United States of Amnesia?
1968 in the USA

Timothy S. Brown

"Americans," writes David Farber, "cannot seem to let the sixties go gently into the night."[1] There are few national settings in which the "1968" has been so heavily debated as in the United States of America. The sixties continue to haunt the American consciousness as (depending on the politics of the observer) unfulfilled dream or persistent nightmare. The reaction against the sixties continues to play a central role in American politics, the Vietnam War, especially, having become a sort of litmus test for political and cultural legitimacy. Yet if the war holds pride of place in the American politics of memory, focus on it has tended to obscure other important areas of contention. The broader emancipatory movement of the 1960s, even more than the war, has proven a fruitful ground for the emergence of stale tropes and flat stereotypes, in equal measure depoliticizing (the "lost idealism" of the "baby-boomers") and recuperative ("revolution" as sales tactic). Yet, while cultural reproductions of the war's legacy (e.g. films like *The Deer Hunter* and *Rambo*) and their instrumentalization by the political right have been the object of significant scholarly study, rather less attention has been paid to the legacy of the radical democratic activism of the 1960s.[2] Successfully positioned by the political right as a short-lived generational revolt with an overwhelmingly negative legacy, the sixties have been lifted out of history in the United States, separated both from the preceding span of radical history and from the radical history that has followed. The title of this essay is thus misleading, for "1968" in the United States has not really been forgotten; on the contrary, memories of "1968" (defined in particular ways that we will examine) make up a critical component in Americans' understanding of themselves.

i. The Disavowal Narrative and the Generational Fallacy

At the most visible level, remembrances of "1968" in the United States have been played out in the public sphere as part of a hard-fought ideological battle. The battle is fought over one black and white proposition: the sixties were either a positive, life-affirming development, or a negative, destructive one.[3] Central to the latter position is a trope of moral decay and social decline, according to which the 1960s laid the ground work for all subsequent ills effecting society. Disseminated by well-paid and highly visible extreme-right commentators, it makes up a key element in a broad-based campaign at demonizing the 1960s.[4] This campaign, which represents nothing less than an attempt to achieve a sort of Gramscian hegemony for the hard right in the United States, is inextricably linked to the rightward shift in American politics of the last several decades.[5] Notable for its vehemence, it is also recognizable for its intellectual dishonesty. "Whether it be Nuremberg or Woodstock," writes conservative critic Allan Bloom in a characteristic example of sixties-bashing hysteria, "the principle is the same."[6] The trope of moral decay and social decline is not just the province of conservative cultural critics like Bloom, but is pushed forward by former radicals who have made a career out of ritual self-abasement for their youthful sins. Two of the most famous of these second-thoughters are David Horowitz and Peter Collier. "What we called politics in the sixties," writes Collier, "was exactly what…many of our political leaders tried to say it was before we shouted them down—an Oedipal revolt on a grand scale."[7]

The contention of Horowitz and others that whatever their good intentions, sixties radicals were naïve and foolish in their attempts to change society, is central to what the historian Geoff Ely has recently called the "disavowal narrative."[8] According to this narrative, the personal doubts of former radicals become the sin qua non of historical analysis. This locking

together of large socio-cultural events with individual biographies becomes central to attempts at "mastering" the American past.[9] The generational model—i.e. the idea of a "sixties generation" that was responsible for "1968"—becomes a weapon of ideological quarantine, making rebellion a mere ephemeral product of birth cohort. Privileging the isolated voices of former radicals—making these voices stand in for a widely-based and multifaceted mass movement—makes it possible to keep the transformations of the sixties at a safe distance, reducing them, in Geoff Ely's wry phrase, to "something that was not inhaled."[10]

More interesting than the paranoid fantasies of conservative cultural critics and apostate former radicals are the ways in which "common sense" ideas about the sixties—idea that, to be sure, often resonate strongly with the talking points of the extreme right—permeate various facets of public discourse. It is well known that ideology disguises itself in "conventional wisdom" and "common sense," and perhaps nowhere is this more the case than with "the Sixties." The very idea of "the Sixties," as Eleanor Townsley has pointed out, is a trope; that is, a "figurative use of words, which organizes our understanding of contemporary US politics and society."[11] Contained in the "sixties" trope is the "separateness" of the 1960s from other periods. Also present is the idea of the 1960s as being beyond human agency (e.g. a "tectonic shift" or "cultural big bang") and therefore, outside the realm of politics.[12] It is in the nature of tropes, as Townsley observes, that they mask their authors and hide the fact that they are tropes. The question thus becomes one of identifying the tropes and their authors. Operative in a number of spheres, ranging from official and semi-official punditry, through film and fiction, to television dramas and comedies, tropes related to the sixties make up part of the fabric of social consciousness in the US. It is to a significant handful of these tropes that we now turn.

ii. "Thank You for Saving 1968." The Tropics of Confusion.

The term "1968" is frequently used as a shorthand—as in the title of this book—for a series of youth and student rebellions that took place around the world beginning in the mid-1960s and extending into the following decade. In the United States, where "the sixties" is the shorthand term of choice for the broader rebellion, the term "1968" often has a slightly different inflection, being meant to suggest a series of political-social-cultural "big events": the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy; the (police) riot at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago; the Tet Offensive in Vietnam; and (somewhat absurdly) the Apollo 8 moon mission that took the first photograph of the Earth from outer space on Christmas Eve 1968. "1968," as the cover of the 40th Anniversary Special of *Time Magazine* put it, was the year of "War Abroad, Riots at Home, Fallen Leaders and Lunar Dreams: The Year That Changed the World."[13]

Considered together, these events tend to cancel each other out in a way that resists meaning. The juxtaposition of disparate, only marginally-related events gives rise to the idea of the sixties as a *confusing* time. Aside from representing a way of commenting on the 1960s without saying anything about them, the idea of the 1960s as "confusing" is one of the key pillars of the forgetting of the sixties in the United States, which is also a part of their de-politicization. For what was really confused in the 1960s was the narrative of the USA: a narrative of American exceptionalism and moral righteousness; a narrative enfolding the unproblematic use of American military power; a narrative of consensus in which "politics" are a foreign import. Hence, the idea of confusion is bound up with the transparency of social and political relations. The November 2007 issue of *Newsweek* magazine proclaimed "1968" as "The Year that Made us Who We Are."[14] Complete with psychedelic cover by Peter Max (of Beatles fame) the magazine presents a typically content-free observation that begs a central question: "Who are we?"

We know that the Sixties have arrived as a subject for popular consumption because Tom Brokaw—the newsman and historical mythologizer—has written a book and produced a TV documentary about it. Brokaw is the author of *The Greatest Generation*, a very popular book singing the praises of the WWII generation.[15] A key installment in the annals of what the cultural critic Tom Engelhardt has dubbed "Victory Culture", the book celebrates, among other things, American martial prowess and the heroic mythology of the D-Day invasion of June 1941.[16] Brokaw's work on the WWII generation fits neatly under this "Victory Culture" rubric, with its emphasis on the virtues—hard work, sobriety, probity—that supposedly characterized American during the years of the Great Depression and afterward. Brokaw's work on the sixties generation, which relies heavily on interviews with military and other establishment figures, also fits under this rubric.[17] The book's project of fitting the Sixties into the all-important heroic narrative comes out clearly. In a telling passage, Jim Lovell, William Anders, Frank Bormann are orbiting the moon in the Apollo 8 spacecraft. They are reading the bible, book of Genesis. Brokaw writes: "When Bormann read the final passage—Genesis, chapter one, verse ten—the long, deeply painful, and disorienting year of 1968 and all those who went through it had an opportunity to stop and contemplate their place in the vast history of the universe. 'And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering of the waters he called Seas; and God saw that it was good."[18] Lovell reported, continues Brokaw, that "when Apollo 8 returned safely to Earth three days later, the crew was inundated with messages from people around the world saying, 'Thank you for saving 1968.'"

Here, in Brokaw's telling, American technological and moral triumphalism has the capacity to erase the "pain and disorientation" of a year in which America's defining narratives have been challenged. This project is made explicit on the cover of the issue of *Newsweek* in

which Brokaw's book is excerpted, which advertises the piece as the answer to the question of "What the Sixties Mean." There are a number of reasons why "what the sixties mean" is important; but the most important is that the issues raised in the 1960s remain unresolved. Indeed, the cultural and political environment of the US over the last several decades would be unintelligible without reference to "1968." Whether we speak of the so-called Reagan Revolution ("morning in America"); the efforts of the George Bush Sr. to overcome the "Vietnam War syndrome;" the taboo, under George Bush Jr., on failing to "support the troops" (itself an implicit reference to Vietnam); all are implicitly or explicitly formulated in terms of the need to restore clarity to the vision of America.[19]

The confusion narrative is nothing new. Not only was it already around in the 1960s, but it permeated even sympathetic portrayals of the counterculture. In the 1969 movie *Alice's Restaurant*, based on the Arlo Guthrie song—billed as "a pleasant, oddball, and highly diverting glimpse into one of the country's most confusing times"—young hippies lead a meandering, haphazard existence. One dies from a drug overdose. Arlo and friends are arrested for illegally dumping trash, after which Arlo is rejected as unfit for military service because of his "criminal record." The hippie critique of authority in the film is made in a desultory, disconnected fashion. Inarticulate, incapable of articulating a coherent politics, Arlo and his friends enact a purely accidental rebellion. This depiction goes precisely against what was going on in the 1960s, which was an attempt by young people—halting, and with mixed results to be sure, but an attempt nonetheless—to try and seize control of their own destinies. Against this historical reality, *Alice's Restaurant* stresses a depoliticizing generational model: "Every generation," promotional copy for the film reads, "has a story to tell." This reduction of the upheavals of the 1960s to a "story" told by a "generation," neither any more or less important than any other, is part of a

project of turning the sixties into an "ideology free zone," that has the effect of protecting

national consensus against the threat of national self-examination.

iv. "Headin' out to Eden": Hippie-crites and Dangerous Idealists

Depoliticizing depictions of the 1960s tend to revolve around the counterculture, and for

good reason; in contrast to the political movement represented by Students for a Democratic

Society (SDS) and the anti-war movement, with its well-articulated, ethical critique of official

anti-Communism and imperial war-making, the counterculture—in particular, the "back to the

land" movement of the late 1960s and 1970s—represents a more inchoate form of politics, one

more easily misrepresented. The movement and the counterculture were not of a piece, as a

number of contemporaries argued, and as much recent scholarship has demonstrated.[20] Yet, as a

field for depoliticizing mythologies, the counterculture has several advantages. One of the most

important of these is that it allows convenient forgetting of the Vietnam War, the key synergizer

of protest in America during the 1960s. Focus on the counterculture, with its emphasis on play

and lifestyle, also makes it easier to forget the central feature of the 1960s—a democratic

engagement in government. Rife with stereotypes, the counterculture represents a potential

source of embarrassment to former participants, the object of mirth for successive generations,

and a boon for right-wing commentators seeking to delegitimize the sixties altogether.

Depictions of the sixties counterculture tend to fall into three areas. At its best, the

counterculture is playful, creative, hopeful, joyous, if largely unpolitical.[21] The idea of the Sixties

as a positive cultural revolution informs the great bulk of the memoir literature which, while

positive in its evaluation of the sixties and their legacy, tends to downplay the political at the

expense of the personal.[22] In the vast majority of fictional depictions, the counterculture is

childish, irresponsible, and naïve; the butt of jokes. Represented visually by the ubiquitous tie-

die and rainbows, the counterculture is personified in the "the airhead" of a hundred sitcom and movie characterizations. Finally, as we will see, the counterculture as a field for the activity of dangerously insane gurus and drifters informs a significant minority of popular portrayals.

One of the most salient elements in portrayals of the sixties counterculture is the theme of hypocrisy. The hippies, goes the message, were incapable of living up to their ideals, and frequently not really serious about them to begin with. Another key theme is the loss of innocence, both personal and national. Both appear prominently in T.C. Boyle's novel *Drop City* (2003), which depicts a hippie commune. After destroying the land at their first location in Northern California, and being kicked out for substandard living conditions, the communards relocate to Alaska. Against a backdrop of free love and drug use, the twin themes of hypocrisy and loss of innocence are played out. Women are coerced into being sexually "free," but reveal to each other (and to the reader) that they secretly don't like it. They do all of the cooking and cleaning in the commune; they are revealed as being the most naïve oof the communards in their desire to escape lives back home that they found to be "too much;" they are repeatedly "too high;" they are childishly vegetarian while the men eat the meat they kill (until the women come to their senses and follow the male lead); and every female character ends up seeking the assistance (rescue) of a male counterpart.

At the same time, the largely lazy commune dwellers find themselves inadequate to the task of creating a new life in the wilds of Alaska. Once they get out of California, they cannot really handle living off the land and their situation deteriorates. One woman becomes a stripper and acquires a sexually transmitted disease; another leaves the commune to get married to a "real" Alaska man. Star (the main lead) settles into her relationship with Marco (the only truly hard-working man in the commune, the lone exception to the lazy hippie stereotype represented

by the others). All she really needed, goes the message, was a good man and a monogamous relationship. Several of the men who were especially abusive toward women (including two that were involved in the rape of a 14 year old girl) die in a fiery blaze, literally. There is a real sense of Alaska presenting a "truer" nature than other places and in doing so, revealing the naiveté of the hippies. There is little sense, in the book, of what Hippies might be trying to escape from, a shining example of historical amnesia.

At its worst, the counterculture is dangerous, a field for the murderous forays of misled idealists. Two key figures, in particular, have become important personifications of the counterculture in all its irresponsible and murderous excess: Timothy Leary and Charles Manson. Leary, as is well known, was a Harvard researcher who became an advocate for the importance of mind-expanding drugs. Arrested himself for drug possession in 1965 and 1966, Leary founded, in September 1966, a psychedelic religion: The League for Spiritual Discovery. Leary's mantra of "Turn on, tune in, drop out" became one of the best-known slogans of the era. Charles Manson, a psychopathic hippie song-writer, led a commune of young men and women in a crime spree resulting in the murder of the pregnant actress Sharon Tate in August 1969 in the hopes of starting a race war Armageddon.

Even before the Manson murders, the "hippie psychopath" in charge of naïve followers was finding expression in popular culture. The television science fiction series Star Trek, known generally for its optimistic, multi-cultural view of the future, explicitly took up the theme in a February 1969 episode entitled "The Way to Eden."[23] The episode dealt with the attempt of Captain Kirk and crew to (in the words of promotional copy for the episode) "deal with the insane leader of a band of rebellious idealists who are searching for the fabled planet Eden." The insane leader is Dr. Sevrin, a famous scientist-turned-critic of society. A clear stand-in for

Timothy Leary, Sevrin levels a withering critique against the "artificial" society of his day, which he describes as "poison." Sevrin's followers behave like spoiled brats, scoffing at notions of duty and honor. Far from being drawn from the lower classes, they represent the best and the brightest—some are scientists, one is the son of an ambassador, another is a drop out from Star Fleet Academy. Motivated by idealism, and under the spell of charismatic but dangerously-unhinged leaders, they stand in for a sixties generation in the thrall of misled idealism.

The hippies under the leadership of Dr. Sevrin attempt to hijack the Starship Enterprise with the goal of arriving at the mythological planet "Eden." Using "peace and love" as a stalling tactic, some of them put on a hippie jam session ("headin' out to Eden, yeah brother") while others *secretly* try to take over the ship. Dr. Sevrin attempts to kill the crew of the Enterprise using deadly sonic frequencies as the hippies sing a song extolling the promised land of Eden they hope to visit. Stealing a shuttlecraft and landing on the planet Eden, the hippies discover that the local flora is filled with acid (pun intended!). The hippies burn their bare feet, and "Adam," a dedicated follower of Dr. Sevrin, eats a poison apple and dies. Sevrin follows suit, demonstrating the self-destructive insanity that lies at the heart of his vision of utopia. To be sure, the show's treatment of the counterculture was not entirely unnuanced; some attempt was made to separate the aims of the counterculture more broadly from the aims of leaders like Sevrin/Leary. As the Vulcan science officer Mr. Spock, the most rational member of the Enterprise's crew puts it: "There is no insanity in what they seek." Yet the message is clear that behind the idealism and fake-pacifism of the hippies—as personified, especially, by members young members of the establishment gone wrong—lies a murderous danger.

iv. "The Manson Moment": The Symbolic Displacement of Violence

An important theme in "The Way to Eden" was that violence in society was being perpetrated not by the establishment, but *by* the counterculture *against* the establishment. This message—that violence came not from the forces of the state, but from the supposedly peace-loving hippies—came at a time when the American bombing campaign in Southeast Asia, which had been in the process of ravaging Vietnam with some 3 and ½ times the tonnage of bombs dropped by the United States in the Second World War, was being extended into Cambodia.[24] It also came just a few months after the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, at which demonstrators faced some 11,000 Chicago police, 6,000 National Guard, 7,500 U.S. army troops, and some 1,000 FBI, CIA & other agents. That the police assault on the demonstrators, broadcast on national television and beamed around the world, has gone down in the popular imagination as an example of violence on the part of the demonstrators, speaks volumes about the way that 1968 has been handled in the cultural memory of the United States.[25]

If it is true, as John Foot has argued, that violence represents one of the "historiographic silences" of "1968" studies, the same cannot be said for the cultural memory of "1968" in the United States.[26] On the contrary, violence—of protestors against the state—is an ubiquitous theme, one that has penetrated far beyond the boundaries of right-wing polemics. The symbolic displacement of violence onto the left comes out clearly in Philip Roth's celebrated 1997 novel *American Pastoral*. In the novel, the life of central character (deceased, his story told in flashback) is destroyed by his daughter's act of violence in 1968 against the Vietnam War. In this telling, as Laura Tanenbaum writes, "[v]iolence is seen as revealing the essence of the period's radicalism, negating its political claims, regardless of how atypical these acts may have been or the extent of the state violence to which they responded."[27] Here, the sixties appear as "trauma," personal loss mirroring national loss. "Roth's protagonist experiences this loss as

violent," writes Tanenbaum, "and we thereby suspect that there are other reasons than the demands of the narrative that this novel—like so many recent novels and films about the period—revolves around the historically rare act of violence by the (white) radical left."[28]

Another "historically rare" act of violence—the murderous rampage by the followers of Charles Manson—has provided further material for the symbolic displacement of the state's violence onto opponents of that violence. The conflation of the counterculture and cult murder is a staple of mainstream treatments of the 1960s. The History Channel, a key site of dissemination for popular-historical interpretations in the United States—and therefore an excellent place to look for dominant narratives and semi-official ideology—displayed this dynamic in its recent documentary "The Hippies."[29] Although it features interviews with the editor of the National Review and a commentator from the right-wing Heritage Foundation, the documentary nevertheless attempts a somewhat even-handed portrayal of the hippie phenomenon. Yet it also juxtaposes the so-called summer of love—itself far from representing the totality of the counterculture—with the Manson cult, making the not-so-subtle point that where the license of something like the counterculture appears, cult murder cannot be very far behind. Indeed, the visual maneuver at the heart of this narrative—quick cut from dancing hippies in the summer of love to a close-up of the face of Charles Mansion, crazed eyes starring straight into the camera—makes a point impossible to miss. The juxtaposition of the racist Manson (who hoped the Tate-Bianca killings would spark a race war between whites and blacks) with a movement rooted in the cosmopolitanism of the beatniks and the civil rights movement of the early 1960s represents another one of the symbolic displacements by which the treatment of the sixties in the US is marked.

The trope of *misled* idealism imbedded in the symbolic appropriation of figures like

Timothy Leary and Charles Manson is intimately bound up with other, related tropes, notably

those of lost idealism and hypocrisy. Typically, the loss of idealism is presented through the

juxtaposition of two symbolic events; in this case, two rock festivals: Woodstock and Altamont.

The former, which took place in Woodstock, New York in August 1969, is idealized as the high-

point of the free-spirited counterculture; the latter, which took place outside Altamont, California

in December 1969, is represented at the death of that counterculture. The killing of a concert-

goer by Hell's Angels hired to provide concert security symbolized, like the Manson killings, the

essential hollowness of hippie ideals of peace and love.

Many of the portrayals of the counterculture—or those widely associated with the

counterculture—such as Arthur Penn's *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967), and Dennis Hopper's *Easy

Rider* (1969)—were steeped in violence. The latter, in particular, portrayed a nightmarish

scenario of two worlds—one hippie, one straight—locked in murderous war with each other.

Ending with the murder of its young rebel protagonists by enraged rednecks, the film signified

both a growing disenchantment and a growing social paranoia on the part of the countercultural

left. But filmic portrayals of the counterculture were by no means all steeped in negative

imagery. The counterculture provoked widely differing assessments, both in the mainstream and

on the left.[30] As Timothy Miller has pointed out, even *Time Magazine* detected a core of ethical

principle of the heart of the hippie movement.[31] More importantly, as the counterculture

announced its disinclination to go away, and as the mainstream adopted more and more of the

counterculture's style, *jargon*, and ideas, more positive evaluations of the counterculture became

possible.

In the 1970 television movie *Tribes* (later released theatrically in Europe under the title *The Soldier Who Declared Peace*) Darrin McGavin starred as a Marine Drill Instructor charged with transforming a hippie into a Marine. The hippie, played by Jan Michael Vincent, refuses to suffer on command. Forced to hold buckets of sand with outstretched arms in the sun, the hippie finds inner peace, imagining himself romping in a field with his hippie girlfriend while Indian sitar music plays in the background. Questioned by a curious fellow recruit, he observes, "maybe it's my karma to be here." Refusing to play by the rules, he wins the grudging respect of his superior. "No high school, no teams, no supervision," observes Drill instructor McGavin, "and yet you're in better condition than the rest of my recruits." An advertisement poster for the film carries the legend: "Wanted by the United States Marines, for A.W.O.L., insubordination, …and doing his thing."

This more positive take on the counterculture *was partly a reflection of* the growing popularity of the anti-war movement. But it was also closely tied in with the recuperation of the counterculture by consumer capitalism.[32] This recuperative vision of the counterculture reached it apogee with the "Caine" character played by David Carradine in the TV series Kung Fu, in which a wandering half-Chinese mystic is forced repeatedly to defend himself against the predations of an assortment of old west rednecks.[33] It is not the image of the peace-loving seeker, however—let alone that of the principled rebel challenging the restrictive social mores and racism of the 1950s and 60s—but the stereotypical acid-casualty (who cannot "remember" what happened in the sixties because of all the drugs he or she took) or the crazed Charles Manson (who reveals the dark madness behind all the talk of peace and love) that has come to predominate.[34] In the event-centric narrative of the United States, in which the burden of proof

never lies with power, but always on the critics of power, the hippie as naïf, hypocrite, or murderer is an all-too-necessary figure.

v. Conclusion: "A Surfeit of Democracy"?

At the heart of the cultural memory of "1968" in the USA lie two silences: One has to do with the looming specter of state violence represented by the Vietnam War. The other has to do with the rebellion (begun already in the 1950s, as Arthur Marwick has pointed out) against the socially restrictive conditions of daily life in Cold War America. Both represented problems that demanded engagement from young people living in a democracy.[35] But that is precisely the point and the problem—because for the well-funded ideological critics of the sixties, as well as for uncritical members of successive generations who repeat canards about the sixties out of ignorance or in order to get ahead in a very different ideological climate, it is precisely the example of democratic engagement represented by the sixties that needs to be erased from memory. From the writers of the 1964 Port Huron statement, who called upon members of their generation to take democracy seriously and to demand that the United States live up to the democratic promises enshrined in its constitution; to the young people who sought escape from the restrictive social and sexual mores of the parent generation; to the activists who pioneered the women's-, gay and lesbian-, African American-, Latino-, American Indian-, and Environmental movements; the American "1968" represents abroad outpouring of democratic engagement. Indeed, it was precisely this broad-based emancipatory-democratic push that has prompted conservative fears about a "surfeit of democracy" in the United States.[36] To lift the sixties out of American history—a history in which alternative lifestyles and living arrangements, as well as radical populist moments, are a salient feature—is an act of historical myopia with potentially dangerous consequences.[37]

[1] David Farber, "Introduction," in David Farber ed., *The Sixties. From Memory to History* (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 1.

[2] Important exceptions include the essays in David Farber and Beth Bailey eds., *The Columbia Guide to America in the 1960s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001). See also Stephen Macedo ed., *Reassessing the Sixties* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), and Jim Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

[3] David Farber, "The Sixties Legacy: 'The Destructive Generation' or 'Years of Hope'?", in David Farber and Beth Bailey eds., *The Columbia Guide to America in the 1960s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 167-175.

[4] See David Horowitz, *Radical Son: A Generational Odyssey* (New York: Touchstone, 1997); Peter Collier, *Second Thoughts: Former Radicals Look Back at the Sixties* (Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1989); David Horowitz and Peter Collier, *Deconstructing the Left* (Los Angeles: Second Thought Books, 1991); Robert Bork, *Slouching Toward Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and America's Decline* (New York: Regan Books, HarperCollins, 1996); Allen J. Matusow, *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984); Fred A. Wilcox, *Chasing Shadows: Memoirs of a Sixties Survivor* (Sag Harbor: Permanent Press, 1996); Ronald Radosh, *Commies: A Journey Through the Old left, the New Left, and the Leftover Left* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2001); Myron Magnet, *The Dream and the Nightmare: The Sixties' Legacy to the Underclass* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2000); President George W. Bush specifically referred to the latter as one of the most influential books on the development of his "compassionate conservativism."

[5] On the influence of Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony on the neo-conservative movement in the United States see Dave Brock, *The Republican Noise Machine: Right-Wing Media and How It Corrupts Democracy* (New York: Crown, 2004); Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent. The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 1988); Thomas Frank, *What's the Matter With Kansas? How Conservatives Won the Heart of America* (New York: Metropolitan, 2004).

[6] Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Student* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), 314.

[7] Peter Collier, "Coming Home," in Peter Collier and David Horowitz eds., *Second Thoughts: Former Radicals Look Back at the Sixties* (Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1989) 59-69.

[8] Geoff Eley, "Telling Stories about Sixty-Eight: Troublemaking, Political Passions, and the Enabling of Democracy," talk give at the annual meeting of the German Studies Association in St. Paul, Minnesota, October 4, 2008.

[9] Kristin Ross, *May '68 and Its Afterlives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

[10] Eley, "Telling Stories about Sixty-Eight;" the reference is to former US president Bill Clinton's famous contention, in 1992, that although he had "experimented with marijuana a time or two," he "didn't like it" and "didn't inhale."

[11] Eleanor Townsley, "The Sixties' Trope," *Theory, Culture & Society* 2001 Vol. 18 (6): 99-123, 100.

[12] Ibid.

[13] *Time Magazine*. 40th Anniversary Special. 2008.

[14] Newsweek, November 19, 2007

[15] Tom Brokaw, *The Greatest Generation* (New York: Random House, 1998).

[16] Tom Engelhardt, *The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a Generation* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007).

[17] Tom Brokaw, *Boom!: Voices of the Sixties: Personal Reflections on the '60s and Today*, (New York, NY: Random House).

[18] Brokaw, *Boom!*

[19] On the relationship between the "Vietnam Syndrome" and America's wars of the 1990s see Jerry Lembcke, *The Spitting Image: Myth, Memory, and the Legacy of Vietnam* (New York: NYU Press, 2000) ; see also Kevin Baker, "Stabbed in the back! The Past and Future of a Right-Wing Myth," *Harpers*, June 2006.

[20] For early, important, positive assessments of the counterculture see Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anvhor/Doubleday, 1969); Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America* (New York: Bantam, 1970). For more recent, less positive assessments of the impact of the counterculture see Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties. Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1987); Jim Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987). A very negative contemporary assessment is to be found in Gershon Legman, *The Fake Revolt* (New York: Breaking Point, 1967). The right-wing "objectivist" philosopher also

weighed in; see Ayn Rand, "Apollo and Dionysis," *The Objectivist* (Dec. 1969-Jan. 1970). Reprinted in Ayn Rand, *The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution* (New York: Signet/New American Library, 1971).

[21] See Iris Keltz*, Scrapbook of a Taos Hippie: Tribal Tales from the Heart of a Cultural Revolution* (El Paso, TX: Cincopuntos Press, 2006).

[22] See Robert A. Roskind, *Memoirs of an Ex-Hippie: Seven Years in the Counterculture* (Blowing Rock, NC: One Love Press, 2001); Roberta Price*, Huerfano: A Memoir of Life in the Counterculture* (Amherst: UMASS Press, 2006); Farida Sharan*, Flower Child* (Aurora, CO: Wisdom Press, 2000); Margaret Hollenbach*, Lost and Found: My Life in a Group Marriage Commune (*Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2004).

[23] Star Trek: Episode 75 (The Way To Eden): aired Feb 21, 1969.

[24] American B-52 Stratofortress bombers flew 19,500 missions over Southeast Asia in 1969, the year of the episode's airing, dropping some 27 tons of bombs per mission; "B-52 Activity Statistics," http://members.aol.com/warlibrary/vwb52.htm.

[25] "Protestors target the Democratic National Convention in Chicago," we read on the contents page of the anniversary issue of *Time Magazine, "and police fight back. Result: Bloodshed."* The implication, that it was the protestors who were responsible for the violence of the police, could not be more clear; "Showdown in the Windy City," *Time Magazine*. 40th Anniversary Special. 2008. On Chicago see David Farber, Chicago '68 (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1988). For a sense of how the theme of violence has been treated in the work of former militants see Susan Stern and Laura Browder*, With the Weathermen: The Personal Journey of a Revolutionary Woman* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers, 2007)*;* Cathy Wilkerson, *Flying Close to the Sun: My Life and Times As a Weatherman* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2007)*;* David Gilbert, *No Surrender: Writings From An Anti-Imperialist Political Prisoner* (New York: Penguin, 2001*);* Assata Shakur*, Assata: An Autobiography* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 1987); Elaine Brown*, A Taste of Power: A Black Woman's Story* (New York: Anchor Press, 1987). *For a scholarly treatment of the Weather Underground see* Jeremy Varon, *Bringing the War Home. The Weather Underground, the Red Army faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

[26] John Foot, "Italy's Long 1968 and the Implications for Memory Studies;" paper given at the conference "Memories of 1968: International Perspectives," April 2008, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.

[27] Laura Tanenbaum, "The Availing Stuff of our Experience": The Historical Novel and the American Sixties," Working Papers on the Web, SUNYhttp://extra.shu.ac.uk/wpw/historicising/Tanenbaum.htm.

[28] Laura Tanenbaum, "The Availing Stuff of our Experience": The Historical Novel and the American Sixties," Working Papers on the Web, SUNYhttp://extra.shu.ac.uk/wpw/historicising/Tanenbaum.htm.

[29] *The Hippies* (2007). Also available from the History Channel, tellingly, is *20th Century with Mike Wallace: Different Worlds: Hippies & Cults in America* (2006).

[30] See Michael Wm. Doyle, "Debating the Counterculture: Ecstasy and Anxiety Over the Hip Alternative," in David Farber and Beth Bailey eds., *The Columbia Guide to America in the 1960s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 143-156.

[31] Timothy Miller, *The Hippies and American Values* (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), 5.

[32] For an early treatment of this theme see Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (New York: Basic, 1976).

[33] The series aired from 1972-1975.

[34] "Most of us dropped too much acid to remember what went on back then anyway," writes Gary Kamiya in his perceptive and critical review of Thomas Frank's book on consumer capitalism's co-optation of the counterculture (Frank argues that there wasn't anything much revolutionary there to co-opt to begin with). "[T]he relics of the counterculture," he writes, summarizing what he sees as Frank's dismissive posture, "reek of affectation and phoniness, the leisure-dreams of white suburban children like those who made up so much of the Grateful Dead's audience throughout the 1970s and 1980s;" Gary Kamiya, "Were the '60s a Fraud?", http://www.salon.com/books/feature/1997/12/cov_22feature.html.

[35] Marwick, Arthur, *The Sixties. Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States c.1958-c.1974* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998).

[36] Samuel Huntington et al, *The Crisis of Democracy: On the Governability of Democracies(report of the Trilateral Commission, 1976).*

[37] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community. Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Pres, 1972).