⁶² Hip capitalists thought about relationships between material production, consumption, and environmental sustainability and determined that there was something political about their economic decisions and those of their customers. Boulder activists who were engaged in the work of community redefinition also tried to reframe the material character of the American dream. Many in Boulder maintained that meaningful individual experience and self-actualization were tied closely to specific types of consumption, work, leisure, and activism. Based on the experiential knowledge that the personal is political, activists connected their left-leaning politics to everyday consumer choices, privileging products marketed at achieving individual holism and environmental sustainability. Entrepreneurs and consumers began to insist on socially meaningful work, and they marketed and consumed “holistic” products and developed local standards for livability and sustainable urbanism.

These entrepreneurs did not eschew materialism per se; on the contrary, they promoted products that promised individual and consequently societal improvement, offering lifestyle liberals and progressive consumers a material base from which to enact personal visions of reform. Like the city’s many hip capitalist entrepreneurs—there were 100 “hip” businesses in Boulder by 1976—Trungpa and Siegel captured the essence of Boulder’s celebration of political authenticity and cultural dissent and sold it for a profit.⁶³

Trungpa did more than anyone else to shape the nature of Tibetan Buddhism in the United States, offering an eclectic path to the sacred for those who dared to walk it.⁶⁴ Aided by Beat poet Allen Ginsberg, Trungpa masterminded the establishment of the Buddhist-poetics-humanist psychology

community in Boulder, channeling this hybrid counterculture spirituality into a lucrative educational enterprise: the Jack Kerouac School of Disembodied Poetics (1974) and the Naropa Institute (1976), now Naropa University.⁶⁵

Following China’s military invasion of his homeland, Trungpa fled to Scotland, where he established a Tibetan meditation community in the Highlands. When the University of Colorado Religious Studies Department offered him a position as a guest lecturer, he moved to Boulder in 1970. Trungpa attracted a handful of students from Boulder’s communes. Many of them were “heads” who had experimented with acid as a sacrament. They welcomed Trungpa as an experienced spiritual master who might mold their psychedelic visions into a new consciousness. Practitioners congregated at Trungpa’s meditation center, dropped acid, listened to Trungpa’s lengthy lectures, and meditated on images from the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*.⁶⁶

By 1972, Trungpa and Ginsberg had concluded that by combining the practices of Tibetan Buddhism, the teachings of humanistic psychology, and the spontaneous linguistics of the Beats, they could fundamentally change the way students perceived the world, offering them an alternative path to higher consciousness and self-actualization. Trungpa and Ginsberg brought Boulder’s growing freak community to the attention of the nation when they launched the Jack Kerouac School of Disembodied Poetics in 1974. Prominent poets, artists, and scholars volunteered to teach in the first summer, including Allen Ginsberg, William S. Burroughs, Ram Dass, and Gary Snyder. Organizers expected a maximum of 200 locals, but the prospect of enlightenment offered by Beat and counterculture poets, hallucinogenic drugs, and religious gurus drew 2,000 people from across the nation.⁶⁷

Realizing the marketability of their educational and spiritual experiment, Trungpa and Ginsberg founded the Naropa Institute, a contemplative college that offered degrees in Buddhist studies, Western psychology, and secular meditation. Instead of directing students toward a career path and a life of acquisitive materialism, Naropa offered a life of contemplation and service to the community. Courses included history of the Beat poets, transpersonal psychology, organic gardening, and insight meditation.⁶⁸

While Trungpa Rinpoche is Boulder’s most colorful ambassador of consciousness commerce, Mo Siegel, the founder of Celestial Seasonings Corporation and a guru of the multibillion-dollar natural-foods industry, is Boulder’s most famous hip capitalist.⁶⁹ Locals celebrate the Celestial Seasonings creation story by recounting how Siegel spent the summer of 1969 with his friends picking herbs, getting high, and concocting teas. By September, they had conjured their first batch of “Mo’s 36 Herb Tea” in a barn outside Boulder, packaged it in hand-sewn bags, and sold it to a local health

food store. Perhaps the more meaningful, if less often told, part of the creation story is Siegel's encounter with the CEO of General Mills in 1972. Seeking to procure financing and a national distribution network, Siegel arranged a meeting with former air force general and General Mills CEO Edwin Rawlings, who adhered to the philosophy that "the principles of good management are pretty much the same whether you are dealing with Wheaties or jet bombers."⁷⁰ Rawlings explained to Siegel that the future of the food industry rested on the development and production of scientifically engineered food, sharing with Siegel that these perfectly nutritious foods would be grown not on farms but in laboratory test tubes. "Son," he said, "if you really want to change the way Americans eat, why don't you just dismiss this idea of natural herbal teas and come join our team." This moment, in which Rawlings advised him to get a haircut and a real job, convinced Siegel that developing a natural-foods industry would be nothing less than a radical venture in American enterprise, and it crystallized his mission statement: "to create and sell healthful, naturally oriented products that nurture people's bodies and uplift their souls, and to make the world a better place by unselfishly serving the public."⁷¹ Not only was Celestial Seasonings radically creative, but it was wildly profitable. In 1970, Siegel earned \$2,000; by 1978, his company employed 200 people and was earning \$9 million per year.⁷²

As Trungpa and Siegel built their businesses into national success stories, it became clear that hip capitalism meant more than "an occasional hippie selling drug paraphernalia and posters."⁷³ Not unlike traditional corporate executives, Trungpa and Siegel realized that power resided in centralized corporate structures, but they believed that leaders guided by a progressive consciousness could use their economic power to uplift individuals and strengthen communities. Both men conducted business based on the idea that their enterprises could make money *and* have a social agenda. Trungpa and Siegel established their businesses with the awareness that a connection existed between material production, consumption, and the individual desire to explore human potentialities and individual authenticity. They did not accept at face value the critiques that 1960s radicals had leveled at American materialism; on the contrary, Trungpa and Siegel turned their energies toward producing material goods, services, and working conditions that they believed were essential to authentic everyday experiences. In a city where an activist's political values influenced her purchasing decisions, hip capitalists provided the material base for individual experiments in cultural and political authenticity.

Finally, Trungpa and Siegel's success depended on their ability to appeal to Boulder's community values by situating their companies as socially use-

ful, morally legitimate institutions. Unlike traditional corporations that lacked a social agenda and based managerial decisions about where to locate solely on economic concerns, hip corporations became connected to their communities for what these places represented culturally and politically. Before expanding into national markets, Boulder's hip capitalists created a corporate soul that reflected the dominant values of their local community, meeting consumer demand while contributing simultaneously to Boulder's image as a progressive city.⁷⁴

Boulder's hip capitalists and their values fit well with city government's task of balancing urban growth and design with environmental preservation. By the 1990s, Boulder was being lauded by many as a model of desirable, sustainable, and economically viable city building. Boulderites had articulated a visionary spirit of place: micropolitan urbanism based on environmental preservation and sustainability, the celebration of tolerance and difference, and an economy powered by creative entrepreneurs offering products for health and sustainability.

Activists influenced by counterculture values, leftists critical of Cold War liberalism, and urban environmentalists determined to prevent sprawl had tried to create a human-scale, sustainable city. Absorbing the critiques of 1960s radicals but working within traditional urban political structures, university-affiliated liberals, outdoor enthusiasts, and counterculture migrants wrested government power from culturally conservative, progrowth businessmen and launched a long-term public experiment to establish an innovative, sustainable, and tolerant cityscape in the American West. A collective determination to achieve "quality of life" stood at the center of activists' experiment in micropolitan city building. The city was their vehicle for thinking about how development patterns determined quality of life. Lifestyle liberals advocated a program of micropolitan urbanism based on broadly defined environmental politics, tolerance of lifestyle diversity, and a local economy sustained by creative capitalism through which entrepreneurs worked for individual, community, and societal reform. They worked to create a compact, human-scale, cosmopolitan city that encouraged individual freedom and fulfillment and rewarded creativity and innovation. Within the micropolitan model, activists searched for solutions to the economic and environmental paradigm that had been addressed superficially by national liberals, and local entrepreneurs addressed anxieties about the tenuous position of the ecologically concerned consumer within an expanding system of global capitalism.

Yet like the conservative businessmen who had held power before them, Boulder's lifestyle liberals inherited the task of preserving the city's beautiful scenery while maintaining a viable economy. In Boulder, becoming micro-

politan meant constructing the ideal place in which to live. But were there limits to Boulder's brand of human-scale urbanism: Could the pursuit of the ideal, sustainable city lead to exclusionary social policies?

As the median cost of housing in Boulder topped \$500,000, bashing newcomers from Texas and California became a local pastime, indicating that many believed primacy of place carried a privileged status in Boulder and represented a different kind of authenticity.⁷⁵ Echoing the pioneer society members of whom David Wrobel writes in chapter 12, Boulder residents cried "NATIVE" in an effort to dissuade visitors from permanently relocating. Boulder still had hip shops, a summer transient population, and the carnival atmosphere of Pearl Street Mall. But in their quest to build a desirable community, had lifestyle liberals preserved hippie aestheticism and hip consumerism at the expense of the complex diversity they had defended during the Age of Aquarius?

Critics claimed that the city, with its moat of open space, had become a gated community harboring wealthy liberals and their trendy cults of self-improvement. Others argued that the city's marketplace focus on authenticity represented an idealism gone clueless and narcissistic, decriing the fact that the social consciousness of many Boulderites extended only so far as a daily shot of wheatgrass juice, trendy yoga workshops, and the most fuel-efficient sport-utility vehicle.

Arguments about the success or failure of Boulder's long-term community experiment indicate that the definitions of "quality of life" and "authentic community"—both goals of lifestyle liberalism in Boulder—are changing and contested. Despite its imperfections, Boulder remains a model for an alternative human-scale urbanism in the West. Boulder continues to experiment with growth management for sustainability, instituting new policies such as permanent affordable housing, inclusionary zoning, green building initiatives, and affordable mass transit. Boulder's experience demonstrates that building sustainable, democratic cities—places where the public participates in the political debates and choices that structure their lives—is a deliberate process made up of daily political choices. Citizens can adopt progressive development models to replace unrestrained, haphazard growth; dedicated activists can consciously determine the physical landscape and urban culture of their cities; and corporate executives can think "more like ecologists than generals."⁷⁶

NOTES

1. Chesebro was not alone in using his car as a weapon against antiwar protestors who obstructed city streets. Presidential candidate George Wallace expressed these sentiments in the extreme. "If when I'm President, any anarchists lie down in front of my automobile," Wallace said, "it'll be the very last time they lie down in front of anything." Phillip Crass, *The Wallace Factor* (New York: Mason/Charter, 1976), 95.
2. Russell "Bud" Chesebro, interview by Ann Bramhall, 28 October 1987, OH 371, Maria Rogers Oral History Collection (hereafter MROHC), Carnegie Branch Library for Local History, Boulder, Colorado.
3. According to David Farber, "Cultural authority—the power to set the rules of proper conduct and behavior—was up for grabs" in the 1960s. "By the late sixties," he writes, "local customs and local power elites were being challenged and often radically subverted by national and international forces." Farber, ed., *The Sixties: From Memory to History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 2.
4. A number of historians have written about the connections between cultural rebellion, lifestyle choices, and political radicalism during the 1960s, most notably Doug Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998); W. J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 141; David Steigerwald, *The Sixties and the End of Modern America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 184; Rusty L. Monhollon, *This Is America? The Sixties in Lawrence, Kansas* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 7, 8, 289.
5. David Ley, *The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
6. Chesebro, interview.
7. Julie Stephens, *Anti-disciplinary Protest: Sixties Radicalism and Postmodernism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 2–3.
8. Van Gosse, "A Movement of Movements: The Definition and Periodization of the New Left," in *A Companion to Post-1945 America*, ed. Jean-Christopher Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002), 277–302.
9. Samuel P. Hays, "From Conservation to Environment: Environmental Politics in the United States since World War II," in *Out of the Woods: Essays in Environmental History*, ed. Char Miller and Hal Rothman (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997), 104, 114.
10. Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class, and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002); AnnaLee Saxenian, *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994); Peter Wolf, *Hot Towns: The Future of the Fastest Growing Communities in America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1999); William H. Hudnut III, *Cities on the Rebound: A Vision for Urban America* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1998).
11. Thomas Frank, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997) and *One Market*

under God: *Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism, and the End of Economic Democracy* (New York: Anchor Books, 2000); David Brooks, *Bobos in Paradise: The New Upper Class and How They Got There* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

12. Robert Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003), 27, 334.

13. Carl Abbott, *The Metropolitan Frontier: Cities in the Modern American West* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1993), 26; Gerald D. Nash, *The American West in the Twentieth Century: A Short History of an Urban Oasis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973), 198.

14. Carl Abbott, "The Metropolitan Region: Western Cities in the New Urban Era," in *The Twentieth-Century West*, ed. Gerald Nash and Richard Etulain (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989), 82.

15. On boosters and capitalization of the western landscape, see Mike Davis, "Sunshine and the Open Shop: Ford and Darwin in 1920s Los Angeles," in *Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s*, ed. Tom Sitton and William Deverell (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001), 115; Michael Logan, *Resistance to Urban Growth in the Southwest* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995), 147–148.

16. Robert Collins discusses growth liberals' ambivalence about the relationship between quantity and quality of life in *More: The Politics of Economic Growth in Postwar America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 61–65.

17. Abbott, *Metropolitan Frontier*, 145–147.

18. *Highlights of PLAN-Boulder County: 1959–1986* (Boulder, Colo.: PLAN-Boulder County, 1986), 45.

19. James Bowers, Tom Pugh, and Trafton Bean, *Boulder's Fringe Area Objectives* (Boulder, Colo.: Boulder Planning Department, 1964); Daniel McLoughlin, "In Pursuit of the Common Green" (1974), Open Space Collections, Municipal Government Reference Center (hereafter MGRC), Boulder Public Library, Boulder, Colorado.

20. The lyrics for "Little Boxes," written by Malvina Reynolds in 1962 and performed by Pete Seeger in 1963, can be accessed at Charles H. Smith and Nancy Schimmel, "Malvina Reynolds: Song Lyrics and Poems" <http://www.wku.edu/~smithch/MALVINA/mr094.htm> (Accessed 28 April 2008).

21. On the development of an ecological urban planning tradition in the West, see Greg Hise and William Deverell, *Eden by Design: The 1930 Olmsted-Bartholomew Plan for the Los Angeles Region* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 11. Also useful is William Cronan's discussion of Americans' tendency to "see city and country as separate places, more isolated from each other than connected." Cronan, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1991), xiv.

22. Carl Abbott, *The New Urban America: Growth and Politics in Sunbelt Cities* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 14; Self, *American Babylon*, 27, 33.

23. Timothy Beatley, "Green Urbanism in the Lessons of European Cities," in *The City Reader*, ed. Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2003), 399–408; Stephen Wheeler, "Planning Sustainable and Livable Cities," in LeGates and Stout, *City Reader*, 486–496.

24. Oliver Gillham, *The Limitless City: A Primer on the Urban Sprawl Debate* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2002), 144.

25. "Cabins, Mines, Now 'Pads': Owners Urged to Check," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 24 February 1968; "Hippies," MGRC, vertical files; anonymous interview by Stephen Gassaway, 1986, Carnegie Branch Library for Local History, Boulder, Colorado.

26. Pete Goter, "Mountain Search Nets Few Hippies," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 5 June 1968, and "Sheriff Scatters Mountain Hippies; Reaction Is Mixed," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 6 June 1968; "Sheriff Nelson Warns against Vigilante Action," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 10 June 1968.

27. Peter Goter, "Investigation Set on Hippie Abuse," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 19 June 1968.

28. "Who's Harassing Whom?" editorial, *Boulder Daily Camera*, 12 June 1968.

29. Goter, "Investigation Set on Hippie Abuse."

30. Ibid.; "Who's Harassing Whom?"

31. Ann Topp, "The Hippie Movement in Boulder: Endor—A New 'Society' for Today's Youth," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 23 June 1968.

32. Bill Brand, "Speakers at CU Rally Urge Armed Revolt against U.S." *Boulder Daily Camera*, 11 September 1969. For accounts of campus unrest, see Frederick S. Allen et al., *The University of Colorado, 1876–1976* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), chap. 6, and Ronald A. James, *Our Own Generation: The Tumultuous Years, University of Colorado, 1963–1976* (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1979). On the SDS's storming of the Institute of Defense Analysis, see "20 Radicals Disrupt Top Secret Meeting," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 29 July 1969.

33. Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 141.

34. Fred Shelton, interview by Stephen Gassaway, 1987, OH 524, MROHC; Fred Shelton, interview by Evalee Gress, 30 September 1988, OH 408, MROHC.

35. Margaret Yeager, interview by Rose Marie Khubchandani, 13 October 1995, OH 773, MROHC.

36. "Police Begin Hill Foot Patrol as Council Considers Hippies," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 18 June 1969; Ruth Correll, interview by Dorothy Hale, 11 March 1986, OH 316; MROHC; Ruth Correll, interview by Stephen Gassaway, 1987 OH 513, MROHC.

37. Sociologist Daniel Foss defined a "freak out" as "an event in which dissidents impose their own cultural meanings on the environment. . . . They are at the same time effacing the cultural meanings imposed forcibly as manifestations of the cultural-political enemy." The desired result, he wrote, was a "free commune or liberated area." Foss, *Freak Culture: Life-Style and Politics* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1972), 134.

38. According to Foss, a "mind-fuck" was "a deliberate attempt to shock, infuriate, confuse, or terrorize the 'straights' by perpetrating inconceivable weirdness upon them. . . . This normally involves the wholesale violation of rules and canons of polite behavior, dress, and language; it is an eruption of an intensified version of the freak life-style into environments where the 'straights' are supposedly secure." Foss, *Freak Culture*, 134, 155, 156, 160.

39. Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 146, 167. Ed Sanders, a New York musician and the

publisher of *Fuck You: A Magazine of the Arts*, suggested ways in which counterculture radicals could freak out: "Large numbers of freaks will, in good weather, sprawl miscellaneously over the sidewalk, cavort in the middle of the street oblivious to traffic, and in general, infest an environment to the obstruction and hindrance of purposeful effort and gainful commerce." Sanders, quoted in Foss, *Freak Culture*, 155.

40. Fuller purchased the bookstore from Clancy Sheehan. Sheehan's store was rumored to have been a stopover for Neal Cassady and Jack Kerouac on their cross-country journeys, and most locals were familiar with its history as a space frequented by political and cultural radicals from the university and the community at large.

41. Daniel Foss described freaks as "walking counterenvironments" to conventionality and argued for their political significance. He argued that the consciousness developed by freaks—"turning on to where it's at"—entailed understanding that "a provisional political truth" emerges from "efforts to safeguard the continuing development of the self." Foss also alluded to the flexibility of the word "freak," pointing out that it can also refer to an addict, a compulsive, or one who emphasizes order and hierarchy at the expense of spontaneity (speed-freak, bike-freak, "violence-freak," "power-freak," or "structure-freak." Foss, *Freak Culture*, 12, 68, 132–134.

42. Peter Coyote, *Sleeping Where I Fall* (New York: Counterpoint, 2001).

43. Mark Perlgut, "Colorado's Longhairs: Up on the Mountain and Down in the Town," *Village Voice*, 27 November 1969, 39.

44. "New City Human Relations Officer Protects Blacks, Chicanos, and Hippies," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 26 November 1970. Examples of the tendency of the counterculture and observers of the counterculture to compare their hipness, marginalization, and cultural isolation to that of African Americans, often through racist rhetoric, abound. For one example, see Tom Wolfe: "Big Nig, the poor pathetic spade wants his rent. A freaking odd thought, that one. A big funky spade looking pathetic and square. For twenty years in the hip life, Negroes never even looked square. They were the archetypical soul figures. But what is Soul, or Funky, or Cool, or Baby—in the new world of the ecstasy, the All-One . . . the Kairos. . ." Wolfe, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (New York: Bantam, 1968), 239.

45. "Zoning Board to Consider Coffee House on Thursday," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 9 July 1969.

46. Jane Cracraft, "Boulder Manager Denies Encouraging Hippie Influx," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 15 April 1970; *City Council Position Statement, October 1969*, MGRC, City Council Files; Ann Nye, "Beverly Hills Police Chief Describes 'Aquarius Age,'" *Boulder Daily Camera*, 21 November 1969.

47. "City Officials Discuss Problems of Transients," *Boulder Colorado Daily*, 9 April 1970.

48. "Mayor Emphasizes City Is Not Soft on Hippies," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 29 April 1970; "Hippies," MGRC, Vertical Files.

49. Ron Tollefson, "Hill Group Starts Petition to Recall City Councilmen," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 9 July 1970, and "Council Recall Effort Awaits Legal Review," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 10 July 1970; "Recall Postponed for Talks with Groups," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 11 July 1970.

50. Boulder City Council minutes (20 April 1971); City of Boulder Central Records, Boulder, Colorado.

51. Richard C. Mclean, interview by Marvin Wolf, 5 March 1996, OH 816, MROHC.

52. "What Are Our Alternatives?" *Denver Chinook*, 2 September 1971.

53. Paul "Bear" Donahue, interview by Stephen Gassaway, 20 February 1992, MROHC.

54. Elmo Fitz-Randolph, interview by Ruth Major, 22 October 1993, OH 650, MROHC.

55. "A Heavy Stone," *Denver Chinook*, 27 May 1971.

56. James M. Hunter, "Statement to Council, Administration," guest editorial, *Boulder Daily Camera*, 13 June 1971; Robert Knecht, "It's a Time for Reason," guest editorial, *Boulder Daily Camera*, 20 June 1971.

57. Collection of CURB Advertisements, MGRC, Associations: CURB; CURB, "The Mayor Says Boulder Has a Tough Policy," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 28 June 1971, MGRC, Associations: CURB; CURB, "Recipe for Instant Slum," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 1 July 1971, MGRC, Associations: CURB; Collection of CURB advertisements, MGRC, Associations: CURB.

58. E. C. Pickett's letter to the editor of the *Daily Camera* is quoted in Phyllis Smith, *A Look at Boulder: From Settlement to City* (Boulder, Colo.: Pruett, 1981), 201.

59. Correll, interview by Gassaway.

60. Conservatives defeated Boulder's first sexual-orientation ordinance and recalled Tim Fuller, who had cosponsored the measure with Penfield Tate, demonstrating the real limits of lifestyle liberals' platform of tolerance.

61. Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America* (New York: Random House, 1970); Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1969); Wolfe, *Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*; James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987); Rossinow, *Politics of Authenticity* and "The Revolution Is about Our Lives": The New Left's Counterculture," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and 70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 99–124; Gosse, "Movement of Movements," 277–302.

62. Quotation from Frank, *Conquest of Cool*, 18.

63. For the statistic on the number of hip businesses in Boulder, see Jane Cracraft, "Establishment 'Bread' Fattens 'Hip' Businesses in Boulder," *Denver Post*, 25 March 1976.

64. James Coleman William, *The New Buddhism: The Western Transformation of an Ancient Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Charles S. Prebish and Kenneth K. Tanaka, eds., *The Faces of Buddhism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998); Richard Hughes Seager, *Buddhism in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

65. Sam Kashner, *When I Was Cool: My Life at the Jack Kerouac School. A Memoir* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004).

66. One participant in Boulder's early Buddhist community remembered, "It was

like, in San Francisco, we took so many drugs that it started to seem that the trips were the same over and over again and that everybody was burning out! So we decided that we'd better get into spirituality. . . . For the first few years, Rinpoche just kept letting us do our drugs or whatever. But then he came down real heavy on us and did not want us doing drugs at all! He didn't even want us smoking a joint! So we all started drinking." Anonymous, Stephen Gassaway, 1987, Oral History Interview 511, Carnegie Branch for Local History, Boulder, Colorado.

67. Steve Krugman, "Naropa Institute, or Notes from a Manure Heap," *Loka*, Summer 1974, 11-17.

68. *Naropa Institute Catalogue*, Manuscript Collections, Naropa, folder 3, Carnegie Branch Library for Local History, Boulder, Colorado.

69. For an introduction to the early history of the natural-foods industry, see William Belasco's discussion on the countercuisine—the counterculture's desire for healthy foods with no synthetic ingredients, minimal processing, and in as close to a whole and natural state as possible. Belasco, *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry, 1966-1988* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989).

70. "General Mills: The General and Betty Crocker," *Forbes*, 1 October 1963, 23-24.

71. Mo Siegel, interview by author, 18 November 2004, Boulder, Colorado.

72. Mo Siegel, interview by Betty Anderson, 1989, MROHC.

73. Frank, *Conquest of Cool*, 26.

74. Roland Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul: The Rise of Public Relations and Corporate Imagery in American Big Business* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998).

75. Tom Kenworthy, "Housing Costs at a High Altitude," *USA Today*, 9 March 2004.

76. Paul H. Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson, *The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People Are Changing the World* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2000), 61.