In 1974, Alexandra Jacobetti’s book *Native Funk and Flash: An Emerging Folk Art* chronicled the reemergence of traditional craft techniques within alternative, hippie subcultures in California. Among its colorful pages, which included documentation of intricate embroidery, hand-carved woodwork, and macramé children’s park, were photographs of what the book refers to as “Glitter Boys”—gender-bending performers who were affiliated with the San Francisco–based groups the Cockettes and its offshoot the Angels of Light, in the 1970s. These collectives were equal parts experiments in communal living, theater troupes, and active promoters of radical new modes of queer and feminist self-fashioning. Category-defying in every sense, the Cockettes and the Angels of Light were known for their outrageous performances wearing handmade outfits both in the theater and in the street. One vivid picture from *Native Funk and Flash* features Pristine Condition (“known as Prissy to her friends”), bedecked in a pink dress with cascading tiered sleeves, a large headress of gathered fabric and silk flowers, and an apron appliquéd with cloth designs (Figure 5.1). Scraggly threads drip
from the skirt's uneven hemline. A diamond-shaped piece of crocheted material—perhaps repurposed from a bed covering—is affixed to the bodice, and the ensemble is festooned with long, ragged streams of old lace. The overall effect, with Prissy perched in pink high heels on a quilt and framed by a light-pink wall decorated with a giant rose, is one of fantastic excess.

Yet it is a form of excess marked not by wealth but by thrift: outfits such as these were made from scavenged materials and trash-picked treasures and relied on the ingenuity of scarcity to achieve their distinctive glamour. As the caption for Prissy’s photograph states, “As she hitched up his dress, s/he said, ‘I’m a firm believer in safety pins!’.” Such text not only points to the thrown-together, impromptu style that was integral to the Glitter Boys, it also underscores their fundamental gender indeterminacy. Within this one brief sentence, three gendered terms are used in rapid succession in reference to Prissy—first female (s/he), then male (h/is), then bigendered (s/he). It is as if no one singular phrase could encapsulate the ever-morphing identities Prissy is taking up, playing with—or perhaps, putting on—as with the exaggerated head-dress and bright-red eye shadow.

In this article, I investigate the handmade costumes of the Cockettes and the Angels of Light to propose that the upsurge in crafting in the late 1960s and early 1970s overlapped in provocative ways with a simultaneous emergence of gay and feminist culture in northern California in the post-Stonewall era. These garish get-ups could be situated within long-standing traditions of drag and camp; within the academy these two dense, related, but distinct terms have been productively circulated, debated, and revised by thinkers such as Susan Sontag, Esther Newton, and Judith Butler. Butler’s work in particular reminds us that the notion that gender might be like a metaphorical change of clothes—worn and then discarded at will—is highly problematic, as it disregards the punitive, regulatory force of the law to maintain and uphold normative gender conventions.

In the historical moment I am examining, however, actual outfits were part and parcel of a utopian vision in which smashing those conventions seemed entirely possible. I focus on the specific material practices that went into constructing these garments and ornaments, and how the Cockettes and Angels of Light, like many in the California alternative craft movement, aligned handmade with countercultural world-making—both as an individualist practice of differentiation and a larger, if somewhat inchoate, communalist project. In the spirit of the patchworked craft of these rough-edged costumes, what follows is somewhat loosely woven, pieced together from archival research, oral histories, and theoretical speculations.

SCRAPS OF HISTORY

The Cockettes were born in San Francisco on New Year’s Eve 1969–1970 and lasted for a little more than two years, staging regular theatrical extravaganzas at the Palace Theater that garnered an avid cult following. These performances, lavishly embellished by their flamboyant, gender-bending costumes, showcased irreverent parodies of Hollywood musicals and integrated solo numbers, music, group revues, and dance as they flaunted their general disregard for traditional codes of sexuality (Figure 5.2). Though they included a diverse assortment of characters, such as soon-to-be disco celebrity Sylvester, the Cockettes circulated around one primary charismatic figure, Hibiscus, who wore glitter in his long beard, lipstick, and innovated in his dress style with evocative sartorial flair.
(Figure 5.3). Here Hibiscus is transformed into a luminous peacock, in a costume designed by fellow Cockette Martin Wong, with flame-colored cardboard feathers arrayed around the upper torso to augment and enhance a glitter-encrusted face.

Anarchic in both spirit and practice, the Cockettes made little distinction between stage and street or between public and private as they wore their fantastical regalia as much in everyday life as they did at the Palace Theater. Audience member and poet Allen Ginsberg noted: "Their productions were transvestite-glitter-fairy-theatre masques. Transsexual dressing is a gay contribution to the realization that we're not a hundred percent masculine or feminine, but a mixture of hormones—and not being afraid of that natural self which the hormones dictate. The Cockettes brought out into the street what was in the closet, in terms of theatrical dress and imaginative theatre."

Ginsberg's remark highlights the crucial role of the imagination in attempting to forge a space for fluid sexual openness—or what we now call queerness, though that was not necessarily the term used to describe them at the time. Hibiscus was a touchstone for a nascent neologism—genderfuck. Encompassing a wide spectrum of queer and assertively nonnormative sexualities, the term genderfuck was first used in reference to phenomena like the Cockettes in a 1974 article in the magazine Gay Sunshine.

For those affiliated with the Cockettes, the theatrical outfit that "comes out of the closet" (never has that wardrobe metaphor been so appropriately) was one that had been lovingly emblazoned with feathers, broken-apart jewelry, beads, glitter, and detritus from the street. Venturing far outside purely gendered frames of reference, these costumes blended animal/human/machine/myth, as papier-mâché horse heads sprouted manes of rubber dildos and flowing, biblical robes were worn with headresses of fresh calla lilies.

In 1971, an ideological rift led to the formation of a splinter group, the Angels of Light, which was dedicated to free performances and was active throughout the 1970s. Several of the Cockettes became Angels of Light members; in contrast to the tenuous, ad hoc organization of the Cockettes, the Angels established many tenets of collectivity, lived together in a communal house on Oak Street that had no doors, espoused the eradication of private property, and shared all their resources. The Angels' group house was part of a larger social movement toward alternative living that was in full bloom across the United States in the 1970s. Thus, while there are important distinctions to be made between these two groups, I am primarily interested in the common ground they did share—namely, their investment in and pioneering of handcrafted clothing worn both at home and in their theatrical presentations. Both believed they embodied the revolutionary edge of a new society that began with such crafting. As former Angel Beaver Bauer recounts, "How we lived and what we made were part of what we wanted to see the world become." By all accounts, the communal Angels' group house had its personality clashes, logistical problems,
and petty in-fights, but it was also an attempt, however compromised, to create an idealistic, projective space—the world of what-if.

As a photo from the 1973 Years Ahead Fashion Show demonstrates, both the Cockettes and the Angels were defiant about nonconformity and self-fashioning on many axes, not least gender (Figure 5.4). Here a Cockette named Wally—pictured at the far right—is adorned from head to toe in hot pink and red. Sporting a feather boa, a bird perched atop a red wig, a beard died pink, and a flowing gown trailing swathes of sheen material, this ambiguously gendered figure is a vision of extreme fashion confection. Such costumes were not always recognizable within the usual rubric of drag’s gender inversion. In an interview in 1980, Hibiscus recounted: “Instead of dressing in drag, I was dressing more as gods. We were all creating mythic figures.”

**FINDING AND MAKING**

The aesthetic of this San Francisco queer counterculture put a great emphasis on dazzle: you were to make a stunning first impression with an overload of eye-catching detail and leave a trail of spangles in your wake. A ruling mantra was that “glitter covers a multitude of sins.” These sparkly surfaces were built up by hand using glue, staples, and whatever was available—in the Angel’s group house, there was only sporadic access to one used (frequently broken) sewing machine. Former Angel Jessica Copen recalls many drug-fueled all-nighters gluing rhinestones into place. Since everyone was in charge of their own costumes, and skill sets varied widely, many improvised their methods of crafting with little care for how things “should” fit the body. In fact, especially in the beginning years, there was an overarching disregard for the natural shape of the figure. For example, the red outfit from 1973 turned Vally’s human form into a bright pyramid of color and texture, a living statue. This disregard for pattern or precedent, combined with a sense that anything at all—from taffeta to tattered curtains—might be used as potential material, promoted experimentation. Within the space of the theater, too, the sets were cobbled together from castoffs and found objects such as painted sheets, cutout cardboard shapes decorated liberally with ubiquitous glitter, and lights stuck in coffee cans.

Many of their base garments were recycled, either dumpster-dived, stolen from costume shops, or found in cheap thrift stores, where used clothes from the 1930s and 1940s were still prevalent. Vintage bos, velvet gowns, and grungy ripped-up castoffs alike all became part of communal “drag rooms” where piles of other fabrics, scraps, and possible accessories were stored. Occasionally, they would make a pilgrimage to Lew Serbin’s Dance Art Company, a boutique of “party beads, marabou feathers, strips of sequins, and boxes of turquoise and emerald rhinestone. Located downtown on Powell Street, the place housed more fantasy clutter than a Hollywood five-and-dime and was revered in our circle as a holy shrine.”

Because they either had to make their outfits themselves or beg/barter with someone else to do it, they learned quickly how to take shortcuts and to create the most effect from the least expense. Adrian Brooks’s memoir *Flights of Angels: My Life with the Angels of Light* recounts the minimal means that they lived on; few had jobs, and they survived primarily from a collective fund of pooled welfare checks: “In 1973, San Francisco reveled in the Glitter Age, its prevailing style coming from retro fashions found in thrift stores or salvaged from ‘free boxes’... a new culture was inventing itself.” No one found it paradoxical that the new was being refashioned from the old; they relied on the anachronistic as well as the futuristic, borrowing especially heavily from art nouveau—it’s sweeping organic lines as well as its orientalizing tendencies.

Many came to the Cockettes and the Angels with no background in craft or sewing at all; Bauer reports having previously only made an apron in her Ohio middle school home economics class that was, she told me, “a tragedy.” Learning by making on the spot, she went on to create some of the Angels’ most memorable outfits, such as the costumes for the 1978 production *Sci-Clones* (Figure 5.5). Here the space aliens wear gowns of transparent shower curtains and extraterrestrial helmets fashioned from plastic champagne flutes found at Community Thrift for an effect that was equal parts Aubrey Beardsley drawing and Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis.* In another example of reusing surprising materials, Bauer took from a garbage pile a wad of the sticky material that
goes under rugs to keep them from skidding to make an elaborate frog outfit complete with psychedelic patterning. The bubbly texture of the industrial material perfectly suited her character’s reptilian skin. Bauer transformed trash to become a resplendent creaturely princess, fully upending the legend of lowly frog that turns into a prince.

Indeed, queer drag and craft are closely aligned, parallel practices: historically, drag queens and kings alke (as well as transgendered folks who aim to pass “seamlessly,” to invoke a sewing metaphor) have had to stitch and make their own clothes, or at least to significantly tailor garments. Larger shoulders, poorly scaled sleeves, ill-fitting crotches, or the simple desire to amp up a garment and make it one’s own: alterations for nonnormative bodies (whether too big, too small, or otherwise “wrong”) necessitate a kind of skilled invention, design sense, and improvisational cunning that, like artisanal knowledge and tradition, are often learned by doing and passed down through mentorship, example, and demonstration. Here the logic of crafted production—and of reproduction—is not hereditary but is instead managed within the queer kinship of shared affiliation and activity.

**CRAFTING SELVES**

None of these outfits was ever considered purely theatrical, taken in its most basic definition to mean “destined for the stage.” Ensembles were not exclusively meant for performances but were assembled to be worn around town—for instance, as the Cockettes stood on the street corner and passed out handmade flyers promoting upcoming shows. Yet even when at home popping popcorn or making dinner, they elaborately enrobbed themselves for themselves and for each other (Figure 5.6). They were interested in creating personas unveiled first at home or on the street, and later rehearsed and integrated into a show—itself an “urban carnival” in which the viewers were as richly attired in rhinestones as the performers. As their own best and first audience, they dressed to outdo and impress each other, as well as to command attention within the colorful tapestry of San Francisco. The outfits were understood as outward manifestations of their mutable inner lives. There was little investment in an “authentic” or stable self; instead, “what resonated deep beneath the glitter,” as one memoir puts it, was a constantly shifting “spirit.” Distinctions about natural versus artificial were dissolved and made irrelevant within the living theater that the Cockettes and the Angels of Light attempted to embody.

If, as Sontag writes in “Notes on ‘Camp,’” “the essence of Camp is its love of the unnatural: of artifice and exaggeration,” then these outfits might not be properly called camp—some saw them instead as the sincere manifestation of complex internal landscapes. For instance, on the stage, masks and costumes were used to obviate the division between reality and fantasy, but they were also charged with the special power of psychic illustration. Especially in the early years of the Cockettes and,
Sweet Pam) recounts, “her mind was so fragmented that assembling her drag became her only focus”—a kind of psychological puzzle to help her put herself back together. In other words, drafting drag was not about dissembling (or falsity) but about assembling an earnest, if provisional, self. The knowing archness that is a hallmark of drag does not quite fit in the case of Hauser, who used it as a route to some sort of fugitive authenticity.

**FOLK, FLASH, FEMINISM**

Let me return to the appearance of the Glitter Boys within the specific context of Jacopetti’s book *Native Funk and Flash*. This series of photos is notable, and not only because of the book’s casual, unassuming incorporation of radically undefined gender identities within what is an otherwise fairly heteronormative framework. Jacopetti chronicles the revival of traditional folk arts by mostly San Francisco–area crafters, including everything from chunky, neoprimitive jewelry to stitched—
together dolls to hand-decorated or “flashed” denim shirts, with a decided interest in showcasing finely done work, emphasizing the time, care, creative inspiration, and effortful labor of the hand—what we have come to think of as “craftsmanship.” Her inclusion of Prissy’s dress therefore legitimizes it as craft—though with some significant disclaimers. Though she celebrates these raw, lovely outfits, Jacopetti’s explanatory captions also state: “So here’s the art of costuming, not craftsmanship, and the use of common elements like patchwork pieces and old doilies. It’s all joined with a fantastic ability to achieve an effect, rivaling the scary shamans of past times for sheer outrageous impact.”

The book thus make a distinct differentiation between these hodgepodge, safety-pinned concoctions and the intricate, precise work she discusses in the rest of the book—Prissy’s costume is heralded for the lack of finesse, its disregard for skill. Though the book draws a line between “costuming” and “craftsmanship,” in fact, some of the outfits documented here were early designs by Cockette Billy Bowers, who went on to be a legendary fashion designer, heralded for his handcrafted work using nontraditional materials that was featured in Italian Vogue and Women’s Wear Daily.

The resurgence of folk art that Jacopetti records, including hand-thrown ceramics, leather tooling, and woodworking, was broadly connected to the concomitant growing environmentalism in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as well as seen as a path to a “gentler” lifestyle. In this, it was linked to a countercultural politics of anticorporalism and a rejection of mass production that would pave the way to living with more integrity. While these ideals were not so far from the utopian dreams of the Cockettes and Angels, there were also significant divergences. The costumes they devised broke with the imperative to make as much as you could by hand when they freely incorporated cheaply made consumer
goods like plastic glasses. Their craft practices and politics were much more heterodox, and due to the pressures of putting shows together quickly and with very little money, they were unabashed about using whatever they could find (or steal).

The upsurge in the 1970s of traditional textile techniques (sewing, embroidery, quilting, knitting, crocheting) was also intimately related to the feminist reclamation of previously denigrated “women’s work.” In fact, feminism is vital to this story—not least because it motored much of the return to craft within both the art world and the hippie/countercultural movement. (It is worth noting that in 1972, the Feminist Art Program’s Womanhouse, which featured some work based on conventional women’s craft, opened in Los Angeles.) In addition, though women’s liberation and gay male liberation have often been historicized as parallel, yet somewhat separate movements in which gay men and feminists are frequently pitted against each other, the Angels of Light provide a crucial, different narrative. Openly feminist participants like Bauer and Copen advocated for strong female roles in the performances and for gender parity in terms of the labor of the communal house. As Bauer states, “We didn’t want to be fan-carriers for drag queens making a grand entrance.” Perhaps because fashion design is equally gendered female and coded homosexual, one place where equality was relatively easily established within the Angels was in the creation of costumes—in other words, handmaking was the sphere where feminist and gay male labors were most equally valued.

DECADENT DÉCOR
In the 1960s and 1970s, California in particular was a space where the revitalization of craft fed off of and into gay liberation, feminism, and communal living. An awareness of geography factors heavily in the literature on the decade’s craft revival as it details the regional blossoming of local artisan communities. The fact that the Cockettes and the Angels surfaced in the Bay Area is significant and is related to certain economic and architectural circumstances, for instance, the availability of rambling, low-rent Victorian houses that were well suited to large groups. The formation of the Cockettes in late 1968 demonstrates that, despite the insistence on the June 1969 Stonewall rebellion (just six months earlier) as the singular origin point of gay liberation in the United States, the genderfuck movement had a unique formation in the hippie counterculture of California.

Furthermore, the turn to handmade fashion, redolent with sequins and beads, also resonates with the negative stereotype of California as a place obsessed with “the superficial” and appearance—politics as style, rebellion reduced to aesthetics. One of the signature features of these groups and their costumes is decorative flourish. Decoration, of course, is a charged word within the history of art and design. In the 1950s, Clement Greenberg warned that it was the “specter that haunts mod-

ernist painting,” as it threatens to devour art into kitsch. Earlier in the century, Adolf Loos in his 1908 essay “Ornament and Crime” cast self-decorating as “criminal” and “degenerate,” writing that “the evolution of culture marches with the elimination of ornament from useful objects.” Loos was especially disgusted with the art nouveau style that so enchanted the Cockettes and the Angels of Light—its hyperbole, its disregard for the categories of high and low, and its mixing of art, design, and craft. In his important reconsideration of Loos, Hal Foster notes that Loos’s terror of art nouveau is related to his disgust for how it “commingles subject and object”—just the sort of fantasy of the ecstatic, hybridized merging the Cockettes and Angels celebrated. What Loos saw as degradation and decadence, they understood as a psychically charged remaking of both self and society as they draped their bodies and their sets in swooping designs using boas in every color and shining lamé.

Though decoration is never explicitly queer in either Loos or Greenberg, Richard Dyer in his book The Culture of Queers discusses the negative association of homosexuality with the decorative and the superficial. The Cockettes and the Angels of Light revealed in extending the self with florid, oversized headaddresses and trailing garments, pleasuring in artifice, and showing little concern for the difference between surface and depth. Or, better, they demonstrated what it might look like when those terms converge to become, to quote a phrase sometimes attributed to Andy Warhol, “deeply superficial.”

WHEN MEMORY SURFACES
In the late 1960s, not everyone saw utopian potential beneath the sparkles and the makeup in San Francisco. Joan Didion’s famous 1967 account of Haight-Ashbury, “Slouching Towards Bethlehem,” instead registers a numbed discomfort with drug culture and a freewheeling, hippie approach to living: “We were seeing the desperate attempt of a handful of pathetically unequipped children to create a community in a social vacuum.” Didion, taking off from a poem by William Butler Yeats, bleakly notes that all these art-into-life experiments were proof that American society was rotting from within: “The center was not holding.” And it is important not to wax overly nostalgic or romanticize these groups, which had their share of jealousies, infighting, overdoses, and so forth. Yet for the Angels, the center did hold together for almost a decade; they lived and worked together until the early 1980s, until they, too, unraveled. That decade saw a further devastation: Hibiscus—inpiration and figurehead—became an early casualty of AIDS in the United States when he died in 1982. Despite these groups’ idealistic attempts to transcend gender, sexuality proved vitally significant when gay men began to contract HIV in the 1980s; many of the men involved in the Cockettes and the Angels have died of AIDS-related illnesses, including Sylvester, Martin Wong, Wally, and Frissy.

Art and design historian Christopher Reed has declared: “There is
sleep on the sheets because there was sort of like difficult glitter stuff there.”44 It is a peculiar conjunction—glamour so excessive that it can admit and embrace its own decrepitude. This is one lesson of the queer handmade aesthetic: it exists where grit and glitter meet, ostensibly right on the surface of things, and yet profound.

something queer about archives.”43 That statement has been borne out in this research project in unexpected, and unsettling, ways. When interviewing Bauer, for example, I asked to see some of her photographs of her time with the Angels. “I’ll need to think about that,” she responded. “To be honest, dredging up that past is very painful for me. When I look at those pictures, I am reminded of tremendous loss and death.” Talking with former members constantly reminded me of the fragmented, piecemeal nature of history itself, the tattered skein of time. Some of their stories were detailed and precise; other times they confessed to large gaps in their recollections. Pam Tent’s memoir emphasizes the communally crafted nature of trying to recall this heady era; its first sentence describes the book as a “collective memoir, and much like a Cockettes show, was pasted together from scraps in our closets and our shared experiences.”44 She is quick to acknowledge holes in the narrative. Likewise, Brooks interrupts his memoir with the phrase “memory fails.”44 Lost films, missing photographs, vanished costumes: it is easy to lose the thread.

In the wake of the Cockettes documentary and the publication of memoirs by former members, this history (and, to a lesser extent, that of the Angels of Light) is being rediscovered for a new generation.45 Unfortunately, the majority of the costumes made by the Cockettes and the Angels did not survive. Though they made spectacular first impressions, many of their outfits were in constant states of disrepair (and some of them were disassembled at the time and reused to make other garments). The performers shed sequins as they staggered offstage. As Tent states, “We ate and even pooped glitter.”45 This statement crystallizes how, with these handmade costumes, outside decoration was incorporated inside, ingested and excreted, traversing the porous membrane between exterior surface and what lies beneath. In a time and place that seemed ripe for social revolution, these groups dreamed of a queer and feminist politics of handmaking, world-making, and self-making that would eradicate the lines between performing theatrical numbers and performing a new way to live. They were crafting their own skin.

Handmade costumes—not to mention radical queer culture—are still considered somewhat marginal within art history, perhaps rightly so. (There are, however, some striking exceptions: for example, Wong is represented in a new textbook on Asian American art history for his Angels of Light stage designs, in an important recognition of the cross-racial nature of this group.)46 Yet despite this marginalization, and despite of the destruction of many of these outfits and stage sets (and the deaths of many former members), the residue of this craft stubbornly lingers. To conclude with one last anecdote, in the early 1970s, Allen Ginsberg had a sexual liaison with Hibiscus. Ginsberg later commented that the erotic encounter was less than comfortable: “His bed was a little gritty because he had a lot of sequins in it. And it was difficult to
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