

American Intellectuals in the Sixties: The Struggle between Power and Resistance

Dr. SELMA DJABALLAH ¹

¹ University of Algiers 2, djaballahselma@gmail.com

Received: 26/ 06/ 2023

Accepted: 24/ 10/ 2023

.....

Abstract:

The 1960s was a period that introduced magnificent changes to the United States, in both society and culture. Different alienated groups wished to be acknowledged for their uniqueness. During this social turmoil, they rose in resistance against all forms of power which included a fierce hatred and mistrust towards intellectuals. These creators of ideas were deeply embedded in their technocratic services in government and were absent from the fighting scenes of civil rights movements and anti-war protests. This paper attempts to determine the precise position of the American intellectual during the 1960s. The social turmoil of this period is best explained in terms of Foucauldian concept of *power relations*. The interplay of power between the institutionalized intellectual and the resistance of the youth and common men embodied a new- “discursive power” that characterized the stormy sixties.

Keywords:

American intellectuals; Discourse; Foucault; Power; Resistance.

Corresponding author: Dr. SELMA DJABALLAH

Email: djaballahselma@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Every intellectual has a universal mission which consists of promoting ideas that would transcend human rights and cultural values. Defining the intellectual has been the subject of discussion of many academics and theoreticians who thrive to see the intellectual rise to his position as the savior of society. Though the theories of his practicality differ, all definitions place the intellectual at the core of historical development. The intellectual has the authority to criticize and foresee the future of his fellow men, basing his remarks on reason and experience. Nonetheless, the notion of the American intellectual has been through so many changes that it has shifted from the simplicity of the definition above. As the American social complexities magnified in both multitude and intensity, the intellectual adapted his position to accommodate new cultural trends, and people's reception of his intellectual production varied accordingly. Evidently, each historical movement, especially after the Second World War, devalued the influential position of the intellectual in his society. People's mistrust of post-War intellectuals worsened as the nation ushered in the stormy sixties.

The historical turmoil of the 1960s was mainly about racism, sexism, poverty and the war in Vietnam. The age disrupted as new values, morals and behavior separated the new generation from the old one. Closing on almost one hundred years after the Civil War, Americans realized that their democratic nation was still not free from racism, sexism, imperialism and ravishing poverty. The sixties was an era of great social and cultural upheaval. It was a period where issues of national identity and racial segregation were readdressed. Moreover, opposition rose against the materialistic spirit of several notions, such as the American Dream and American Exceptionalism. As new mores were changing the core of American conservatism, it seemed that the nation could no longer trust its class of intellectuals. Since young people lost

their faith and trust in their elders, politicians and their brain-trusts fell to their decay.

Each decade has known its own breed of intellectuals who carved their way through society. Nonetheless, it is arguably difficult to frame the type of intellectuals that were behind the scenes of the stormy sixties. With the exception of the African-Americans, including Martin Luther King and Malcolm X who led a fierce battle for racial equality, intellectuals did not control the social movements that disturbed that period. History recorded a series of battles between the radicals of the New Left and the liberals who attained political power. However, little definition was given to the intellectual and his function in the 1960s. Therefore, for the purpose of investigating his role in the midst of this troublesome period, it is important to ask a fundamental question: who *was* the intellectual of the 1960s?

Michel Foucault, the twentieth century French historian and philosopher, was prolific with his writings on power relations. In *Power/Knowledge* (1989), he explains how power is not maintained by authoritative structures and violent tyranny from above; power is much deeper and more pervasive than that. It is the way in which knowledge circulates through a well established discourse. In other words, any institution that produces its own knowledge could maintain what Foucault calls a “discursive power.” Therefore, all functioning establishments in a society produce their own discourse. This power operates through different institutions such as the media, political and economic ideologies, hospitals, churches, schools and universities.

As intellectuals have always been – or rather should be – the leaders of thoughts in society, they emanate their own discourse to which people look up to. They build up their own

power in their different interactions with society. Foucault adds to his theory of power relation the notion of *resistance* as a logical reaction to any form of power. Power forcibly meets and even generates its own resistance. These are the terms that best describe the social, cultural and political new attitudes sweeping the American society. The forces of the 1960s collided to create a series of confrontations. Many people lost their traditional moral restrains. Neither government nor intellectuals seemed able to ensure the continuity of American cultural values.

1. The American Intellectual through History

Each upheaval in the United States history has brought upon a new vision of the intellectual and his functions. The positivism of the progressive intellectual at the turn of the twentieth century set the country on the road of progress; however, its essence eroded when the leader of progressive intellectuals, President Woodrow Wilson, took the country into the First World War. American intellectuals descended from their “ivory tower” and started entering the corrupted political sphere. What followed was a lost generation of bohemian intellectuals who were tormented by the falseness of the Great War. Furthermore, the experimentation of socialism in post-war America introduced a more radical and outspoken intellectual. The way he flirted with socialism, and communism at times, imbedded him in a more direct way with the public. As the upheavals piled up, the American intellectual became more infiltrated and involved in politics.

By the beginning of President Theodor Roosevelt’s New Deal, the American intellectual was deeply involved in political institutions as the brain trust of their structure. He served and implemented their discourse in different fields. He became what Michel Foucault would name decades later a “*specific intellectual*.” He served the different branches and institutions of government according to his own field of expertise; including

economy, finance and education. As the nation erased the last traces of darkness caused by the Great Depression, another world war erupted. Different technological means were at the disposal of intellectuals to be involved in the war of destructions. By launching the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, they concretized their place in history as false intellectuals. They became what Jean Paul Sartre defines as “technicians of practical knowledge.”¹ Science became a weapon of extermination and manipulation. These false intellectuals infiltrated government as technocrats, serving specific sectors, and, consequently, being more effective with their agendas.

2. Anti-intellectualism at the Heart of Academia

Everywhere in 1960s America, a newly negative attitude took place towards all kinds of authority and institutions. The youth generation created a cultural revolution by turning its back on conservative agendas. Instead, they promoted a *counterculture* discourse, aimed at dismantling all authorities. Discourse, according to Foucault, is not necessarily a single text, statement, or action. It is a “social language created by particular cultural conditions at a particular time and place, and it expresses a particular way of understanding human experience” (Tyson, 2006, p. 286). Discourse can be a site of both power and resistance. In his *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge* (1978), Foucault explains: “We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby a discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but

¹ “Techniciens du savoir pratique” is used by Jean-Paul Sartre in his *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels* to denounce the modern intellectuals. He accuses them of applying universal “notions and practices” on specific agendas designed by political institutions. (“Technicians of practical knowledge” is my own translation)

also a hindrance, a stumbling point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (p. 123). Accordingly, *counterculture* stood as a discourse on its own by which the youth resisted different forms of power. *Counterculture* became a way of defying social boundaries, conservative manipulations and international hegemony. It consisted mainly of several co-existing, yet conflicting, cultural practices: Rock music, wild outdoors and communal living, drug experimentation, and activism that included civil rights and anti-war demonstrations. The dissatisfaction reached its peak when resentment and mistrust formed the trend of anti-intellectualism.

Contemporary historians are still conflicted over the devaluation of intellectuals in the 1960s and the reasons behind it. Allan Bloom, an American academician and philosopher, was very critical of the sixties, and especially of the educational and intellectual field. In his *Closing on the American Mind* (1978), Bloom investigated what he believed to be the birthplace of the intelligentsia in society; the university. He identified the professor as America’s “best traditions and highest intellectual aspiration” (p. 314). Bloom concluded that high education in America has been failing tremendously, and particularly in philosophy and humanities. In his chapter “The Sixties,” Bloom states; “Enlightenment in America came close to breathing its last during the sixties” (p. 314). Thorough introspections were replaced by mere language analysis, irrationalism and skepticism. Thus, the sterility of the university elites created a void in the minds of the upcoming generation. Intellectuals softened the authority grip on their students. From fear of being labeled as racists, some of them were reluctant in adjusting what they viewed wrong about the liberation movements. The sixties, for Bloom, was a period of “dogmatic answers” and “trivial tracts.” This void was replaced by pop and rock music which, according to him, carried a false discourse of sexual liberation and political authenticity. Bloom’s vision was that the sixties did not breed

strong intellectuals due to the incapacities and shortcomings of the university.

Intellectuals of 1960s were not a monolithic entity; there were diverse perspectives and approaches within their ranks. Some intellectuals were more radical and confrontational, while others took a more moderate or reformist stance. Stephen Greenblatt, an American thinker and literary historian, built most of his work on Foucault's theory on power relations. In his *Shakespearean Negotiations* (1988), Greenblatt extended Foucault's theory by analyzing the process by which power operates. He declared that power structures usually construct a distorted "alien image" in order to uphold their authority. In other words, power is "in need of such [alien] counterimages in order to secure its own position" (p. 167). In the same manner, many intellectuals sensed that they were no longer the prized brain-trusts who helped crystallize the New Deal. Thus, they found it very difficult to welcome the new egalitarian movements. They kept labeling these social uprisings as degenerate, hedonistic, and arrogant. They identified themselves in opposition to the "rabble" as social elites who were unjustly "alienated." Moreover, they believed it was far better to leave matters of culture to the "educated elites" who were better equipped to preserve the Western civilization. Their interests were misplaced; instead of attempting to find solutions, they indulged in self-pity for their lost position.

Anti-intellectualism was, ironically, harboring even at the heart of college campuses. One of the first organized protests against established authority broke out at the heart of University of California in 1964, under the name of Free Speech Movement. This protest group was part of so many others that constituted the New Left movement of the 1960s. New Left was a term

coined by the socialist C. Wright Mills, and it denoted a new radicalism, a “new leftist” ideology that promoted *counterculture* values; at its heart was the Students for a Democratic Society movement (SDS). It was associated with and represented by, radicals, hippies, and was mainly composed of college students. Among many requests, students insisted that the university should allow political practices on the campus and grant them total academic freedom. They believed that universities became impersonal “machines” that were more tied to corporate interests than human and educational values. For them, intellectuals and their sphere of knowledge were an authoritative power that must be resisted.

Although different groups within the New Left movement were active in making a more egalitarian America, some intellectuals kept underestimating their intentions and efforts. The discourse of the *counterculture* movement created what Foucault perceived as a positive resistance. Resistance, according to him, should not be understood as a binary opposition to power; rather, it is a perpetual quest for the “truth.” Both power and resistance are necessary, productive and positive forces to shuffle misconceptions and injustices in a society. Although the liberals in power put the civil rights movement at the top of their agenda, they later on temporized and stalled in actions. They were heavily criticized by the New Left who participated more effectively by pressuring both President John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. Thus, the radicalism of the New Left, managed to emanate a positive resistance by advocating for democracy and civil rights. The walls of segregation crumbled under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Though this fight did not eradicate racism from the American mind, it was an important step towards social progress. Nonetheless, this effort was “ridiculed” by some intellectuals who minimized the intentions of these activists. Allan Bloom, for instance, accused intellectuals of surrendering their principles

for a false “mythology of morality.” He asserted that the real intensions of the student protest groups were more to destroy the elitism of white people than to support the fight for democracy. He labeled them as “mob” and “rabble” who took the civil rights movement as a cover for their war against social elitism.

Intellectuals who felt disconnected from these cultural upheavals found themselves on the margins of a rapidly changing society. The resentment of intellectuals was thoroughly explained in Richard Hofstadter’s *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*² (2006). The American intellectual and historian Hofstadter did not appreciate the fact that the New Left was led by young students, business leaders, and other common individuals instead of intellectuals. He explained that these leaders infiltrated the public scene as “social saviors” who would later on manipulate the essence of the reform. The young activists embraced alternative lifestyles that clashed with the traditional values and ideologies upheld by many intellectuals of the time. This generational divide created a sense of alienation and a loss of influence for these established intellectuals. Moreover, most intellectuals pointed to how the battle for civil rights changed from the nonviolence of Martin Luther King to the separatism of Malcolm X and the violence of the Black Panther Party.³

² *Anti-Intellectualism* is Hofstadter’s bestseller and Pulitzer Prize winner. It analyses many features of the American mind and character. It traces the demise of intellectuals in the American society. It also criticizes the educational system and democracy all together; whose degradation was, according to Hofstadter, the reason behind the fall of the intellectual.

³ The Black Panther was a revolutionary Black Nationalist movement from 1966 until 1982. They advocated for racial equality and justice in society. This

Many intellectuals of the time, particularly those who were associated with the establishment or mainstream society, felt a loss of control over these cultural changes. These intellectuals were often educated in traditional institutions and held positions of influence in academia, media, and other spheres. They were accustomed to being the arbiters of knowledge and taste, shaping public opinion and maintaining societal norms. However, the cultural shifts of the 1960s challenged their authority and control. The younger generation, fueled by dissatisfaction with the status quo, began questioning and challenging established beliefs and institutions. This rebellion against authority was seen in protests against racial discrimination, gender inequality, and the Vietnam War, among other issues.

3. The Case of the Vietnam War

The Vietnam War was one of the most dividing events in history of the United States. Some Americans found justification in communist paranoia, or yet in an ideological superiority for political interventionism. Others, however, insisted on isolationism and the right for self-determination.⁴ While the American society was already in the middle of a cultural turmoil,

=organization was a very influential movement in the 1960s. However, it did have several relations to crime and violent resilience.

⁴ The troubles in Vietnam began in 1955, when Ngo Diem, a South Vietnamese politician, was named Prime Minister of the State of Vietnam after winning a rigged election. American politicians supported the election while maintaining a strong alliance with Diem. They feared a “domino effect” of communism in Asia; whereby if one nation surrendered to the horrors of communism, the entire region would follow the same pattern. The United States was under the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower who feared communist threats and wanted to secure an anti-communist area. Eisenhower left several warnings on how to fight communism to the next president John F. Kennedy who escalated financial and military advisors to Diem.

political leaders and their brain-trusts added more grievances and worries for the people.

Violence hunted the American society in the mid-1960s, and it was aggravated by the conflicts and divisions of its intellectuals on the case of the Vietnam War. On November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was shot and killed during an open limousine ride in Dallas, Texas. As the people dwelt in sorrow for their charismatic president, vice president Lyndon B. Johnson took over the American presidency. President Johnson did not make of the Vietnam case his priority at first. However, when the political situation started to deteriorate in Vietnam, he began to expand a direct military commitment. Though the Americans were generally united over the issue of democracy and freedom, they gradually came to feel deceived by the real causes of the intervention.

University campuses began to form groups in opposition to the Vietnam War by early 1965. Their gatherings were called “teach-in” which were a combination protests, critical classes, marches, and songs. The Vietnam Day Committee was born which organized major actions of anti-war protests. The college antiwar community was not alone in the protest. As previously mentioned, the intellectuals of the 1960s were not unified by a common cause and objectives. While there were intellectuals who served as agents to the government in designing the war, there were also others who stood against what they perceived as a false war. The Vietnam War was for some of them a chance to win back their title as true intellectuals. Their protests were simply a voicing of a discomfort that created a powerful and positive resistance. Foucault recognizes that resistance should not always be perceived as a violent struggle or an agonistic force. Rather, resistance consists of a “creative traversing.” It

could result from the subject's autonomy through "immanent critique." Similarly, some intellectuals voiced their criticism about this war and the executive agents behind it.

Noam Chomsky is known to be one of the rare intellectuals who dared to lead a critical opposition against the Vietnam War. In his article "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" (1967), Chomsky expressed his views on the intelligentsia and the educational institutions in America. He began his article by stating: "Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions" (Chomsky 1967). Chomsky assigned the intellectual the mission of breaking governmental false discourses. Just as Foucault insisted that resistance is simply a perpetual quest for the "truth", Chomsky argued that intellectuals hold a special place in society because they have a duty to discover and publicize this truth. They free society from the manipulator of events, news, and major ideas.

Chomsky accused America's intelligentsia, or as he referred to them "pseudo-scientists" or "technical experts", of being subservient to the authoritative discourse. During the Vietnam War, some members of the intelligentsia, especially those who were institutionalized in government, primarily accepted the politicians' propaganda instead of fighting it. They provided several "pseudoscientific" justifications, including the "imperative nature" and "defense of freedom." By securing their universal validity, they finally established their power and authority. As a result, they eliminated the threat of other ideologies that could lead to a radical change of society. Chomsky insisted that the major role in stopping the war was played by young students instead of a well structured institution of intellectuals. The majority of American intellectuals failed to resist an authority that ought to conflict with their "personal moral code." They were the absentees who conformed to a deceitful war.

Chomsky joined a minority of other intellectuals in voicing the realities and distortions behind the Vietnam War. For some of them, the war was a “painful period of disillusionment, despair, reassessment, and readjustment” (Robert, 1998, p.11). They were torn between fighting and surrendering. Some intellectuals shifted their philosophy and became “radicalized,” constituting what they called “the doves” against the war. They became activists against the political and intellectual designers of the war. But most of them, however, resigned with the acceptance of their own “political and social powerlessness” (Robert, 1998, p.11). Among those who were disgusted by the war was the famous Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. The historian Schlesinger was a public intellectual and a social critic; he was also the adviser for the Democratic Party. During his life time, he was very prolific of the Kennedy presidency and family. Schlesinger opposed the war and feared that America’s anticommunist phobia, based on supposedly high moral values, was leaving no hope for peaceful negotiations. Moreover, he insisted that Communists were not a threat to Americans, and that the domino theory was not “monolithic”. After the assassination of President Kennedy, he resigned from his position of ambassadorship and Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Relations. However, he continued contributing to anti-war efforts through his tenure as a professor at Harvard University. In the midst of the Vietnam War, American intellectuals had to readjust their thinking and to introspect on the new realities of American democracy.

CONCLUSION

Noam Chomsky once stated in an interview: “I think the activism of the 1960s had a very definite civilizing effect on the whole society in all kinds of ways. So lots of things that by now

are almost taken for granted were heretical in the 1960s” (Falcone 2014). Indeed, the modern American society owes so much to the activism of the sixties. African-Americans started to acknowledge and impose their uniqueness. They reshaped the concept of multiculturalism in the American consciousness. The period also provided a solid boost for the feminist movement that would mature in 1970s. Students’ activism pushed for some very important values as well; including racial justice, nonviolence, and antiwar sentiments.

Nonetheless, the essence of such activism eroded as the decade approached its ending. Though the decade evoked many critical issues, it did not resolve them with everlasting solutions. The fight for civil rights did not eliminate the spirit of racism in the American mind. The effects of the separatist movement invoked by some African-Americans left a stereotype of violence and disobedience associated with their race. Although the youth movements were responsible for the stir of many perceptions in the sixties, they did, however, as Chomsky put it, call for “too much democracy.” The drug experimentations they hailed led many to their early graves. The sexual freedom they called for engendered more debate on sexual and gender equality. They succeeded in stopping the Vietnam War, but the division it created still lives to this day. Their efforts did not prevent the American government from launching other preemptive wars in the years to come. The cultural wars between race relations, sexual identities, gender roles, political orientation, and personal and social morality were left unresolved. As America entered the seventies, the youth generation grew older, the *counterculture* movement loosened in spirit, the civil rights movement fell silent, and economic stagnation ended the prosperity of the previous decade.

While the 1960s witnessed significant progress in terms of civil rights legislation, social awareness, and cultural transformation, the unresolved divisions and lack of a unified

front limited the ability to fully resolve the conflicts. The sixties were viewed by historians as an era of discomfort and anger, where each alienated group created its own turmoil, but without necessarily uniting as one structure. More importantly, the division within the intellectual body in the American society did not provide a solid foundation to effectively resolve the cultural wars between these different groups. Intellectuals and academics held diverse perspectives and approaches to social change, leading to debates and disagreements on how to tackle the issues at hand. These divisions further complicated the efforts to resolve the cultural wars between different groups. This lack of unity and a common structure hindered the intellectuals' ability to effectively address the cultural wars and bring about lasting social transformation.

In his *Intellectuals and Power*, Foucault stated "Intellectuals are themselves agents of this system of power -- the idea of their responsibility for 'consciousness' and discourse forms part of the system" (Foucault, 1977, p.207). Indeed, intellectuals are part of power structure, especially if they are institutionalized as agents of the "régime of truth." American intellectuals had been hailed before as the saviors who worked under oppressive conditions. They were called upon in times of crisis, as saviors, to offer their intellect and serve their nation with innovative solutions. However, after World War Two, they became too involved with political agendas. These intellectuals were experts in specific sectors. Each one of them was institutionalized in a specific domain, according to their own personal and academic experience. Therefore, as America ushered in the troublesome sixties, intellectuals were publicly part and parcel of a discursive power. They put their academic professionalism and influence at the service of government.

Their intellectual power in government grew immensely, and their autonomy was compromised by the rise of technocracy. The power of intellectuals in the sixties grew within institutions designed by government, but it weakened in its role of leading society towards a better future.

American intellectuals of the 1960s were shattered, incorporated within different labels, attempting to adjust to the cultural struggles while promoting specific agendas. Whether it was radicals from the New Left or Liberals from the heart of government, intellectuals in the sixties seemed lost in the maze of a torn society. People who had the possibility to guide the people through this difficult time were no longer trusted to lead. The American intellectual was “indecisive” and reluctant in his stand for the civil rights movement. He wanted to voice his convictions for social and racial justice. However, he was also trapped in his desire to maintain the institution of law and order. He was intimidated by the agitation of the youth generation, and, therefore, retreated from what could have been an intellectual revolution towards racial equality in the history of America. Feeling powerless against the movement of *counterculture*, and threatened by the general feeling of anti-intellectualism in his society, the American intellectual retreated in isolation. He became alienated, self-indulged and worried about his lost position. Defining the intellectual of the sixties is a difficult issue. Tracing his role in the midst of so many uprising is even harder. The intellectual of the sixties was a lurking shadow, resisted and mistrusted by the common men, and rejected for his technocratic tendencies in government. The sixties condemned him to retreat; it was an alienation that he could perhaps never fully recover from.

References:

- Ali, Z. (2012). Specific Intellectual, Modern Society and Change. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* , 7 (1), 294-307.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster, INC.
- Burner, D. (1996). *Making Peace With The Sixties*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1967, February 23). *The Responsibility of Intellectuals*. Retrieved 07 10, 20016, from CHOMSKY.INFO: <https://chomsky.info/19670223/>
- Falcone, D. (2014, October 13). *Chomsky: There's an Overt Corporate Effort to Indoctrinate American Children*. Retrieved 07 13, 2016, from <http://www.alternet.org/chomsky-theres-overt-corporate-effort-indoctrinate-american-children>
- Farber, D. (North Carolina). *The Sixties: From Memory to History*. 1994: University Of North Carolina Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *POWER/KNOWLEDGE: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.) New York : Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982, October 25). Truth, Power, Self: An Interview with Michel Foucault. 9-15. (L. Martin, Interviewer) London.
- Foucault, M., & Deleuze, G. (1977). *Intellectuals and Power: In Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. (D. F. Bouchard, Ed.) New York: Cornell University Press.-

American Intellectuals in the Sixties: The Struggle between Power and Resistance

- Greenblatt, S. (1988). *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. California: University of California Press.
- Hendricks, C. (2000, May). Foucault's Prophecy: The Intellectual As Exile. *International Association for Philosophy and Literature*.
- Hofstadter, R. (2006). *An Intellectual Biography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hofstadter, R. (1963). *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: New York Alfred A. Knopf.
- Jacoby, R. (1987). *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of the Academe*. New York: Perseus Books Group.
- Medvetz, T. (2007). *Hybrid intellectuals: Toward a Theory of Think Tanks and Public Policy Experts in the United States*. New York: Cornell University.
- Medvetz, T. (2007). *Think Tanks in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Reinelt, J. (2002). Approaching the Sixties: Between Nostalgia and Critique. *The Journal of the American Society for Theatre Research*, 43 (1), 37.
- Roszak, T. (1969). *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflexions of the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1972). *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Schmitz, T. A. (2002). *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tames, R. (1998). *Apocalypse Then: American Intellectuals and the Vietnam War 1954-1975*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tsimpouki, T. (2008). The Sixties Are Dead: Long Live Their Legacy: The Politics and Poetics of Counterculture. 16 (1), 45-66.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.