A Beautiful Politics: Theodore Roszak's Romantic Radicalism and the Counterculture

Christopher Partridge

> *Ugly will not be made beautiful by the increase of ugliness. And beauty—the beauty of human souls reclaimed and illuminated—is the banner and power of* our *revolution. A beautiful politics. Despite the bastards. The technocracy will not be overthrown. It will be displaced—inch by inch—by alternative realities imaginatively embodied.*[1]

It is now almost fifty years since the publication of one of the most influential studies of 1960s youth culture, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* by Theodore Roszak. Published in 1969, it developed a number of ideas introduced the previous year in a series of well-received articles for *The Nation*, a weekly American journal of progressive opinion.[2] Of course, an anniversary is not in itself a good enough reason to revisit a book. However, the significance of this work, not only in popularizing the word "counter culture"[3] and in contributing to our understanding of protest politics during the 1960s, but, as I will argue, in developing a distinctive countercultural philosophy make it worthy of re/consideration by those interested in discourses of dissent.

In a review of *The Making of a Counter Culture* for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Alan Watts encouraged those of his contemporaries who "want to know what is happening among [their] intelligent and mysteriously rebellious children" to buy the book. "The generation gap, the student uproar, the New Left, the beats and hippies, the psychedelic movement, rock music, the revival of occultism and mysticism, the protest against our involvement in Vietnam, and the seemingly odd reluctance of the young to buy the affluent technological society—all these matters are here discussed, with sympathy and constructive criticism, by a most articulate, wise, and humane historian."[4] Of course, not everyone who took Watts's advice and picked up the book agreed with his assessment. Some, such as Linda Herbst, found his treatment "naïve"[5] or, like Andrew Greeley, considered him to be "preaching a new irrationality."[6] Others, such as Clive James, while disagreeing that his analysis betrayed naïveté and irrationality, nevertheless, concluded

that, overall, it was "not very good." Roszak can, he argued, "draw upon sufficient intellectual resources to know a problem when he sees it. Having seen it, he raises it; and having raised it, skates around it. So *The Making of a Counter Culture* is shallow without being naïve, which is a lot worse than [previous books on the underground] which were shallow *because* they were naïve."[7] While James was arguably right to draw attention to Roszak's enthusiastic support for the counterculture without fully interrogating the implications of his position or cogently articulating a viable alternative (which he would go on to do in subsequent books), generally speaking, many disagreed that the book was "not very good." Indeed, like Watts, many at the time lauded it as "a brilliant book,"[8] while others have since come to consider it as perhaps "the most insightful analysis of the social trends of the sixties"[9] and arguably "the most influential contemporary account of the counter culture."[10] Certainly, as James conceded, it is not a naïve book.

Roszak understood the counterculture better than most academic observers at the time and, for all its youthful exuberance and excess, he saw that it was, as the sociologist Bernice Martin later commented, "an index to a whole new cultural style, a set of values, assumptions and ways of living." More particularly, drawing on Roszak's analysis, she agreed that postwar cultural changes could be understood in terms of the "working out of the principles of Romanticism" that had become embedded in western culture at the dawn of the modern age.[11] As the currents of Romanticism and antistructure gained ground during the 1960s, he discerned "a transformation in the assumptions and the habitual practices which form the cultural bedrock of the daily lives of ordinary people," opening Western societies up to "the expressive revolution."[12] Hence, it has always seemed rather odd to me that otherwise excellent analyses of the period, such as those of Christopher Gair and Colin Campbell, mention Roszak only in passing,[13] or, in the case of some studies, such as those of Harvey Cox, Danny Goldberg, and Hugh McLeod,[14] fail even to acknowledge his work.

The Making of a Counter Culture is, however, more than simply a perceptive discussion of youth rebellion and its principal intellectual resources (which is how it has tended to be read). Rather, I argue that Roszak began the construction of a systematic countercultural philosophy that I want to call "Romantic radicalism," which he then

unpacked more fully in subsequent works, especially *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society* and *Person/Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society*. Indeed, in many respects, much of his subsequent scholarly output developed ideas that were embryonic in *The Making of a Counter Culture*. As such, he deserves significantly more attention than he has so far received as an important countercultural thinker. Kevin Fagan was quite correct when he commented in his obituary that "the counterculture was never a dim relic of the 1960s for Theodore Roszak. It was a vibrant, ever-evolving zeitgeist of thinking beyond every box in sight, of endlessly exploring the essence of humankind and its relationship with the Earth."[15] Focusing on *The Making of a Counter Culture*, the following discussion argues that he was indeed a perceptive Romantic visionary. While the counterculture was not always as countercultural as many of its adherents believed and, wittingly or unwittingly, was tamed by consumptive capitalism,[16] unlike many at the time, Roszak was sensitive to such pressures, unmasked them, and resisted them. Indeed, up until his death in 2011,[17] his thought was imbued with an unwavering optimism about the subversive energy of the counterculture.[18]

Technocracy and the myth of objective consciousness

At the beginning of *The Making of a Counter Culture* he observed that "the interests of our college-age and adolescent young in the psychology of alienation, oriental mysticism, psychedelic drugs, and communitarian experiments comprise a cultural constellation that radically diverges from the values and assumptions that have been in the mainstream of our society at least since the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century."[19] This gave him hope that "this disorienting civilization of ours" might be transformed "into something a human being can identify as home."[20] But what was it about the modern world that troubled him and what was it about the counterculture's resistance to it that gave him hope?

Understanding what Roszak meant by "this disorienting civilization of ours" is central to understanding his thought, his celebration of the counterculture, and indeed the reason why his work often generated critical opprobrium within academia. Put succinctly, the focus of his ire was "technocracy"—"the mature product of technological progress and the scientific ethos." In a technocratic society "those who govern justify themselves by

appeal to technical experts who, in turn, justify themselves by appeal to scientific forms of knowledge. And beyond the authority of science there is no appeal."[21] This engenders a myopic "single vision" of reality. As such, the entire socioeconomic system of a technocratic society is organized around the views of a hierarchy of "experts" who subscribe to that vision: "if the technocracy is dependent on public deference to the experts, it must stand or fall by the reality of expertise." But, he asks, "what *is* expertise? What are the criteria which certify someone as an expert?" He continues, "if we are foolishly to agree that experts are those whose role is legitimized by the fact that the technocratic system needs them in order to avoid falling apart at the seams, then of course the technocratic status quo generates its own internal justification: the technocracy is legitimized because it enjoys the approval of experts; the experts are legitimized because there could be no technocracy without them."[22]

Moreover, because technocracy renders itself "ideologically invisible," its "assumptions about reality and its values become as unobtrusively pervasive as the air we breathe."[23] Technocratic values are hegemonic. Members of society are easily and unwittingly coerced to accept the technocratic status quo as common sense. Roszak refers to this corrosive cultural phenomenon as "the myth of objective consciousness." Again, members of technocratic societies erroneously believe that the only "reliable knowledge" available is that peddled by experts who can be trusted simply because their analysis is "scientifically sound, since science is that to which modern man refers for the definitive explanation of reality."[24] This is problematic because it is a myth that blinds us to other ways of gaining access to reality. If it cannot be verified by scientific expertise, "cleansed of all subjective distortion, all personal involvement," it cannot be considered "knowledge."[25] However, as we will see, he argued that the rejection of affective and poetic responses to the world and the imposition of the myth of objective consciousness leads to a dangerous distortion of our relationship with reality.

The counterculture was significant because it rejected the myth of objective consciousness. In turning to drugs, mysticism, and occultism, it subverted technocracy and championed the epistemological importance of subjective experience. Young people "turned from objective consciousness as if from a place inhabited by plague" and, Roszak argued, "in the moment of that turning, one can just begin to see an entire

episode of our cultural history, the great age of science and technology which began with the Enlightenment, standing revealed in all its quaintly arbitrary, often absurd, and all too painfully unbalanced aspects."[26] Youth culture countered core technocratic assumptions and values.

For Roszak, however, this countercultural revolution was only a beginning. In turning away from technocracy, there was some uncertainty as to what the counterculture was turning to. While some offered thoughtful, humane alternatives, others immersed themselves in superficial, hedonistic and ultimately destructive beliefs and practices. Concerning the use of drugs, for example, while he accepted that they might have revolutionary potential, he could also be scathing about their use in youth culture: "there is nothing whatever in common between a man of Huxley's experience and intellectual discipline sampling mescaline, and a fifteen-year-old tripper whiffing airplane glue until his brain turns to oatmeal. In the one case, we have a gifted mind moving sophisticatedly toward cultural synthesis; in the other, we have a giddy child out to 'blow his mind' and bemused to see all the pretty balloons go up."[27] That is not to say that watching all the pretty balloons go up lacked significance as a challenge to technocracy, only that it was often an ill-advised and naïve byproduct of the counterculture. Despite its "hallucinogenic obsession and sheer, infantile make-believe," what he referred to as "the callow days of LSD and Tolkien's hobbits"[28] still represented an important challenge to the conformity and conservatism of technocracy. What it did indicate was that, important though such ideas and practices could be, the counterculture lacked a coherent philosophy that could replace the "reductive rationalism" that dominated everyday life in technocratic societies.

There were, however, several worthwhile "mentors of our youthful counter culture" that pointed the way forward for young people. In particular, he discusses Herbert Marcuse, Norman Brown, and Paul Goodman, and, to a lesser extent, the mystical and psychedelic approaches of Allen Ginsberg, Alan Watts and Timothy Leary, all of whom, in various ways, "called into question the validity of the conventional scientific world view, and in so doing… set about undermining the foundations of the technocracy."[29] Still, he found them wanting in certain respects. Hence, in the final analysis, Roszak

turned to the thought of William Blake and suggested a form of Romantic radicalism as a way of bringing together a number of currents within the counterculture.

While there are, of course, many more radical thinkers in the past that he could have drawn upon, such as those within the history of Marxism, his concern was that they often failed to offer the necessary comprehensive critique of science. In other words, they hadn't fully understood the corrosive power of technocracy. The problem is that previous generations tended to view science "as an undisputed social good," largely because it was "so intimately related in the popular mind… to the technological progress that promised security and affluence."[30] They were blind to the fact that "the impersonal, large-scale social processes to which technological progress gives rise—in economics, in politics, in education, in every aspect of life—generate their own characteristic problems." Consequently, "when the general public finds itself enmeshed in a gargantuan industrial apparatus which it admires to the point of idolization and yet cannot comprehend, it must of necessity defer to those who are experts or to those who own the experts."[31] Technocracy continues and other ways of understanding reality and human wellbeing are trivialized. Blake understood this and challenged technocratic progress with alternative visions of reality:

> To see a World in a Grain of Sand,
> And a Heaven in a Wild Flower,
> Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand,
> And Eternity in an hour. [32]

Reality is penetrated, but not in a way that makes sense in a technocratic society.

Hence, central to Roszak's Romantic radicalism was the development of an alternative "politics of consciousness."[33] The whole human personality, he argued, "body, soul, and spirit, must be brought into the arena of dissent as a critical counterpoise to the diminished range of experience to which urban-industrialism limits our awareness."[34] In other words, like many in the counterculture, he prioritized seeking a change in consciousness in order to effect political change. Changing the way people experience and think about themselves, each other, and the planet was the key to sociopolitical

change. Once consciousness is changed, he believed, there will naturally follow a revolution in our approach to understanding reality, as well as a significant shift in the development of policies, social structures, institutions, and economic systems. He was convinced that countercultural music, literature, art, communalism, protests, and, a whole range of "non-intellective modes of consciousness" (e.g. psychedelics, occultism, "freaking out") not only represented the cri de cœur of a generation desperate to throw off the shackles of technocracy, but that they would generate an adjustment in consciousness. Bob Dylan was right[35]—"the times they are a-changin'."[36]

Hence, while it is clear that Roszak's "neo-luddism,"[37] as he later came to refer to his thought, was to some extent a product of his engagement with the counterculture, we will see that the broad contours had already taken shape prior to the 1960s. Not only was he a countercultural Romantic by nature, but, I want to suggest, his upbringing significantly contributed to his radicalism.

The formation of a countercultural mind

While Roszak was a "fierce polemicist," he was also "shy, gentle, intense… [and] articulate without being rhetorical…" He was, as one early interviewer seemed surprised to discover, "very, very far from the dark angel leading the evil forces of mindless irrationality that many of his critics fear."[38] Likewise, his obituaries portray a generous scholar who was "something of a leftist, though no admirer of dogma or orthodoxy" and "a man of good hope who sought, in a writing career that lasted more than four decades, to ride the new waves of social possibility."[39]

Born in Chicago on 15 November 1933, into a working class, Roman Catholic family, his parents, Anton and Blanche, eventually moved to Los Angeles, where he attended Dorsey High School and met Betty Greenwald, who would become his wife, muse and coeditor in 1969 of *Masculine/Feminine: Readings In Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women*.[40] After graduating with a degree in history from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1955, he received his Ph.D. in 1959 from Princeton University. His dissertation focussed on "Thomas Cromwell and the Henrican Reformation."[41] His first teaching post was at Stanford University, following which, in 1963, he became Professor of History at California State University, Hayward (now East Bay). Although

he remained here for the rest of his career, having gained tenure in 1968, he enjoyed a number of sabbaticals and periodically taught at other institutions, notably the University of British Columbia and the Schumacher College in the UK, the ethos of which reflected Roszak's own countercultural radicalism.

His upbringing in a working class, Roman Catholic family had a formative influence on the development of this radicalism. Indeed, it is possible to piece together a basic biography from his scattered comments. For example, we learn that his father, who was a carpenter, died at the age of 47 having been typical of many working class men that "grind their substance away at hard and dirty work for too little pay and appreciation."[42] There is little doubt that this experience made him receptive to Marxian analysis, which in turn led to an early appreciation of the New Left (which emerged in Western Europe and the United States in the late-1950s). Likewise, it is not difficult to trace the roots of his strident critiques of religion, dogmatism, and patriarchy back to his "mind-murdering struggles" with Catholicism. He describes learning the catechism as "a jackbooted parade of lifeless verbal formulas… every one of them to be literally believed under threat of corporal punishment. Dogma and doctrine were marched through my brain like storm troops flattening every natural barrier childish inquisitiveness might raise." Like many in the counterculture, he viewed the institutional religion within which he was raised as "open warfare on a young imagination." More particularly, he asked, "can there be any question what damage has been done to the visionary powers in our culture by generation after generation of such ruthless creed mongering?"[43] As such, from fairly early in his career he seems to have concluded that institutional religion often functioned as a tool of technocracy. Certainly, such experiences were of formative importance of. As Roszak put it, "the hopes I invested in the protest of [the 1960s] had much to do with my own situation."[44] Again, he bemoaned the fact that, unfortunately, "what our culture knows of the art of introspection it inherits from religious traditions that have a heavy investment in fear and trembling." Indeed, he suggested that "the major forms of deep self-analysis that have been developed in the Western world are all related to the experience of sin and the fear of divine displeasure: the Catholic confession, the Puritan diary, the camp-meeting testimonial."[45] This influence of "ruthless creed mongering" in modern culture needed to be exposed and resisted. While his voice of dissent can be heard in much of

his work, it is particularly evident in his satirical novel *The Devil and Daniel Silverman*, which relates the story of a struggling, gay, Jewish novelist from San Francisco who takes up an invitation to lecture on humanism at a fundamentalist college in Minnesota run by the Free Reformed Evangelical Brethren in Christ. Trapped in the college by a snowstorm, the protagonist is forced to engage with the insular and ill-informed discourses of conservative religion. While the book offers a humorous caricature of the religious right, it also provides a cogent critique of unthinking religious irrationalism, sadism, and bigotry: "believing in God isn't nearly enough, not at all; it's not even the beginning. It doesn't bring repentance and true conversion—not unless one dreads the pains of hell. If faith is going to touch the heart, there has to be fear, fear of damnation, fear of everlasting anguish, fear of the devil's cunning."[46] Again, Roszak almost certainly has his own experiences mind. As he notes elsewhere, his "first deliberate effort at self-examination took place as a child of nine in the Catholic confessional." What, he asks, "had I been trained to do in that interval of solitude? To think of my sins, to weigh and ponder each one, to grieve for the offense I had caused to God, and to tremble at the prospect of eternal damnation."[47] It is little surprise, therefore, that he found the ideas of the human potential movement and countercultural experimentation liberating.

Having said that, it's important to note that Roszak did not completely reject religion. While it had always troubled him, he eventually came to recognise its revolutionary potential, it being central to the visionary and emotional life of many of those he admired, not least the Romantics.

> I, who do not share any of Tolstoy's religion or that of the prophets of Israel, and who do not believe that a single jot of Dante's or Blake's world view is "true" in any scientific sense, nevertheless realize that any carping I might do about the correctness of their convictions would be preposterously petty. Their words are the conduit of a power that one longs to share. One reads their words only with humility and remorse for having lived on a lesser scale than they, for having at any point foregone the opportunity to achieve the dimensions of their vision.[48]

Hence, unlike many who were sympathetic to the thinking of the New Left, he was convinced that "it is the energy of religious renewal that will generate the next politics, and perhaps the final radicalism of our society."[49] Indeed, building on the analysis in *The Making of a Counter Culture*, his next book, *Where the Wasteland Ends*, was, he argued, "about the religious dimension of political life." Of course, he was keen to point out that "the religion I refer to is not that of the churches; not the religion of Belief or Doctrine." Rather, his interest was in "religion in its perennial sense. The Old Gnosis. Vision born of transcendent knowledge. Mysticism if you will."[50] It was the celebration of visionary energies, conspicuously evident in the work of Blake, that interested him. These energies of reenchantment, which resisted the progress of secularization and which he witnessed in the counterculture, were, he insisted, "neither trivial nor irresponsible, neither uncivil nor indecent." On the contrary, the counterculture's fascination with mysticism, the occult, and human potential ideas was "a profoundly serious sign of the times, a necessary phase of our cultural evolution, and—potentially—a life-enhancing influence of incalculable value. I believe it means we have arrived, after long journeying, at an historical vantage point from which we can at last see where the wasteland ends and where a culture of human wholeness and fulfillment begins."[51]

Turning to his pacifist critique of technocracy, of particular significance for the early development of his thought was a civil defense issue, which became a matter of public debate in the late-1950s and early 1960s: "quite simply what was being proposed, with all the authority of the state, and all the political and scientific expertise the state could muster, was to take the whole of American society and bury it in concrete vaults underground for the sake of an effective, credible, nuclear deterrent system. It was like a horror story; a nightmare."[52] Because it was proposed that this "deep shelter system" was to be financed from local community funds, it split both public opinion and scientific opinion. Roszak became interested and was invited to debate the issue at local meetings where he was frequently opposed by a phalanx of "experts" who were, he recalled, "all marshaled to defend the greatest insanity I've ever contemplated."[53] His own arguments, which were rooted in a "sick nausea" induced by the prospect of mutually assured destruction, were dismissed as irrational and unscientific. Why? Because, his opponents argued, they were simply the result of an *emotional* response to

the possibility of annihilation. “If you introduced anything emotional or evaluative [into the debates], you were immediately cautioned for trying to arouse feelings.”[54] This experience forced him to the conclusion that technocracy not only ignores who we are as thinking, feeling human beings, but it poses a threat to civilization and, indeed, the future of the planet. This brings us to the heart of the development of Roszak’s Romantic radicalism and to the reason why he welcomed the emergence of the counterculture. “My response was that feelings were part of the discussion: human beings are whole things, and the feelings of dread and horror and disgust and moral distress were part of the issue—in fact, the heart of the issue.”[55] To simply dismiss such responses as irrelevant and to focus instead on “the thickness of concrete” required for a nuclear shelter “took a heavy toll on my appreciation for reason and realism in American society.”[56] Such “technocratic manipulation” of the modern mind reduced reason to a “pathetically small and vicious” tool that alienated people from themselves. Members of society were “systematically encouraged to believe that certain kinds of strong moral feelings should be repressed and hidden.”[57] Again, he saw in the various spiritual, psychological, and cultural currents that emerged during the 1960s a direct challenge to this type of thinking.

Also of formative significance for the development of his radicalism were three relatively long periods that he spent in London between the mid-1960s and the early 1970s. The first of these, in 1964, was particularly important for him, in that he succeeded Hugh Brock as the editor of the radical pacifist journal, *Peace News* (founded by the Quaker Humphrey Moore), which was closely linked to the influential anti-nuclear Aldermaston disarmament marches of the 1950s and 1960s. Having said that, as Graham Chedd reported in 1971, Roszak “had strong pacifist inclinations for as long as he [could] remember, and was a member of that tiny and ridiculed minority in the States which, in the decaying years of the Eisenhower era, constituted the early peace movement—and which used to look with awe and respect at the massive protests the CND were then managing in Britain.”[58] Consequently, it was inevitable that he would become actively involved in the British peace movement and, moreover, that this involvement would contribute to the development of his “beautiful politics.”

Having returned to teach history at California State University for a couple of years in the mid-1960s, he found that he was struggling to research the cultures of dissent in the United States and Europe with which he had become involved. Hence, in an attempt "to escape" in order "to get some book-writing done"[59] he returned to London in 1967 and immersed himself in the burgeoning British counterculture. Of particular note during this period was his involvement in the founding of the "turbulent, short-lived 'Antiuniversity of London' where transient students arrived with little more to their names than guitars, begging bowls, and a stash of magic mushrooms to study the teachings of Timothy Leary, anarchist politics, and Tantric sex."[60] This involvement, as well as his work within the peace movement, led to a deeper, more sympathetic understanding of the counterculture as a force for good in Western societies. Indeed, it is no surprise that it was while he was living in London, immersed in the counterculture, that he produced a series of four articles for *The Nation*, the research for which eventually led to *The Making of a Counter Culture*—much of which was also written in London.[61] The term itself, "counter culture," was initially introduced in the first of these articles, "The Counter Culture: Part 1. Youth and the Great Refusal," on 25 March 1968.[62] However, the key point I want to make here is that his left-wing thought, distrust of authority, resistance to dogma, and pacifist sympathies, all of which emerged as a result of his upbringing and early childhood experiences, were systematized into a Romantic radicalist philosophy during the 1950s and 1960s largely as a result of his direct involvement in the peace movement and the counterculture.

Concerning the concept of a "counterculture," it's worth noting here that at roughly the same time that Roszak was writing his articles, another American, the psychotherapist Joseph Berke, who had also moved to London in 1965 (to work with R.D. Laing[63]), was compiling a compendium of revolutionary resources entitled *Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society*, a summary of which was published in the British underground magazine *International Times* in December 1968.[64] While the books were published the same year, neither mentions the other. Berke's work, which is now largely forgotten,[65] is typically countercultural, comprising photographs, illustrations, comic strips (by Robert Crumb and others), reprinted newspaper cuttings, articles by influential thinkers such as Allen Ginsberg and Stokely Carmichael on the core themes of psychedelics, sex, and revolutionary politics, as well as discussions by those involved

in social and educational experiments such as Germany's Kommune 1 and Denmark's New Experimental College. Funded by the Underground Press Syndicate, it was designed to appeal to readers of countercultural magazines such as *International Times*, *Oz*, *Berkeley Barb*, *The East Village Other*, and *Actuel*. Moreover, it was intended "to be used as a handbook for direct action" and a manifesto for the "revolutionary reconstruction of society."[66] Although it did not have the political impact Berke had hoped for, it does demonstrate that the term "counter culture" was becoming common currency in the closing years of the 1960s. Indeed, it's important to note that neither Berke nor Roszak coined the term. "Counter-culture" had already been used once by Talcott Parsons in 1951 with reference to the "counter-ideologies" of "deviant groups."[67] Then, with reference to Parsons' work, J. Milton Yinger, in an important discussion in 1960, suggested the use of the term "contraculture" wherever "the normative system of a group contains, as a primary element, a theme of conflict with the values of the total society, where personality variables are directly involved in the development and maintenance of the group's values, and wherever its norms can be understood only by reference to the relationships of the group to a surrounding dominant culture."[68] While focussing primarily on those he considered to be "delinquents," Yinger's understanding of the "contraculture" overlapped significantly with the later notion of a "counterculture," which had, by the close of the 1960s, thanks to Roszak's work, become the principal term for modern, largely youth oriented, sociocultural radicalism.[69]

After a fruitful, but challenging period exploring London's underground, Roszak returned to California at the end of the 1960s. Finally, in 1970, he and his young family made a third journey back to London, where they rented "a rather inadequately heated upstairs maisonette of a shabby bijou house in the northern part of Earls Court Road."[70] This time, he concentrated on writing his next book, *Where the Wasteland Ends*, which provided a more rigorous articulation of his Romantic radicalism. In it, as we have seen, he theorized a return to the "Old Gnosis" ("the magical and sacramental vision of nature") and the establishment of a "visionary commonwealth" that will replace the sterile "single vision" of technocracy.[71] Indeed, the year it was published, 1972, Roszak also produced an accompanying political reader: *Sources: An Anthology of Contemporary Materials Useful for Preserving Personal Sanity While Braving the Great Technological*

Wilderness. Bringing together excerpts from the writings of a range thinkers, from Herbert Marcuse and Paul Goodman to Carlos Castaneda and Gary Snyder, he intended the volume to contribute to a politics of consciousness. "Imagine what you read here is arranged in five concentric circles, but each circle defined by no more than the emphasis of the author's thoughts and flowing into the next. Thus, five expanding stages of liberation: person, body, community, whole earth, transcendence."[72] By this point he understood his work in terms of the construction of a radical alternative to the violence of both technocracy and also much of the neo-Marxist protest politics that he had witnessed in Europe and America.

Finally, Roszak's radicalism was further stimulated by his experience of university life. From early in his career he had sympathized with the indignation of the sociologist C. Wright Mills,[73] who had argued that scholars have a responsibility to analyse cultural hegemonies. Likewise, he agreed with Noam Chomsky's thesis in his essay "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," which Roszak republished in 1969 in a provocative volume entitled *The Dissenting Academy*. "It is the responsibility of intellectuals," insisted Chomsky, "to speak the truth and to expose lies. This, at least, may seem enough of a truism to pass without comment. Not so, however. For the modern intellectual, it is not at all obvious."[74] Likewise, Roszak lambasted "the American university" for offering its academics "little opportunity to disconnect from this dismal tradition of official conformity."[75] Particularly critical of the methodological neutrality of German scholarship, which he understood to be a conspicuous influence on American academic life in the 1960s, he lauded the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment. Indeed, strictly speaking, they were "not academics, because to be an academic in their age required that one be a petty and irrelevant mind, thus a 'safe' mind from the viewpoint of the authorities."[76] The *philosophes*, however, spoke truth to power. Similarly, Roszak, angered by the self-serving political quietism of some of his colleagues, railed against the safe mind. "There was a time when men of intellect described the purpose of their lives in ways that stirred the souls of the noble and chilled the blood of the base."[77] In a decade that was witnessing the Vietnam war and deep social injustices, careerist colleagues had retreated into their ivory towers: "what are the imperatives our students would find inscribed upon our teachers' lives? 'Secure the grant!' 'Update the bibliography!' 'Publish or perish!' The academic life may be busy and anxious, but it is

the business and anxiety of careerist competition that fills it, not that of a dangerous venture."[78] Furthermore, these colleagues had the audacity to dismiss the counterculture as trivial, profane, and not worthy of serious analysis. They were either blind to its political importance or disturbed by its rude radicalism. Hence, *The Making of a Counter Culture* needs to be understood on a number of levels. It is an apologetic analysis of youth protest, an exercise in conscious raising, an initial contribution to the construction of a "beautiful politics," and a direct challenge to the academic establishment.

In his thoughtful essay published the same year as *The Making of a Counter Culture*, "On Academic Delinquency"[79]—which is still worth reading—Roszak commended Thomas Jefferson's plans for the University of Virginia, which imagined an institution that would "exercise an independent criticism of those forces of church and state which 'fear every change, as endangering the comforts they now hold.'"[80] His overall point is that understanding (in the sense of *verstehen*) was opposed by those academics committed to the technocratic "single vision" who were responsible for the funding of higher education. Hence, as in the 1960s, those young people hungry for a countercultural alternative had to look beyond the confines of the university for "the defiant minds of the time."[81] As a result, they created extracurricular literary societies and invited speakers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson—who, on their arrival, were frequently barred from speaking in the university buildings. Roszak's argument was simply that, because universities tend to be bastions of technocracy, things have not changed much.

While, in the final analysis, the 1960s counterculture failed to produce everything that he had hoped it might, nevertheless, later in life—notably in his books *America the Wise* (1998) and *The Making of an Elder Culture* (2001)[82]—he returned to some of the core themes explored in *The Making of a Counter Culture*, arguing that its radical values could still bear fruit and transform society in positive ways. He urged baby boomers, who were living longer and in better health than previous generations, to draw on the cardinal values of the counterculture in order to promote self-actualization, social justice, and altruism. Indeed, while Roszak could be forgiven for becoming disheartened during the 1970s and 1980s, as he witnessed the progress of technocracy and neoliberalism, this, in fact, was not the case. While there was still much work to be done,

as his daughter recalled following his death, "Often, people would say, 'Whatever happened to the counterculture?' And he'd say, 'Look around you; it's all around us… It's in our clothing, in organic food, in the ways families have rearranged themselves. It's part of our living now—and he always had great hope for the future."[83]

Blake and Ginsberg

"History is not sensibly measured out in decades. The period of upheaval we conventionally call 'the sixties' is more appropriately seen within a broader setting that stretches from 1942 to 1972."[84] These three decades identify what Roszak referred to as "the Age of Affluence," 1942 being "the point at which the United States finally emerged from the Great Depression."[85] (That said, he would almost certainly have agreed with Arthur Marwick's identification of the primary years of revolution as the "long sixties," 1958-1974.[86]) Hence, he argued, paradoxically (from the perspective of Marxian analysis), the roots of the counterculture could be found, "not in the failure, but in the success of a high industrial economy. It arose not out of misery, but out of plenty; its role was to explore a new range of issues raised by an unprecedented increase in the standard of living."[87] This was, we have seen, important for Roszak, because, contrary to much Marxian analysis, it highlighted the significance of technocracy. Western youth culture, in its protests against the Vietnam war, in its distrust of mainstream politics, in its suspicion of "science," in its rejection of "the establishment," in its abandonment of the values of the previous generation, and in its celebration of subjective experience, was responding to life in technocratic societies.

Nowadays, there is little scholarly consensus as to what "the counterculture" specifically refers to beyond identifying a late-modern *zeitgeist* that manifested in a number of disparate trajectories. It is also a little difficult to identify a particular moment when the counterculture began to coalesce in postwar Western societies. Roszak, however, would almost certainly have identified 1956, linking its emergence directly to the publication of Ginsberg's "Howl.[88] If there was "a founding document of the counterculture,"[89] he declared, this was it! It was the initial anguished cri de cœur against technocracy. That is to say, while earlier important texts might be considered, such as Aldous Huxley's *Doors of Perception* (1954),[90] they were not born out of the same deep sense of dis-ease that Ginsberg's work addressed. Hence, when Roszak read this key early work of "the Beat

generation,"[91] he immediately recognized it to be nothing less than "the world's distant early warning system."[92]

Beat texts, such as, most influentially, Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* (1957), William S. Burroughs's visceral *Naked Lunch* (1959), and "Howl," excavated the underbelly of postwar American society and exposed the social pressures its members were subjected to. The results were, as Ginsberg discussed later in life, revolutionary and wide-ranging:

- general liberation: Sexual "Revolution" or "Liberation," Gay Liberation, Black Liberation, Women's Liberation too;
- liberation of the word from censorship;
- decriminalization of some of the laws against marijuana and other drugs;
- the evolution of rhythm and blues into rock and roll, and rock and roll into high art form, as evidenced by the Beatles, Bob Dylan, and other popular musicians who were influenced in the 1960s by the writings of Beat Generation poets and writers;
- the spread of ecological consciousness, emphasized by Gary Snyder;
- opposition to the military-industrial machine civilization, as emphasized in the works of Burroughs, Huncke, Ginsberg, and Kerouac;
- attention to what Kerouac called, after Spengler, "Second Religiousness" developing within an advanced civilization;
- respect for land and indigenous peoples as proclaimed by Kerouac in his slogan from On the Road, "The earth is an Indian."[93]

Such concerns concurred with Roszak's own emerging countercultural thought. He noted that, rather than turning to violent protest, Beat Romanticism sacralized what a conservative, largely Christian technocracy had trivialized and profaned. "Life is holy," declared Kerouac, "and every moment is precious."[94] In the dark corners of society and in the undergrowth of modernity the Beats found holiness and beauty. "I knew," said Kerouac, "that the earth, the streets, the floors and shadows of life were holy."[95] Explicit, loud, and provocative though Beat culture often was, Roszak understood it to be politically important. For example, he insisted that "much of the permissive eroticism of the day, insofar as it [was] unforced and flowing, is not simple hedonism." Such

subjective experiences should not be condemned. "Rather there is about it a certain unpretentious enchantment with organic display and pleasure…"[96] There was something fundamentally revolutionary about a statement such as Ginsberg's "the asshole is also holy."[97]

"Howl" distilled the Beat response to postwar technocracy and reoriented the consciousness of a generation of young people. Indeed, much of Roszak's theorizing of the counterculture can be traced back to his reading of "Howl." Fuelled by Ginsberg's experience of sex and psychedelics, the poem's "onrush of emotional bulk"[98] immersed its readers in a surreal, hallucinatory world of madness, music, and mysticism. It was a brazen, unflinching challenge to prevailing constructions of the sacred in American society. Unsurprisingly, the authorities reacted swiftly and brutally. As well as confiscating copies of the book, on 3 June 1957 (Ginsberg's birthday) police arrested his publisher, Lawrence Ferlinghetti. Eventually, however, to the surprise of many at the time, common sense prevailed. The subsequent obscenity trial included the testimony of nine literary experts who defended the merits of "Howl." Judge Clayton Horn was persuaded by their arguments and declared it to be "not without redeeming social importance." As such, he concluded that "it cannot be held obscene."[99] Roszak understood this to be a significant historical milestone.

As indicated above, of particular importance to Roszak was the fact that the Beats, unlike the Marxist critics of an earlier generation, viewed the world through a Romantic lens. In particular, Roszak was not alone in identifying Blake as the prophet for the emerging counterculture.[100] Ginsberg, for example, claimed that "Howl" was the direct result of "a beatific illumination years before during which," he said, "I'd heard Blake's ancient voice & saw the universe unfold in my brain."[101] Again, he declared that "the voice of Blake… is the voice I now have."[102] Huxley too, of course, had turned to Blake several years previously when writing *The Doors of Perception* (the key idea and title of which was inspired by his thinking in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*). Blake's interest in subjective experience, his support for the American and French revolutions, his opposition to slavery, his defense of sexual liberation, his commitment to female emancipation, his resistance to oppression, his criticisms of organized religion, his esotericism, and his emphasis on the imagination made him an important

countercultural antecedent. Hence, Roszak begins *The Making of a Counter Culture* with a few telling lines from Blake's *Milton*:

> Art Degraded, Imagination Denied: War Governed the Nations.
>
> Rouse up O Young Men of the New Age! set your foreheads against ignorant Hirelings! For we have Hirelings in the Camp, the Court & the University, who would, if they could, for ever depress Mental & prolong Corporeal War.[103]

Indeed, his book can be read as an unpacking of these lines. For Roszak, Blake stands as the key thinker in a long history of "Dionysian seers."[104] It is to him that we should go to begin the construction of a "beautiful politics." Hence, unlike earlier twentieth-century cultures of resistance (particularly in Europe), the protest politics of the American counterculture should not "run back to Marx," but rather it should draw its inspiration from "the eclectic radicalism of Blake."[105] While Roszak appreciated the importance of Marxian analysis, being particularly influenced by the ideas of the New Left, his line of sight was unapologetically fixed on Blake: "Blake, not Marx, is the prophet of our historical horizon."[106] Again, as he writes of *Where the Wasteland Ends*, "if I had to summarize the purpose of this book in a sentence, I might call it an effort to work out the political meaning of William Blake's prophetic poems—especially *Vala*, *Milton*, and *Jerusalem*." Of particular importance to him was "the political significance of his 'mental fight' against the psychology of science and the culture of industrialism." Unlike Marx, Blake had recognized "that there was another, darker politics unfolding beneath the surface of class conflict. He saw in the steady advance of science and its machines a terrifying aggression against precious human potentialities—and especially against the visionary imagination."[107]

For Roszak, therefore, the problems were "never as simple as social justice."[108] As Peter Otto has commented, "echoing the correspondence drawn by Blake between modern culture, political systems, and war, it seemed to Roszak… that the deepest impulses of the technocratic mind could be seen in the destruction of the natural world, the wars ravaging the twentieth century, and the threat of nuclear annihilation."[109] Yet, just as Blake had glimpsed the light of hope in the energy driving the revolutions in France and

America, so Roszak saw it in the countercultural activity of the baby boomers, particularly when their efforts were directed towards the promotion of peace and a neo-luddite turn to nature. He saw this energy in Ginsberg's work, the key words and images within which are, he argued, "those of time and eternity, madness and vision, heaven and the spirit." His was a cry, "not for a revolution, but for an apocalypse: a descent of divine fire."[110] As such, "like Amos and Isaiah, Ginsberg aspires to be a *nabi*… one who permits his voice to act as the instrument of powers beyond his conscious direction."[111] It is as if, Roszak mused, "Ginsberg set out to write a poetry of angry distress: to cry out against the anguished state of the world as he and his closest colleagues had experienced it in the gutters and ghettos and mental institutions of our society. What came of that suffering was a howl of pain."[112]

Roszak saw in the counterculture "the fires of Orc"—Orc being the personification of righteous rebellion in Blakean mythology, who stands against Urizen, the personification of tradition and conservatism. Just as, at the beginning of Blake's *America a Prophecy*, the fires of Orc ignite and drive forward the revolution against oppression, so in *The Making of a Counter Culture* Roszak identifies the counterculture as "taking a stand" against a "background of absolute evil..."[113] Similarly, at its nadir, Ginsberg's prophetic angst manifested in a dark, psychedelic vision of Moloch, arrestingly related in Part II of "Howl": "I… got high on Peyote, & saw an image of the robot skullface of Moloch in the upper stories of a big hotel glaring into my window; got high weeks later again, the Visage was still there in the red smokey downtown Metropolis…"[114] (Moloch—Molech, Molekh, *mōlek*—is the Ancient Near Eastern god associated in Leviticus with child sacrifice.) Ginsberg drew on ideas gleaned from Moloch's reception history: in *Paradise Lost* Milton describes the "horrid King besmeared with blood/ Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears…"; in Blake "Molech" represents the inhumanity of war and blind wrath; and in Fritz Lang's 1927 film, *Metropolis*, Moloch is the demonic machine that consumes workers, who are then simply replaced as components of industry.[115] Hence, for Ginsberg, Moloch epitomizes all that is wrong with technocracy. As Gregor Stephenson says, he "presents a comprehensive nightmare image of contemporary society which is as penetrating as that of Blake's 'London'… American society is seen as having consistently ignored, suppressed and destroyed any manifestation of the miraculous, the ecstatic, the sacred

and epiphanous."[116] It is not difficult, therefore, to see why Roszak understood "Howl" to be the founding document of the counterculture. Ginsberg had discovered, he says, "what it was that the bourgeois god Moloch was most intent upon burying alive: the curative powers of the visionary imagination."[117] Moloch represented the demonic potency of technocracy—the excesses of industrialization, militarism, materialism, capitalism, the instrumental use of persons, the starvation of the soul, and the alienation of the creative spirit. Likewise, drawing on Blake, Roszak's own work sought to change consciousness by exposing technocracy and revealing the revolutionary potential of the counterculture.

Marcuse, repression and the return to the Old Gnosis

We have seen that, for Roszak, the roots of social revolution were to be found in consciousness, not class. Of particular note in *The Making of a Counter Culture* was his contention that, while Marxian analysis still had insights to offer, it was Freudian analysis that would provide the new revolutionaries with the guidance they needed. Psychology, not sociology would be key to the success of the counterculture: "sociology has been forced to yield progressively to psychology as the generative principle of revolution."[118] Hence, Roszak saw much promise in humanistic psychology and the development of "human potentialities" (a concept popularized by Huxley[119]): "among a growing number of those who move with the forward currents of psychotherapy and the healing arts, 'consciousness research' and the new religions, a spontaneous consensus has sprung up around the evolutionary image of human potentiality."[120]

Roszak linked this to countercultural Easternization,[121] which significantly contributed to the sacralization of what the humanistic psychologist Abraham Maslow called "peak experiences."[122] Concerning sex, for example, Roszak observed that "nothing is so striking about the new orientalism as its highly sexed flavor. If there was anything Kerouac and his colleagues found especially appealing in the Zen they adopted, it was the wealth of hyperbolic eroticism the religion brought with it rather indiscriminately from the *Kama-sutra* and the tantric tradition."[123] Again, the same was true of psychedelic experiences. While we have seen that Roszak could be scathing about such "non-intellective modes of consciousness," he did not therefore dismiss them as lacking social significance: "even if Zen, as most of Ginsberg's generation have come to know it

and publicize it, has been flawed by crude simplifications, it must also be recognized that what the young have vulgarized in this way is a body of thought that… embraces a radical critique of the conventional scientific conception of man and nature. If the young seized on Zen with a shallow understanding, they grasped it with a healthy instinct."[124] Peak experiences could be genuinely consciousness expanding.

Roszak's analysis and development of the ideas of the Freudian Left can be understood harmartiologically as an investigation of the corrosive impact of technocracy. That is to say, they identified the sinful state from which individuals needed redemption. In particular, he made much of Herbert Marcuse's reading of Freud and Norman O. Brown's "silly-brilliant effort"[125] in his widely read book *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History*,[126] both of which were enormously influential. As David Allyn has commented, "it is hard to appreciate how popular both Marcuse and Brown were among the students of the sixties and seventies... They redefined the notion of 'the good life,' one of the most important categories in western thought, in a manner that appealed directly to the sexual revolutionaries of the younger set."[127] Jim Morrison of The Doors, for example, made much of Brown's book.[128] As we will see was the case with Marcuse's work, Brown challenged the values of the previous generation, explained the status quo in terms of repression, and, for Roszak, exposed the malign impact of technocracy. (Of course, that Roszak drew heavily on their ideas, had the immediate effect of investing his own work with countercultural capital.) Likewise, from a different perspective, Goodman's use of gestalt psychology, which focused on the individual's conscious experience in the present moment, further helped Roszak to explain the psychological effects of technocracy: "individual and social neurosis sets in only when the seamless garment of the 'organism/environment field' is divided by a psychic factionalism that segregates from the ecological whole a unit of defensive consciousness that must be pitted against an 'external' reality understood to be alien, intractable, and finally, hostile."[129]

While Roszak makes a number of important points regarding the work of Brown and Goodman, he is most engaging and revealing when discussing Marcuse, "the guru of the New Left."[130] In *Eros and Civilization*[131]—one of the key texts to inform the sexual politics of the counterculture—Marcuse discusses the "reality principle"

(*Realitätsprinzip*). For Freud, this referred to the capacity of the mind to evaluate the external world and to respond to it, as opposed simply to reacting in accordance with the "pleasure principle" (*Lustprinzip*)—the instinctual libidinous urge to seek pleasure and to avoid pain in order to satisfy biological and psychological needs. Hence, in effect, the reality principle enables an individual to function according to reason rather than passion. (This is libidinal repression, the sublimation of which, Freud understood to be central to the emergence of "civilization.") For Marcuse, it is important that the repression of the reality principle is rooted in history, not biology. Repression is the product of *an unequal distribution of scarcity in a civilized society*. It occurs when the apparatus of industrial capitalism enables the ruling elite "to impose their selfish will on subject populations, to deprive and exploit and tread down those who are weaker. So begins the 'logic of domination.'"[132] To unpack this a little more, central to Roszak's understanding of the logic of domination in technocratic societies are two key Marcusian concepts, "the performance principle" and "surplus repression." The former, which is "the prevailing historical form of the *reality principle*,"[133] is a socially imposed compulsion to work, which manipulates the individual into repressing the erotic and playful side of his or her nature. This, for Roszak, identified one the primary malign forces of technocracy, which, in turn, made the counterculture's non-intellective modes of consciousness so necessary. While the performance principle manifests in various ways, whether we think of feudalism or capitalist industrialism it is always rooted in domination. Ordinary members of society, argued Marcuse, must "perform" according to what is required of them as workers manipulated by the "productive apparatus."

Surplus repression, which was also central to the development of Roszak's understanding of technocracy, is related to the performance principle. "Basic repression" in Marcusian philosophy is "necessary for the perpetuation of the human race in civilization,"[134] in that the desire of libidinal instincts for immediate gratification does need to be restrained in order for humans to function properly in everyday life. Like Freud, Marcuse argued that basic repression and sublimation are requirements for the progress of civilization. (Roszak's criticisms of countercultural excess can also be interpreted in this way.) Surplus repression, however, refers to "the restrictions necessitated by social domination."[135] It organises the instincts in accordance with the "performance principle." Moreover, as with others associated with the Frankfurt School,

such as particularly Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, Marcuse argued that, in order to ensure compliance, workers must be dominated in ways that make the restrictions appear "natural." Hence, as we have seen Roszak argue of technocracy, repression is perceived, not as "domination," but rather as common sense. Repression is disguised as the action of rational, objective laws, which are defended by experts. As such, the individual unwittingly internalizes surplus repression: "the societal force is absorbed into the 'conscience' and into the unconscious of the individual and works as his own desire, morality, and fulfilment." Hence, Marcuse argues, "in the 'normal' development, the individual lives his repression 'freely' as his own life: he desires what he is supposed to desire…"[136] Again, this informed Roszak's argument regarding the importance of the counterculture as a force for unmasking the true nature of technocracy and liberating the human spirit.

Important though Marcuse was for the development of Roszak's critique of technocracy, he was unhappy with some aspects of his thought. Drawing on the Romantic tradition, humanistic psychology, and countercultural bohemianism, he rejected Marcuse's claim that the logic of domination is *necessarily present* throughout human history and in all cultures. For example, articulating a rather naïve and Romantic primitivism, Roszak insisted that there had been societies in which their members were able to live in a harmonious relationship with each other and the natural world, uncorrupted by the productive apparatus of civilization: "it is not at all clear… that these simple folk spent their lives drudging away under the whiplash of near-starvation. In fact, we have reason to believe that many of them (especially during the Neolithic period) lived a decently comfortable life in a wise symbiotic relationship with their environment."[137] That is to say, he constructed his own myth of the "noble savage"—which has been used throughout the modern period to articulate a primal and innate human goodness uncorrupted by civilization[138]—as a challenge to technocratic hegemony. Our Neolithic ancestors, he believed, "lived mainly in egalitarian communities where domination, as Marcuse uses the term, did not take its toll. At this stage of society, therefore, repression could not have existed in any form that satisfies Marcuse's definition." Hence, he concluded, "repressive, class-based regimentation—the social form we call 'civilization'—only *follows* upon the destruction of primitive tribal and village democracy."[139] The counterculture thus became an important moment in Roszak's

redemption narrative, which is theorized as a post-technocratic return to an idealized state. In other words, he imagined a neo-luddite progression to premodern harmony. Again, this is why he celebrated—as did several others, such as Charles Reich in his influential utopian manifesto, *The Greening of America*[140]—countercultural communalism and the bohemian return to nature. He described this as the surfacing of "the ancient and original nature philosophy of our species"—"the Old Gnosis."[141] Hence, although he employed Marcuse's theory of repression, he interpreted it very differently as the suppression of the Old Gnosis. This, again, was informed by his reading of the Romantics, particularly Blake: "by way of their fascination with primitive and pagan worship, Hermeticism, cabbalism, and nature mysticism generally, the Romantics make clear their kinship with that great and ancient spiritual current."[142] As Joni Mitchell put it in "Woodstock," a song that summed up much of what Roszak celebrated about the counterculture:

> We are stardust,
> We are golden,
> And we've got to get ourselves
> Back to the garden.[143]

Concluding comments

The aim of this article has been relatively straightforward, namely, to argue that Roszak, as well as being a perceptive chronicler of 1960s youth rebellion (which is how *The Making of a Counter Culture* tends to be read, particularly by those who have not studied it carefully), was an important radical thinker in his own right. I have argued that he sought to prepare the groundwork for a distinctive politics of consciousness— what he referred to as "a beautiful politics," and what I have called his "Romantic radicalism." Drawing heavily on the Romantic tradition and particularly on the thought of Blake, he critically incorporated a number of countercultural ideas to construct a alternative to the dominant political theories of the New Left (and their use of Freud), on the one hand, and to the psychedelic, sexual, and mystical explorations of the counterculture, on the other. Again, as an activist on the pacifist Left, he was just as critical of any form of revolutionary violence as he was of colleagues who retreated to their ivory towers to interpret the world rather than join the struggle to change it.[144]

While Marxian analysis was certainly a formative influence on his thinking, he came to view it as part of the problem. While he clearly considered the use of Freud by Marcuse to be inspired and certainly helpful to the development of his own thought, in the final analysis, it too fell short of what was required, for Marxism had, from the outset, been corrupted by technocracy. It had "endorsed the fundamental values of industrialism."[145] This is why the counterculture was so important for the development of Roszak's beautiful politics: "by way of a dialectic Marx could never have imagined, technocratic America [had produced] a potentially revolutionary element amongst its own youth." Along similar lines to the argument presented by Mills in 1960,[146] he argued that the working class, which had previously "provided the traditional following for radical ideology, now neither leads nor follows, but sits tight and plays safe: the stoutest prop of the established order."[147] *The Making of a Counter Culture* therefore insists that those concerned with social and political change must take seriously the Romantic vision of disaffected middle class youth: "there is a sense in the air, especially among the young, that Marxism and liberalism have in good measure ceased to provide explanations of the world. Indeed, in their official forms, these doctrines have become part of what requires explanation."[148] Again, Marxism had never adequately questioned "the one-dimensional consciousness of technocratic society," or called for "a renaissance of the imagination."[149] As such, he identified a contradiction unforeseen by many on the Left. They had "always predicated revolutionary change on the 'immiserization' of the proletariat." Their problem during the long 1960s was that "rebellion was breaking out where it was to be least expected: among younger members of the bourgeois elite whose interests the military-industrial complex purported to serve."[150] As a result of the affluence of the 1960s and a consequent sense of security, a new generation, inspired by the Romantic spirit, demanded "levels of freedom, self-expression, and enjoyment that suggested they saw life as something more than getting and spending." Moreover, "instead of thanking their benefactors, they mocked them in their songs and poems, and proceeded to raise issues that suggested severe doubts about the rightness and rationality of urban industrial society. They were doing no less than calling the myth of material progress into question."[151] In short, those considered crass, profane, and irrational by the "experts" in patrician technocracy, were drawing on the Old Gnosis to clear a path to the state from which humanity had fallen. The "instinctive fascination

with magic and ritual, tribal lore, and psychedelic experience attempts to resuscitate the defunct shamanism of the distant past."[152] However, participative democracy, he argued, "cannot settle for being a matter of political-economic decentralism—only that and nothing more."[153] The spell of objective consciousness must be broken; the "high priests of the citadel who control access to reality"[154] must be defrocked. Consequently, naïve though some of their ideas may be, "the strange youngsters who don cowbells and primitive talismans and who take to the public parks or wilderness to improvise outlandish communal ceremonies" are showing society the way forward, for it is they who are "seeking to ground democracy safely beyond the culture of expertise."[155]

---

[1] Theodore Roszak, *Sources: An Anthology of Contemporary Materials Useful for Preserving Personal Sanity While Braving the Great Technological Wilderness* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972), xxii.
[2] Theodore Roszak, "British Peace Movement: Looking for the Marchers," *The Nation*, 25 October 1965, 273–77; "The Counter Culture: Part 1. Youth and the Great Refusal," *The Nation*, 25 March 1968, 400–406; "The Counter Culture: Part 2. Politics of the Nervous System," *The Nation*, 8 April 1968, 439–43; "The Counter Culture: Part 3. Capsules of Salvation," *The Nation*, 1 April 1968, 466–70; "The Counter Culture: Part 4. The Future as Community," *The Nation*, 15 April 1968, 497–502.
[3] While Roszak used "counter culture," in this article the more recent compound "counterculture" will be used.
[4] Alan Watts, quoted on the back cover of Theodore Roszak, *Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
[5] Linda Herbst, "Review: *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*," *Social Research* 37, no. 3 (1970), 484.
[6] Andrew Greeley, *The New Agenda* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1973), 291
[7] Clive James, "Under the Counter," *New Society* 15 (12 March 1970), 449.
[8] Jerome Kirk, "Review: *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*," *American Journal of Sociology* 75, no. 5 (1970), 893. See also, George Stade, "The Conversion of a Square," *The New York Times Book Review* (24 September 1972), 1.
[9] Mark C. Taylor, "Terminal Faith," in *Religion, Modernity, and Postmodernity*, ed. Paul Heelas (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 53.
[10] Peter Otto, "'Rouse Up O Young Men of the New Age!' William Blake, Theodore Roszak, and the Counter Culture of the 1960s-1970s," in *Blake 2.0: William Blake in Twentieth-Century Art, Music and Culture*, eds. Steven Clark, Tristanne Connolly, and Jason Whittaker (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 28.
[11] Bernice Martin, *A Sociology of Contemporary Social Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981), 1. See also, Arthur Marwick, *Culture in Britain Since 1945* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991), 67–132.
[12] Martin, *Sociology of Contemporary Social Change*, 15-16.
[13] Colin Campbell, "Accounting for the Counter Culture," *Scottish Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 1 (1980), 45; Christopher Gair, *The American Counterculture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 9–11. Although acknowledging the importance of Roszak's work, Gair effectively ignores it. Similarly, in a review of theories discussing why countercultures emerge and their overall psychosocial significance, Campbell simply notes that Roszak was one of several thinkers to focus on the importance of societal trends.
[14] Harvey Cox, *Turning East: The Promise and Peril of the New Orientalism* (London: Allen Lane, 1979); Danny Goldberg, *In Search of the Lost Chord: 1967 and the Hippy Idea* (London: Icon Books, 2017); Hugh McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[15] Kevin Fagan, "'Counter Culture' Author Dies," San Francisco Chronicle Online, 13 July 2011, http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Theodore-Roszak-Counter-Culture-author-dies-2354712.php (accessed 5 January 2018).

[16] See, for example, Thomas Frank, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Joseph Heath and Andrew Potter, *The Rebel Sell: How the Counterculture Became Consumer Culture* (Chichester: Capstone, 2006).
[17] He died of complications related to liver cancer at his home in Berkeley on 5 July 2011.
[18] See particularly Theodore Roszak, *The Making of an Elder Culture: Reflections on the Future of America's Most Audacious Generation* (Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2009).
[19] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, xii.
[20] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, xiii.
[21] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 8.
[22] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 207.
[23] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 8.
[24] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 208.
[25] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 208.
[26] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 215.
[27] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 159.
[28] Theodore Roszak, *Unfinished Animal: The Aquarian Frontier and the Evolution of Consciousness* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), 35.
[29] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 205.
[30] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 205.
[31] Ibid., 205–206.
[32] William Blake, "Auguries of Innocence," in William Blake, *Selected Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, 173.
[33] Theodore Roszak, *Person/Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1979), xx.
[34] Roszak, *Person/Planet*, xx.
[35] See Roszak's comments on Dylan in *Making of a Counter Culture*, 63, 71.
[36] Bob Dylan, "The Times They Are a-Changin'," *The Times They Are a-Changin'* (Columbia Records, 1964).
[37] Theodore Roszak, *The Cult of Information: A Neo-Luddite Treatise on High-tech, Artificial Intelligence, and the True Art of Thinking* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).
[38] Theodore Roszak and Graham Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," *New Scientist* 49, no. 471 (4 March 1971), 484.
[39] Eric Homberger, "Theodore Roszak Obituary," Guardian Online, 27 July 2011, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2011/jul/27/theodore-roszak-obituary (accessed 20 July 2017).
[40] Betty Roszak and Theodore Roszak, *Masculine/Feminine: Readings In Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1969). He references her as an inspiration in: *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1972), ix; *The Voice of the Earth: An Exploration of Ecopsychology* (London: Bantam Press, 1993), 5; *The Gendered Atom: Reflections on the Sexual Psychology of Science* (Berkeley: Conari Press, 1999), 168–69. It is also worth reading the following by Betty Roszak: "The Spirit of the Goddess," in *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind*, eds. Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes, and Allen D. Kanner (New York: Sierra Club Books, 1995), 288-300; "The Two Worlds of Magic," 1974, *http://www.theosophy-nw.org/theosnw/world/modeur/ph-rosz.htm* (accessed 15 July 2017).
[41] Theodore Roszak, "Thomas Cromwell and the Henrican Reformation" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1959).
[42] Roszak, *Elder Culture*, 281; Roszak, *Person/Planet*, 217.
[43] Roszak, *Elder Culture*, 281.
[44] Roszak, *Elder Culture*, 23.
[45] Roszak, *Person/Planet*, 89.
[46] Theodore Roszak, *The Devil and Daniel Silverman* (Wellfleet: Leapfrog Press, 2003), 223.
[47] Roszak, *Person/Planet*, 95.
[48] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 237.
[49] Roszak, *Wasteland*, xxiii.
[50] Roszak, *Wasteland*, xx.
[51] Roszak, *Wasteland*, xxii.
[52] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.
[53] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.
[54] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.
[55] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.

[56] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.
[57] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 485.
[58] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 484.
[59] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 484.
[60] Theodore Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," in *Making of a Counter Culture*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), xiii.
[61] Roszak, "British Peace Movement," 273–77; "Counter Culture: Part 1," 400–406; "Counter Culture: Part 2," 439-43; "Counter Culture: Part 3," 466–470; "Counter Culture: Part 4," 497–502.
[62] Roszak, "Counter Culture: Part 1," 400–406.
[63] See, Andrew Rossabi and Joseph Berke, "Anti-Psychiatry: An Interview with Dr. Joseph Berke," *Salmagundi* 16 (1971), 185–92.
[64] Joseph Berke (ed), *Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society* (London: Peter Owen, 1969); Joseph Berke, "Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society," *International Times* 46 (13–31 December 1968), 20–21.
[65] It is not even referenced by Ken Goffman and Dan Joy in *Counterculture Through the Ages: From Abraham to Acid House* (New York: Villard, 2005).
[66] Berke, *Counter Culture*, 5.
[67] Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (Glencoe: *Free Press of Glencoe*, 1991), 355, 522.
[68] J. Milton Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," *American Sociological Review* 25, no. 5 (1960), 629.
[69] See, for example: Stanley Cohen and Laurie Taylor, *Escape Attempts: The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Everyday Life* (London: Allen Lane, 1976), 160–65; Robert Hewison, *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940* (London: Methuen, 1995), 129, 131, 143–45, 150–57; Kenneth Leech, *Youthquake: The Growth of a Counter-culture Through the Decades* (London: Sheldon Press, 1973); Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c.1958–c.1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 10–12; Keith Melville, *Communes in the Counter Culture: Origins, Theories, Styles of Life* (New York, Morrow, 1972); Frank Musgrove, *Ecstasy and Holiness: Counter Culture and the Open Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974); Elizabeth Nelson, *The British Counter-Culture, 1966–73: A Study of the Underground Press* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1989); James Spates, "Counterculture and Dominant Culture Values: A Cross-national Analysis of the Underground Press and Dominant Culture Magazines, *American Sociological Review* 41, no. 5 (1976), 868–83.
[70] Roszak and Chedd, "Romantic at Reason's Court," 484.
[71] Roszak, *Wasteland*, 139, 413–45.
[72] Roszak, *Sources*, xxiii-xxiv.
[73] See Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 24–25; Theodore Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," in *The Dissenting Academy*, ed. Theodore Roszak (London: Chatto and Windus, 1969), 21–22.
[74] Noam Chomsky, "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," in *The Dissenting Academy*, ed. Theodore Roszak (London: Chatto and Windus, 1969), 256.
[75] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 5.
[76] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 5.
[77] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 3.
[78] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 4.
[79] For worthwhile analyses of the current situation in the UK, with much of which Roszak would have agreed, see Stefan Collini, *Speaking of Universities* (London: Verso, 2017) and Les Back, *Academic Diary: Or Why Higher Education Still Matters* (London: Goldsmiths Press, 2016).
[80] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 5.
[81] Roszak, "On Academic Delinquency," 4.
[82] Theodore Roszak, *America the Wise: The Longevity Revolution and the True Wealth of Nations* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998); reprinted as *Longevity Revolution: As Boomers Become Elders* (Berkeley: Berkeley Hills Books, 2001; 2nd ed. 2009).
[83] Kathryn Roszak, quoted in Fagan, "'Counter Culture' Author Dies."
[84] Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," xi.
[85] Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," xi.
[86] Marwick, *The Sixties*.
[87] Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," xii.
[88] Allen Ginsberg, *Howl and Other Poems* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1956); See also Jonah Raskin, *American Scream: Allen Ginsberg's Howl and the Making of the Beat Generation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
[89] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 67, 202.

[90] Aldous Huxley, *Doors of Perception* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1954).
[91] "…this isn't a lost generation, this is a beat generation." Jack Kerouac, quoted in Bill Morgan, "Editor's Preface," in Allen Ginsberg, *The Best Minds of My Generation: A Literary History of the Beats*, ed. Bill Morgan (London: Allen Lane, 2017), xix.
[92] Theodore Roszak, *From Satori to Silicon Valley: San Francisco and the American Counter-Culture* (San Francisco: Don't Call It Frisco Press, 1986), 51.
[93] Allen Ginsberg, "Prologue," in *Beat Culture and the New America, 1950-1965*, ed. Lisa Phillips (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1995), 18. This is a revised version of his "A Definition of the Beat Generation," *Friction* 1 (1982), 52; Ginsberg, *Best Minds*, 1–5.
[94] Jack Kerouac, *On the Road* (London: Penguin, 1972 [1957]), 51.
[95] Jack Kerouac, *The Portable Jack Kerouac*, ed. Ann Charters (New York: Penguin, 1996), 84.
[96] Roszak, *Unfinished Animal*, 257.
[97] Allen Ginsberg, quoted in Roszak, *Unfinished Animal*, 257.
[98] Michael Rumaker, "Allen Ginsberg's 'Howl,'" in *On the Poetry of Allen Ginsberg*, ed. Lewis Hyde (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984), 36.
[99] Bill Morgan and Nancy Peters (eds), *Howl on Trial: The Battle for Free Expression* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2006), 197.
[100] See, Alicia Ostriker, "Blake, Ginsberg, Madness, and the Prophet as Shaman," in *William Blake and the Moderns*, eds. Robert J. Bertholf and Annette S. Levitt (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982), 111–31; Otto, "'Rouse Up O Young Men'," 27–40.
[101] Allen Ginsberg, "Notes for *Howl* and Other Poems," in *The New American Poetry, 1945-1960*, ed. Donald Allen (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 415; also noted by Roszak in *Counter Culture*, 127. As Steve Finbow discusses, the poem is actually replete with spiritual, political and creative influences: *Allen Ginsberg* (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), 63–65. See also, Ostriker, "Blake, Ginsberg, Madness," 111–12.
[102] Allen Ginsberg, "Notes Written on Finally Recording Howl," in *A Casebook on the Beat*, ed. Thomas Francis Parkinson (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1961), 28.
[103] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, ix.
[104] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 114, 119
[105] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 126.
[106] Roszak, *Wasteland*, xxxiii.
[107] Roszak, *Wasteland*, xxvi.
[108] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 126.
[109] Otto, "'Rouse Up O Young Men'," 31.
[110] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 126.
[111] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 128. John Lardas has Ginsberg assuming the role of Jeremiah: *The Bop Apocalypse: The Religious Visions of Kerouac, Ginsberg, and Burroughs* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 214.
[112] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 128.
[113] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 47.
[114] Ginsberg, "Notes for *Howl*,' 416; see also Allen Ginsberg, *Deliberate Prose: Selected Essays 1952-1995*, ed. Bill Morgan (London: Penguin, 2000), 230.
[115] John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, eds. William Kerrigen, John Rumrich, and Stephen Fallon (New York: Modern Library, 2007), 29. See also, Ostriker, "Blake, Ginsberg, Madness," 120–23; Lardas, *Bop Apocalypse*, 214; Gregory Stephenson, "'Howl': A Reading," in *On the Poetry of Allen Ginsberg*, ed. Lewis Hyde (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984), 389–90.
[116] Stephenson, "'Howl'," 390.
[117] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 128.
[118] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 186.
[119] See, Aldous Huxley, "Human Potentialities," in Julian Huxley (ed.), *The Humanist Frame* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1961), 417–432; Aldous Huxley, *The Human Situation: Lectures at Santa Barbara, 1959*, ed. by Piero Ferrucci (St Albans: Rriad/Panther Books, 1980), 231–247.
[120] Roszak, *Unfinished Animal*, 4.
[121] For a comprehensive discussion of the Easternization thesis, see Colin Campbell, *The Easternization of the West: A Thematic Account of Cultural Change in the Modern Era* (Abingdon: Routledge/Paradigm, 2007). See also, Christopher Partridge, *The Re-Enchantment of the West: Alternative Spiritualities, Sacralization, Popular Culture and Occulture,* Vol. 1 (London: T and T Clark International, 2004), 87–118; Robert Wuthnow, *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s* (Berkeley: University of California

Press, 1998); Robert Wuthnow, *Experimentation in American Religion: the New Mysticisms and Their Implications for the Churches* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).
[122] Abraham Maslow, *Religions, Values, and Peak Experiences* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976 [1964]).
[123] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 135–136.
[124] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 136.
[125] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 115.
[126] Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History*, 2nd ed. (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1985 [1959]).
[127] David Allyn, *Make Love, Not War. The Sexual Revolution: An Unfettered History* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2000), 200.
[128] See, James Riordan and Jerry Prochnicky, *Break On Through: The Life and Death of Jim Morrison* (London: Plexus, 1991), 50.
[129] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 187.
[130] See, John Abromeit and W. Mark Cobb, "Introduction," in *Herbert Marcuse: A Critical Reader*, eds. John Abromeit and W. Mark Cobb (New York: Routledge, 2004), 2.
[131] See, Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry Into Freud* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956).
[132] Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, 104.
[133] Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, 35.
[134] Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, 35.
[135] Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, 35.
[136] Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, 46.
[137] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 105.
[138] See, Ter Ellingson, *The Myth of the Noble Savage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).
[139] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 105–106.
[140] Charles Reich, *The Greening of America* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971).
[141] Roszak, *Person/Planet*, 53; Roszak, *Wasteland*, 353.
[142] Roszak, *Wasteland*, 353.
[143] Joni Mitchell, "Woodstock," *Ladies of the Canyon* (Reprise, 1970). See, Christopher Partridge, *The Lyre of Orpheus: Popular Music, the Sacred and the Profane* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 115–41.
[144] Marx's 11th thesis on Feuerbach: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it."
[145] Roszak, *Sources*, xii.
[146] C. Wright Mills, "Letter to the New Left," *New Left Review* 1, no. 5 (September-October, 1960), 18–23.
[147] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 34–35.
[148] Barrington Moore, quoted in Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 103.
[149] Roszak, *Sources*, xix.
[150] Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," xxv.
[151] Roszak, "Introduction to the 1995 Edition," xxv.
[152] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 265.
[153] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 265.
[154] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 265.
[155] Roszak, *Counter Culture*, 265.