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Abstract

Even before the 1960s were over, people were studying the counterculture. In the four decades that have passed since this tumultuous decade, scholars have written numerous books. In this thesis, I evaluate five of those books including: *Make Love, Not War* by David Allyn; *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond* by Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain; *Tomorrow Never Knows* by Nick Bromell; *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s* edited by Michael Doyle and Peter Braunstein; and *Gates of Eden: American Culture in the 1960s* by Morris Dickstein. In the historiography of the 1960s, I believe these are the five best books. By evaluating these books I attempt to answer the question of what pushed these individuals to break away from society and form a counter culture. During the 1960s many were unhappy with both society and the government. So what was it that made these individuals break away from the lifestyle they knew and form what was to become known as the counterculture? Also included are reasons as to why the counterculture began to fade and opinions on its successes and failures.
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The era of the 1960s in American history was, by far, the most tumultuous and eventful of times in our young nation’s record. Not only were we at war overseas, we were at war within our own nation. Unlike times before when faced with a foreign war, the hated enemy did not wear a specific colored uniform and not everyone in the nation gathered behind the government in support. Within our own borders, the 1960s witnessed the United States being nearly as torn as it had been one hundred years prior during our nation’s Civil War. Distrust of our government as well as an intense dislike of our nation’s overall lifestyle led many individuals to break away from mainstream culture and form what would be known as the counterculture.

Such a term brings to mind visions of a young, sexually active, drug-experimenting, stereotypical “hippie.” These individuals are regarded with interest and to some degree, mystique. During their time, however, they were anything but an object of affection for mainstream America. As Ronald Reagan once said, a hippie is someone “who dresses like Tarzan, has hair like Jane, and smells like Cheetah.” Despite the attacks members of the counterculture received from mainstream society, they remained adamant to live their life contrary to their upbringing.

Even in times of prosperity and growth, it is hardly uncommon for a citizen to be unhappy with his or her form of government. The individuals of the counterculture dropped out of mainstream society because the prosperity of the nation gave them the ability to provide for themselves. Lies discovered within the government further pushed them away from trusting our country’s foundation. To improve as a civilization we must always yearn for a better life. Members of the counterculture needed to break away from
all that they knew to be normal in order to experiment with what they could do to make
society the best it could be. However, not all citizens break away and form what is to be
known as a ‘counterculture.’ So what made those of the 1960s different? Why were they
the ones who had had enough and decided to create an alternate lifestyle from
mainstream America? These are all questions which can be pondered and never
definitively answered. It is my purpose to provide a response and attempt to explain such
actions.

In an attempt to answer such questions, one must give some basic criteria and
boundaries in which to work. The term “the ‘60s” is a broad range of time not
necessarily beginning January 1, 1960 and ending December 31, 1969. For the purpose
of this paper, the ‘60s will range roughly from 1964 with the first tour of the Beatles in
America and the rise of Beatlemania to the late ‘70s when America began to feel pressure
from a suffering economic situation. This constricting economic pressure limited those
who had formerly spent their time protesting but then had to start using their time in a
manner which would provide a more stable living situation.

In addition to defining the time period of the ‘60s, one must attempt to give
limitations to those who were in “the counterculture.” Such a label is nearly impossible
to give someone since in fact becoming a member of the counterculture meant rejecting
labels, memberships, or anything that would provide later scholars with data regarding
who was part of this group. Therefore we must let the label hang loosely and those who
wish to may grab it. For the purpose of this paper, members of the counterculture are
ones who consciously went against social norms of the time, whether publicly or
privately. They may claim to be a member of the counterculture based on their sexual practices, drug experimentation, or basic belief system. In any case, it is hardly the purpose or appropriate setting for this paper to attempt to give or deny credit to any individual as a member of the counterculture. Rather, the purpose is to take a look at what pushed these individuals to break away from mainstream traditions and create a counterculture. These are the individuals which make the 1960s fascinating. The era will continue to be studied and debated long after the last claimed (or unclaimed) member of the counterculture is gone. It is a task which will most likely end with more questions than answers; such is the cycle of history which continues to provide scholars with new inquiries.

In an attempt to answer what it was that pushed the counterculture to reject America during its most prosperous time up to that point in our history, I selected several writings by scholars who have spent considerable time studying the 1960s. While the historiography of the ‘60s is limited, there are many books available that offer insight to specific aspects of this era. For that purpose, this paper will examine five different books: David Allyn’s *Make Love, Not War*; Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain’s *Acid Dreams*; Nick Bromell’s *Tomorrow Never Knows*; Morris Dickstein’s *Gates of Eden*; and Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle’s *Imagine Nation*. Braunstein and Doyle’s work is the most complete composition of essays on the counterculture; within this book readers can find essays on nearly every aspect of the counterculture. Within the other four books mentioned, scholars can investigate more specifically on an aspect of the
David Allyn does a superb job in analyzing the sexual revolution in his book *Make Love, Not War*. Allyn begins by asking a fundamental question many have attempted to answer: What was the sexual revolution? This question sets the basic framework from which Allyn researches. Other questions which Allyn attempts to answer throughout his book stem from his original inquiry: Who were the people who rebelled against sexual mores in the sixties and seventies? What sort of personal risks did they take? Why did they challenge the authorities? What form of resistance did they meet? How did they succeed? How did they fail? What was life like before the sexual revolution and to what extent was it really changed?

It was because of these primary questions that I chose Allyn’s book as a source of research. David Allyn is a social scientist who studied at Harvard University. He is currently active in his scholarship at Princeton University. His question of why people challenged the authorities fell directly in line with my original question framed within my thesis statement inquiring as to what made those within the counterculture different from others who find themselves dissatisfied with a government institution.

In answering his questions, Allyn begins the chronology of the sexual revolution with the 1962 publication of the best-seller *Sex and the Single Girl* by Helen Gurley Brown. Within this book, Brown unabashedly admits to having premarital sexual relations. Brown’s book’s success stemmed not only from her open admission of her sexual relations but also in large part comes from her ability to reach both single girls and
Madison Avenue executives alike with a blend of consumerism and individualism.³ From Brown’s book Allyn’s chronology continues into the beginning of the 1970s, where he acknowledges 1973 as the year of downturn for the sexual revolution. Sideswiped by an economic crisis filled with high unemployment rates and even higher oil prices, Americans no longer had the time or energy to devote to sexual liberation.⁴ Throughout this decade of time Allyn analyzes his focus falls primarily on east- and west-coast cities. However, along with his anecdotes of San Francisco and Greenwich Village, Allyn does at times include the rest of the nation in with his inquisition of the sexual revolution. When discussing the research of sexual science being conducted during the sixties, Allyn includes a married couple from Peru, Indiana. The couple told of their own experiences with sex therapists during this time period when sex therapy was becoming more accepted than in the past. This shows that Allyn included more than just the coastal cities in his research.

Although Allyn acknowledges the downward turn of focus on sexual liberation that began to occur during the mid-1970s, he makes an excellent point toward the end of his book. A significant number of Americans continued to support indispensable elements of the sexual revolution. By 1977, polls showed that seventy-seven percent of Americans believed public schools should provide sexual education. Over ninety-percent of Americans surveyed believed birth control information should be freely available.⁵ These are issues still being debated today and therefore some may be quick to say that the sexual revolution was not a success because it did not put these issues to rest. To the
contrary, Allyn points out, the sexual revolution was not all good nor all bad, neither all successful nor all failure.

This ambiguity associated with the sexual revolution coincides with the manner in which Allyn both begins and ends his book. His book begins with the elemental question, “What was the sexual revolution?” and ends with more questions: How do we acknowledge the sexual desires of children and teach them about their choices without invading their privacy or making them feel pressured to have sex? How do we craft laws and workplace policies that prevent sexual harassment but do not encourage witch hunts or further alienate us from our own bodies? How do we protect free speech but maintain aesthetic standards for our communities, our literature, our art? I believe it is a source of strength in a book when at the end of his or her research, an author does not necessarily answer the questions in which he sought to answer but rather has transformed his old questions into new inquiries.

As a final point of strength in Allyn’s work I agree with the review written by historian Ruth M. Alexander. She states that Allyn successfully stays away categorizing liberationists as either “authentic”, “artificial”, “opportunists” or “exploitive.” This is true as Allyn addresses all players in his work in a non-judgmental fashion. He saw that each played a role in the overall sexual revolution. While he acknowledges that feminist lesbians and Hugh Hefner’s playmates loathed one another, Alexander points out, he more importantly recognized that each were interested in enhancing individual expression. These strengths outweigh flaws pointed out by Jane Gerhard of Harvard University. In her review in the *Journal of American History*, Gerhard states that Allyn
offers little new insight into the sexual revolution. Rather, she states that he loosely strings together events year-by-year. I contrarily believe that Allyn does in fact give us in-depth insight to the sexual revolution while at the same time acknowledging that he himself is still searching for answers.

Sexuality was not the only way in which members of the counterculture expressed individuality. In fact, everything that counterculture members did was done in the name of embracing individuality. Another important element of the counterculture was drug experimentation and usage. Mind-blowing experiences with sex or drugs or music were the most likely ways to alter the worldview of America's youth. Especially widespread among members of the counterculture were hallucinogens, commonly LSD or acid. For an in-depth social history of LSD in America one should read Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain's *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond*. Lee and Shlain take readers through a forty-year span of time to learn the origins of the mind-altering drug. LSD-25 was synthesized by Dr. Albert Hoffman in 1938 but the effects were unknown to him for the first five years. It was not until 1943 that Dr. Hoffman accidentally discovered the hallucinogenic effects of the drug.

Dr. Hoffman's own timeline coincided with the United State's Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and their quest to discover a truth-serum. In 1942, the OSS assembled scientists and asked them to begin conducting a top-secret research program to develop a speech-inducing drug for use in intelligence interrogations. While the CIA's actions may prove questionable by ethical standards, such proceedings came at a time when the fear of communism was both consuming and controlling. If the CIA believed that a drug
could be concocted that would help bring down communism, ethics quickly took a backseat in the name of experimentation. In Acid Dreams, Lee and Shlain give detailed accounts of the development of acid from the time of synthesis and end in 1977. It was in October 1977 that Dr. Hoffman gathered for a weekend conference at the University of California in Santa Cruz. By this point he was revered as a near-mythic figure by a generation of acid enthusiasts.¹³

During this multi-decade study of acid experimentation, the authors focus most of their attention within the limits of the United States; however the authors must acknowledge global happenings if for no other reason than the simple fact that Dr. Hoffman first synthesized LSD-25 in Switzerland. Important locations within the United States included both east- and west-coast cities. In the Haight-Ashbury district (which the authors referred to as the psychedelic city-state) of San Francisco acid was commonplace.¹⁴ The entire bohemian district was established around the idea of a free entity in which everything (including drugs) was handed out free of charge.

Far away from California was Millbrook, New York. After Leary and his colleague Richard Alpert were expelled from Harvard in connection with their psychedelic experiments, they were determined to carry out additional studies. It led them to travel internationally during which time they met William Mellon Hitchcock. An immensely rich, young stockbroker, Hitchcock proved to be a vital part of the acid experiments. He offered his family’s four-thousand-acre estate in Dutchess County, New York which housed a mansion known as Millbrook. Leary, Alpert and his clan now had living quarters in which to live out their experiments.¹⁵
During his reign as acid-king, Leary interacted with numerous individuals who later were able to give accounts which helped document the roller-coaster ride that was acid experimentation. Authors Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain are both journalists who interviewed numerous people during the research for this book.\textsuperscript{16} Lee received his undergraduate degree in philosophy from the University of Michigan. In 1994, he received the Pope Foundation Award for Investigative Journalism. Shlain is a sports writer who has previously published two books on the subject of baseball. In writing their book, the authors relied not only on other books but heavily on primary documents. Nearly 20,000 pages of once-classified government documents were released by the Freedom of Information Act. This provided the authors with invaluable information about the CIA and their involvement with psychedelic drugs.\textsuperscript{17}

While giving them credit for their investigative skills in providing new information about the CIA’s involvement with hallucinogenic drugs, Richard H. Immerman of the University of Hawaii takes aim at what he believes to be Lee and Shlain’s lack of analysis and critique. Immerman believes that the authors could not decide whether to focus on the role of drugs in the political spectrum or the popular culture and thus provides a book which offers little insight into either world.\textsuperscript{18} I do not believe that to be true. While the book is distinctly divided into the CIA’s role and the public’s role in drugs, I believe that Lee and Shlain used both to enhance, not detract, from one another.

While sex and drugs played a prominent role in counterculture lifestyle, it is impossible to forget the role of music. For members of the counterculture music was less
Nick Bromell’s *Tomorrow Never Knows* shows an excellent portrayal of the relationship between rock and psychedelics in the 1960s. In reading Bromell, one is able begin to grasp the intensity in which the counterculture lived through the music: “[...] simplicity...that can be recaptured only by *listening* to Beatles songs again, is what explains their appeal and their meaning. Their simplicity said, in effect, that innocence has virtue and validity.”

Bromell also uses analysis given by others since 1960 to place his appreciation for rock in context. He quotes Allen Ginsberg as saying that the Beatles opened a new door in America; this door combined complete masculinity and complete tenderness and vulnerability. For those who accepted this combination, the result was more open-minded, open-hearted relationships within their lives.

The importance of the Beatles is impossible to miss when reading Bromell. His opening chapter describes the beginning of the Beatles as a feeling of an ending. While the start of the Beatles was something amazing and life-changing, it is true that they say the beginning of one thing means the end of another. The beginning of the Beatles signaled to some the end of the life as they knew it.

While drawing on the input of key figures from the era, Bromell is most successful in making readers feel as if the music is a quasi-religious experience because of his first-hand anecdotes. He remembers sitting in a dorm room in college smoking dope and listening to the Beatles and the Stones with others he barely knew. And it didn’t matter how well or if he knew the people with whom he was smoking—the music did the bonding for them.
while smoking pot and listening to music was a bonding experience for millions of young people during the 1960s, it was also an experience shared by musicians which changed their music. Bob Dylan first introduced the Beatles to marijuana, which began a drug usage that would lead to acid. After this experience, the Beatles joined Dylan in making music in a more personal manner. Their music began to be inundated with personal feelings and awareness. Suddenly, the music wasn’t just about the music; it was now also about the relationship between rock performers and rock artists.  

Therefore, when reviewer Edward Macan of College of the Redwoods states that Bromell does not offer a close analysis of the sounds of rock itself, he is absolutely right. Nor does Bromell offer readers a comprehensive writing of sixties rock. Macan acknowledges that Bromell was interested instead in the ideas portrayed through the music. The reviewer states the weakness that Bromell himself is not a musicologist and thus relied on the authority of others. This is indeed true as Bromell is currently director of graduate studies in the English department at University of Massachusetts Amherst. But while as a reviewer Macan may find this to be a weakness, I do not agree. If one is looking for an in-depth analysis of the music itself from the 1960s then Bromell’s book is not appropriate. However, for scholars of the ’60s, I believe Bromell’s book is absolutely appropriate because it shows music in the light in which it was shown in the 1960s: as a way of life. Most of those sitting in dorm rooms across America were not analyzing the chords and notes throughout the songs. Rather, they were relating the music to their own life and the world around them. In his book, that is exactly what Bromell has displayed.
While Bromell’s book focused on music, Lee and Shlain’s on acid, and Allyn’s on sexuality, Morris Dickstein’s book *Gates of Eden* is the first to be analyzed in this paper that focuses more broadly on the 1960s. His analysis includes discussions on writings, music, and American thought. Thus it can be accurately said that this book deals more with culture in a somewhat wider spotlight. By no means is this to say that Dickstein lacks substance.

As proof of Dickstein’s notable writings on the 1960s, *Gates of Eden* was republished in 1997, twenty years after its original publishing date. In his new introduction “The View from the End of the Century” Dickstein makes a point which I believe is essential to understanding the counterculture: “[...] the core of the sixties was not the shifting fashions, or glib antinomian slogans by gurus anointed by the media, or any strictly political worldview, but the changes in consciousness that lay behind the public spectacle of the time.”

Dickstein begins with the Beat authors to show this change in consciousness. In his prologue, he stresses the influence of Allen Ginsberg. Ginsberg helped articulate the changing tide of America by stressing this utopian, romantic, and religious strain that was ultimately at the heart of the new responsiveness of the sixties. In his younger days at Columbia, Dickstein met Ginsberg and in much the same way that music became personal to its listeners, Dickstein’s meeting with Ginsberg transformed poetry into a personal experience for him.

Dickstein continues to recognize the personalization of the arts as he acknowledges that the young people of the sixties were looking for something in
literature and not just looking at it. This took a sophisticated amount of tolerance and eagerness, and these young people possessed that.\textsuperscript{28} Dickstein seems to take this acknowledgement seriously as most of his book, while diversified in culture, is deeply seeded in American writings as well as culture. Reviewer Jerome L. Rodnitzky from University of Texas, Arlington comments on this aspect as well. While he credits Dickstein’s writings as eloquent, an appropriate recognition, he then states that the subtitle for this book should have been “American Writers and American Culture in the Sixties.”\textsuperscript{29} I believe that to be true. While Dickstein does effectively incorporate other aspects into his book, they are integrated within the realm of literature and authors.

If it appears that Dickstein leans toward writers as a starting block for his writing, it certainly does not mean that he is uncritical of any of them. As Rodnitzky states, Dickstein is critical of everyone—youth, writers, professors, even himself—and gives readers an unsentimental look at the 1960s. It was his hope during the ‘60s era that the Gates of Eden were on the verge of opening. However, to his disappointment, they were not. One such reason has to do with the obvious lack of clarity Columbia students possessed in defining their goals and demands. As the students attacked the university as a symbol of the society with which they disagreed, Dickstein felt that they were attacking one of the few institutions that was sympathetic to their needs.\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, Dickstein saw a door of opportunity shut by those who could not distinguish friend from foe.

Dickstein was of the age to be directly involved in the goings-on during the ‘60s. He enrolled in Columbia University in 1957, did graduate work at Yale, and taught at Columbia during the SDS upsurge in 1968. Because of his intense personal connection
with the era, I agree with Rodnitzky that a brief autobiography provided by Dickstein in an introduction would have been beneficial. For readers to really understand the assertions an author reaches, especially critical assertions, it is valuable to know their experiences which may have led to these contentions.\textsuperscript{31}

To continue with the assertion that Dickstein's book was heavily influenced by his own experiences, he is criticized in \textit{Reviews of American History} by Professor Richard King of the department of history at the University of District of Columbia. Geographically, Dickstein focuses on the east-coast, in particular New York. Taking into account his personal experiences, this is understandable considering his time spent at Columbia. It is unbalanced, however, to not include the important west-coast cities (i.e. San Francisco) which saw some of the most dramatic happenings of the 1960s.\textsuperscript{32}

It is fair to say then that Dickstein's book \textit{Gates of Eden} is both brilliant in some manners and lacking in others. Of the five books analyzed in this paper I felt that \textit{Gates of Eden} was the hardest to grasp. In a less-than academic criticism, I would say that \textit{Gates of Eden} lacks the ability to reach to those who are not scholars but rather interested persons wanting to learn more about '60s culture. While the four other books are more accessible, \textit{Gates of Eden} is a bit harder with which to work. Again that is not to say that Dickstein should not receive due credit for his writings; rather it is just another observation to keep in mind when critiquing the undersized historiography of the counterculture.

Because of this limited library of books specifically on the counterculture, it was imperative to include \textit{Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s} and
Edited by Michael William Doyle and Peter Braunstein, this book is a collection of thirteen essays written by scholars regarding various aspects of the counterculture. These essays are broken up into five sections including deconditioning; cultural politics; identity; pop culture and mass media; and alternative visions. One of the most important sections of the book, however, is its introduction.

It is in this introduction that Doyle and Braunstein make an imperative point which must be kept in mind during any examination of material regarding the counterculture. They state that the counterculture “...should never properly be construed as a social movement. It was an inherently unstable collection of attitude, tendencies, postures, gestures, “lifestyles,” ideals, visions, hedonistic pleasures, moralisms, negations, and affirmations.” It is by this statement that one can begin to understand the counterculture not by what they were but more so by what they were not.\footnote{33}

Keeping in mind that the counterculture was not a social movement, the editors did provide the Sixties counterculture into two phases for the sake of historical context. The first phase begins roughly around 1964 with the Beatles first tour and fades out after the election of President Richard Nixon in 1968. This group was the utopian “flower child” version of a hippie.\footnote{34} The second phase came in the early 1970s and was marked by a fragmentation of the counterculture into various liberation movements. These movements sought to fulfill radical values outside of society.\footnote{35}

Given these basic parameters it is easy to see that the chronology follows from roughly 1964 through the mid- to late-70s. Geographically the two meccas of the counterculture are listed as San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district and New York’s East
What gives this book balance, however, are the essays within that include other cities such as Detroit and Ann Arbor, Michigan.

In these two Midwestern cities the White Panther Party became a target for the FBI’s COINTELPRO during the late 1960s and very early 1970s. Jeff A. Hale’s essay titled “The White Panthers’ ‘Total Assault on the Culture’” focuses on the countercultural impact upon the Midwest, which especially in Ann Arbor, Michigan, also saw happenings similar although less extreme than coastal cities.

The essay focusing on the White Panthers Party is only one of many fascinating writings contained within this compilation. Beth Bailey contributed an essay regarding sexuality and underground comics. Everything from feminism (Debra Michals’ “From ‘Consciousness Expansion’ to ‘Consciousness Raising’: Feminism and the Countercultural Politics of the Self) to guerilla theater (Michael William Doyle’s “Staging the Revolution: Guerilla Theater as a Countercultural Practice, 1965-1968) to music (Lauren Onkey’s “Voodoo Child: Jimi Hendrix and the Politics of Race in the Sixties) is included in this expansive writing on the counterculture.

With a book which includes writings by so many different scholars, praise should be given to editors Peter Braunstein and Michael Doyle. To gather texts and make them flow smoothly under the ever-reaching umbrella of “the counterculture” is not an easy task. Peter Braunstein is a journalist and cultural historian based in New York City. He received his M.A. from New York University having written a thesis on the Haight-Ashbury counterculture. With similar interest within the counterculture, Michael William Doyle earned a B.A. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a Ph.D. at
Cornell University after writing his dissertation regarding The Haight-Ashbury Diggers. Professor Doyle currently is assistant history professor at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana.

In the introduction to *Imagine Nation* editors Braunstein and Doyle make the point that the easy term “counterculture” easily leads to a lost definition of what the term actually represents. It quickly loses its historical standing. Therefore it is difficult for any student of the counterculture to give boundaries to what exactly it is they are studying. While at times it is a maddening process, it is this inability to nail directly to the wall the concept of study which makes the subject endlessly fascinating.

This fascination is drawn to the general direction of those in the era of the 1960s in America who were exhausted with their way of life and decided to go against societal norms and create their own culture, thus a “counterculture”. What made these individuals different from others who have become dissatisfied with their government? The answer is neither easy nor concrete.

For the young people of the 1960s the world was very different than it had been for their parents. The generation before them had watched the nation prosper whereas the ‘60s children were born into a nation with unprecedented wealth. As Dickstein states in his book, “Whatever spiritual yearnings were satisfied, sex and drugs were also extensions of the consumption ethic of the postwar years.” Therefore they could afford to leave the prosperity that they once knew and enter a different world of affluence. And while this new world may not have been focused on material goods and services, it
certainly held its own structure of wealth and consumption which allowed those entering it to feel secure.

These young adults also knew that their parents would continue to live in this materialistic and prosperous world. And while they would be hard-pressed to admit it, it must have been some reassurance (perhaps even subconsciously) that they could return to their former safe-haven when needed. This can also begin to explain the decline of the counterculture when the economy hit a lull in the mid-1970s. Without the surplus in the economy, those who took it for granted that they could drop out of society yet re-enter at any time realized that this easy track back to a stable life may not always be there.

Besides the economic factors changes in our nation’s trust in our government had a sure effect on those citizens who became members of the counterculture. At one point United States citizens would not have questioned the authority of their president. But when the Vietnam War dragged on without hope in sight, and most definitely after the Nixon Watergate scandal, some who had placed their trust in the higher government system took back that trust. Therefore, it seemed to be common sense to reject a system which so blatantly lied to its people.

While war waged in south-east Asia and throughout America, citizens began to yearn for a different setting. Dickstein wrote, “Utopia always eludes our grasp, but we still need it as a regulative idea…unless we dream of a perfect society, we’re unlikely to achieve a better one.”41 As scholars and historians we will continue to ask the question of what pushed these individuals to leave behind the comfort of their homes and enter a world unbeknownst to them. We will ponder how it was exactly that they defined
themselves, and whether they acknowledge what they did to be a success or failure. As
brilliantly stated by Braunstein and Doyle, “Countercultural knowledge can’t be
accurately represented by a straight line, or even the squiggly line; a more evocative
figure would be the matrix, or perhaps the concentric circle.”42 We will continue to study
and question. At the same time, we will continue to appreciate and respect the place in
history which belong those who were considered members of the counterculture.
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