# Shifting to Confrontation: Herbert Marcuse and the Transformation of the American Student Movement

**Michael Frey**
*Ruhr University, Bochum*
*Kade-Heideking Fellow, 2003–2004*

## I. Turning Point 1964/65: "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution"

In 1964 the American student movement slid into a deep crisis of identity causing a massive change in ideology and strategy.[1] After more than four years of activism in numerous grass roots projects and non-violent direct action protests, the young radicals of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) appeared exhausted: "We can demonstrate until we are in jail, but neither the inconvenience we cause nor the moral witness we present will alter the situation. The trouble is, we just aren't reaching the centers of power."[2] The editor of the newly created student periodical *The Activist*, Jonathan Eisen, stated: "Students are becoming more aware of their own limitations at the same time their intellectual and 'programmatic' horizons are expanding. The 'crisis in tactics' is a very real and honest admission that nobody seems to know where the movement is going or how 'to catch up with it.'"[3]

Not only the SNCC worried about tactics. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) had set up the "Economic Research and Action Project" (ERAP) in 1963 in order to organize an interracial movement of mostly unemployed poor people in the north of the country, but during the summer of 1964 the ERAP staff found "the people" harder to organize than they had expected. Now the SDS had to come to terms with the limitations of the poor as an "agent of social change." Although they failed to transform the poor into a new vanguard of a massive social movement, there was one crucial lesson students in ERAP learned—their disillusionment with liberalism. The SDS had started on the assumption that liberals "are the most interested and committed of all our institutions, and we must find a close but critical relationship to them."[4] But after months of discouraging results ERAP had the opposite effect on the activists: "We are now enemies of welfare state capitalism, with little faith or desire that the liberal-labor within this system be strengthened vis-à-vis their corporatist and reactionary allies," the long-term SDS member Richie Rothstein wrote in retrospective in 1969.[5] The rejection of liberal-

ism first became apparent at the National Council Meeting of the SDS in December 1964, when a majority of the delegates refused to vote for the electoral strategy of the so-called "coalitionists," the faction within the SDS which had supported the reelection of Lyndon B. Johnson with the slogan "Part of the Way with LBJ."

Around 1964/65, the enthusiasm of the college generation that had begun to change society with the sit-in movement in 1960 vanished and the optimism for voter registration and community organization disappeared. Reforms seemed to be more and more an attempt to integrate radical ideas into the "system," and the young activists started to deride supporters of a liberal-labor-progressive coalition as "corporate liberals." Fueled by outrage about the beginning war in Vietnam, the development reached its temporary peak with Staughton Lynd's essay on a future strategy, in which the peace activist demanded a clear decision: "Coalition Politics or Non-violent Revolution?"[6] Just two months later, in November 1965, Bruce Payne began to call into question the theories of the "godfather" of the New Left:[7]

> It is possible to defend C. Wright Mills's 'power elite' thesis as an honest radical perspective on the existing social order; the forces of which he speaks could and would act collusively against any attempts to alter the entire social structure. But the SNCC argument lacks the important conditional implied by Mills. The power structure, in the SNCC view, acts collusively, conspiratorially, on its own behalf and against the poor *whether or not* there is any present threat to the order. Moreover, the ranks of this monolithic elite include liberal as well as conservative groups and individuals.[8]

This was the situation in which Herbert Marcuse published his book *One-Dimensional Man*.[9]

## II. The Project

The following essay is part of a dissertation project that focuses on the protest movements in West Germany and the United States in the 1960s. Among historians, the year 1968 is considered a decisive watershed with a worldwide impact, not only in Western countries but also in Latin America and behind the Iron Curtain. All protest movements in Europe and overseas developed in a similar way, supported liberation movements in the Third World, and regarded Che Guevara and Ho Chi Minh as international icons of protest. Nevertheless, the movements of the sixties were characterized by a significant tension: global orientation on

the one hand, specific circumstances of local phenomena on the other. One glance at the core topics in both countries, West Germany and the United States, reveals unique national conflicts. For one, the American student protests were deeply rooted in the civil rights movement struggling for racial equality. The campaign against the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) and the protests against the foreign policy of the Kennedy administration generating the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC) were important topics as well. On the other hand, the German SDS (*Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund*) directed its criticism at the National Socialist past of Germany, and from 1964 on, at the new German emergency laws (*Notstandsgesetze*).

The extensive historical research on the 1960s has mainly focused on national circumstances.[10] Even scholarly work following an international comparative approach and the sophisticated comparisons of the German and the American movements take the perspective of national movements and relate them to each other.[11] As a result, these studies identify more differences than similarities, which leads to a separation rather than a connection. The research on cultural transfer developed by Michael Werner and Michel Espagne offers an excellent methodological concept for analyzing intercultural transfer beyond national borders.[12] Their approach gives priority to the context of how and why cultural elements of another country are introduced. Emphasizing the dynamics of cultural exchange and the specific circumstances of both countries, Werner and Espagne consider intercultural transfer as a process of productive adoption, known as "acculturation."[13] This term enables researchers to interpret the special local phenomena of two nations in a flexible, reciprocal social context—especially in an analysis of the intellectual constitution of social movements.

This essay concentrates on Herbert Marcuse and his role in the American movement. The philosopher became an international symbol for youth as one of the few intellectuals who supported the uprising of the protest movements. Many of his writings in the 1960s connected him in an analytical, critical, or encouraging way to the developments, changes, and strategies of the international protests. His books gave orientation to the New Left in the United States and the *Neue Linke* in the Federal Republic of Germany. *One-Dimensional Man*, in the American movement simply called "the book," was essential in transforming the cognitive landscape of the New Left in the United States during a specific period under specific circumstances.[14] It replaced the pragmatic strategy and reformist ideology of the early phase, led to the breakthrough of a new kind of activism in the United States, and created the preconditions for the transfer of new methods of protest into other countries.

## III. Radical Reformism—The American Movement Until 1964/65

American society was completely unprepared for the new wave of activism. Nobody could have foreseen the great success of the spectacular sit-in movement that began in Greensboro on February 1, 1960 when four black college students ordered a cup of coffee at a segregated Woolworth lunch counter. It prompted a movement which inspired more than seventy thousand young people to take part in non-violent direct action in several American states. Nobody expected the hundreds of new activists who started to protest not only against racial segregation in the "Jim Crow" states, but also against HUAC and the atomic bomb in the next years. This new activism caught everyone by surprise—especially the few tiny, somewhat sectarian student groups that had managed to stay alive during the McCarthy Era, a period of drought for radical thinking. The late fifties and early sixties saw the sudden founding and rapid development of numerous organizations. Established in 1958, the Student Peace Union's growth, for instance, was "simply fantastic:" "Everywhere we strike," wrote Ken Calkins, the founder of this midwestern organization, "we strike fire."[15]

Moral outrage, not a reawakening in party politics after an era of political apathy, fueled the outburst of new activism. Disgusted young people started to fight the consequences of the Cold War in small but very active groups, declaring a "New Era" and demanding nothing less than the reassertion of "moral politics."[16] But their demands hardly would have made it into the newspapers without a new method to get public attention: direct action. With the "Americanization of Gandhi," small groups were able to attract media attention to issues such as racial segregation or the arms race. The direct action campaign started by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in Birmingham in 1963 demonstrated the efficacy of this method. The massive violence of southern white policemen using hoses and dogs against demonstrating black children was broadcast on international television and forced the Kennedy administration to act.[17] Although direct action was a method that sometimes sparked violence, the driving force was moral outrage and the aim was social change. It was a tactical means to create a democratic public and inspire liberal support against abortive developments of the American society.

The belief that society both needed and was capable of reform was an essential part of American New Left thinking in the early sixties. Two intellectual departures around 1960 clearly marked a break with the Old Left and its doctrinaire Marxism: the student magazine *Studies on the Left* and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Both *Studies on the Left*

and the SDS harshly criticized American society, but neither promoted a revolutionary theory. While with *Studies on the Left*, published in the fall of 1959, an academic journal tried for the first time to establish a new platform of radical thought, or as it put it a "Radicalism of Disclosure,"[18] SDS was both an organization of radical pamphleteers and an action group. SDS was an expanding network of activism and a kind of New Left think tank trying to combine the different topics of the early sixties in a variety of influential writings. The most famous pamphlet—the "Port Huron Statement," mainly written by Tom Hayden in 1962—offers the best insights into radical thinking in this organization,[19] because in this comprehensive approach of new radicalism, the SDS connected radical analysis of the society with a new strategy of activism. Although a radical document in its time, the Port Huron Statement was not a declaration of revolutionary changes. Including the main left-wing concerns of the decade—civil rights, civil liberties and disarmament—the statement criticizes the American political system from a militantly democratic point of view. The main idea, the change of society through "participatory democracy," seems to be the re-creation of a vision of a face-to-face democracy, an ideal of community deeply rooted in American history: the town council.[20]

Not surprisingly, SDS picked C. Wright Mills, Paul Goodman, and Arnold Kaufman as their most influential intellectual sources. The influence of the intellectual maverick Mills on the emerging New Left is obvious. His more scholarly writings like *The Power Elite* and *White Collar* or pamphlets like *The Causes of World War III* and *Listen Yankee* or the milestone "Letter to the New Left" inspired the young intellectuals the same way that Paul Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd* or Arnold Kaufman's theory of "participatory democracy" did. It was Kaufman who presented his idea at the Port Huron Conference in July 1962. Despite different traditions of radical thought, their commitment to social activism, and their judgment on the New Left, the three intellectuals shared an interest in rational and reform-minded political transformation of the political system. Their radicalism was, of course, partly influenced by Marxism, but their theories chiefly drew on American leftist political thought.

Many young activists grew with their experiences and gradually changed their views. Doubts came with the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, which left the young radicals disillusioned with the Kennedy administration. The consequence was a new SDS statement, endorsed in June 1963, "America and the New Era." It clarified New Left thinking about liberals, distinguishing "corporate liberals" from democratically oriented liberals.[21] The document argued that domestic reforms could not be pursued while the country maintained its international interventionism, and that an agenda of reformism for America was not possible without the

end of the Cold War.[22] Following the test ban treaty and the period of détente in 1963, SDS leaders Tom Hayden and Richard Flacks announced the "End of [the] Cold War" in numerous articles.[23] A period of social change seemed to be possible, and the movement endorsed new activities.

With the renewed escalation of the Cold War, the increasing international tension caused by the war in Vietnam, and the disillusionment with countless projects in 1964 and 1965, the movement reached a new position—and needed new theories to analyze the changing situation. The new intellectual guiding force was Herbert Marcuse.

## IV. A New Orientation: Herbert Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man*

Marcuse's meteoric rise in 1965 was breathtaking. Since the media had discovered him, countless interviews and discussions all over the world had made him a star in a protest movement of the young. The movement had announced they would not trust anybody over thirty, and Marcuse, then in his sixties, was far beyond this age. Still, he was more than well respected, and he began to gain the status of a father of the New Left. Nevertheless, his prominence was totally unexpected, and his new fame concealed the fact that this German immigrant was an outsider in the academic world. Marcuse emigrated to the United States in the 1930s with Max Horkheimer's Institute for Social Research.[24] Unlike fellow members of the Frankfurt School, Marcuse stayed in the United States, yet never gave up his intellectual roots, even after more than twenty years in his new home country. His philosophy was thoroughly influenced by the late Hegel, and Marcuse shared Theodor W. Adorno's emphasis on "negative dialectics." Perhaps this was the reason for his infrequent activities on the American Left. Politically never involved, Marcuse avoided commitment to one of the leftist magazines such as *Liberation*, *Dissent*, *Monthly Review*, or *New Politics*, not even as a member of their editorial boards, which would have been merely an act of solidarity. In contrast to the prominent peace activist Abraham J. Muste or Erich Fromm, Marcuse's former colleague at the Institute for Social Research, Marcuse also avoided activities in the numerous peace groups. Until 1965, he had never written articles for student magazines, although the Madison magazine *Studies on the Left*, for example, tenaciously tried to involve him.[25]

With the publication of *One-Dimensional Man*, Marcuse's reputation within the New Left increased tremendously, and he began to direct his own energies toward the young radicals with growing interest. As Paul Goodman remarked: "I can remember talking to Marcuse a year ago and I put it to him that the student revolt was very serious and he said, 'Ah,

no, no. It will all be co-opted.' But now since the episodes in Paris [the student revolts of May 1968], he has changed entirely. [. . .] He just doesn't read it right, and he just doesn't know the American scene at all; [. . .] he doesn't realize that the Americans have a long history of this populism."[26]

But why did the young radicals turn to Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* from 1964/65 onward? It is obvious that the reason was not his analysis of liberalism. William Appleman Williams had already coined and defined the term "Corporate Liberalism," which was well known in New Left circles and which gained—the more the rebellion advanced—an increasing quality as an insult to moderates or liberal critics. Likewise it was not the notion of the American society as a technocratic one. In *The Power Elite*, written in 1956, C. Wright Mills had identified the political, economic, and military powers that structured American society. Even Marcuse's thorough belief that the working class had lost its function as the agent of social change and was now totally integrated into capitalist society was not the important point. Years before—in his "Letter to the New Left"—Mills had demanded the farewell to the "labor metaphysics" of the orthodox Marxists.[27]

Without question, many of Marcuse's ideas had precursors in books that were written in a more appealing style and in much more concrete terms. But his approach to explaining the "advanced industrial society" as a system of manipulation was much more appropriate to the circumstances: In *One-Dimensional Man*, Marcuse portrayed a society totally mobilized against its own liberation. In contrast to orthodox Marxists, this heretic of pure doctrine did not consider the economy as the source of social repression; the origin of injustice was technical rationality in itself. "As the project unfolds," Marcuse says in his introduction, "it shapes the entire universe of discourse and action, intellectual and material culture. In the medium of technology, culture, politics, and the economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up or repulses all alternatives."[28]

But the system was much more elaborate: In a one-dimensional society, Marcuse argued, the domination was so total, the manipulated satisfaction of the masses in superfluous abundance so complete that the society both allowed and absorbed alternative understandings of that society. People were free to think whatever they wanted, but could be sure that nothing would change.[29] Even worse, capitalism offered forms of pseudo-liberation. A state of well-being created new materialistic desires—for example, commercialized sexual excitement—which the system in turn satisfied. In this welfare state of consumerism, alternative concepts were almost unthinkable. But more important, advanced capitalism co-opted all opposition. As the manipulated working class had

been integrated into the system of advanced capitalism, society would absorb each and every revolutionary movement, even the tiniest critical impulse. Reforms that appeared revolutionary in fact served to uphold the status quo. And this "containment of social change," Marcuse wrote, "was perhaps the most singular achievement of advanced industrial society."[30]

Thinking of a society as one-dimensional led to a specific conception of politics. Strategies became obsolete because conventional politics as Marcuse interpreted them would be absorbed. They would be integrated into the ruling system and thus lose their critical impulse. Therefore, politics were only thinkable in categories of confrontation, captured between two extremes, integration or overthrow in a revolution. This tendency militated against traditional political activism and a politics of rational persuasion.

For many young radicals, the structure of thought sketched in *One-Dimensional Man* corresponded to their experiences. The ideas reflected the frustrations suffered in ERAP, the Mississippi Summer, and other community organizing projects. Perceiving that they were living a one-dimensional existence, Marcuse's book was a key component in the beginning process of self-constitution and self-comprehension of the movement during the years before 1968.[31]

At first sight, this was surprising, for the new father of the New Left provided no instructions on how to shape a new political strategy. *One-Dimensional Man* pessimistically denied praxis.[32] On the one hand, political praxis would be co-opted and stabilize the system. On the other hand, as Marcuse saw it, a revolution to overthrow the system was also impossible, for there was no revolutionary subject. Ironically, here Marcuse argued like an orthodox Marxist of the Old Left. However, Marcuse described this vicious circle as a self-expanding and self-perpetuating system.[33] The only chance to escape seemed to be the "Great Refusal."

Although the movement, like the student movements in Germany and other countries, ignored this aspect of his philosophy, the idea that praxis could be absorbed by a manipulative society was absorbed by the activists themselves. During the next five years, SDS dropped all questions about strategy and organization. SDS conventions after 1965 usually ended in chaos, and proposals for the endorsement of new projects never passed the conventions. Even important projects such as a new Vietnam campaign were turned down. The SDS's style since 1965 cannot be described as "politics." Anxiety about co-optation led to the conscious rejection of everything connected to the system or its politics. The style of former SDS project-oriented "politicos" was replaced by a new style: "prefigurative politics."[34] Spontaneous, local, uncoordinated, and individual in character, "prefigurative politics" rejected traditional politics.

As a result, reform projects such as ERAP and, of course, traditional election campaigns were replaced by a diffuse and abstract struggle for one's own liberation. Greg Calvert, National Secretary of the SDS, explained the differences and defined the new values in a speech in February 1967:

> The liberal reformist is always engaged in 'fighting someone else's battles.'[. . .] The liberal does not speak comfortably of 'freedom' or 'liberation', but rather of justice and social amelioration. He does not see himself as unfree. [. . .] Revolutionary consciousness leads to the struggle for one's own freedom in unity with others who share the burden of oppression. It is, to speak in the classical vocabulary, class consciousness because it no longer sees the problem as someone else's, because it breaks through individualization and privatization, of the oppressed, because it posits a more universally human potentiality for all men in a liberated society.[35]

## V. Contagious Confrontation: The Transformation of Direct Action and the Internationalization of "Obstruction Politics"

The way to achieve liberation was not quite clear and the abandonment of strategy had left a gap. In his writings, Marcuse avoided offering any advice, and this absence, as well as anxiety about becoming co-opted, resulted in a form of activism that rejected a long-term strategy, but also led to spontaneous actions confronting the system. Although most of these actions were directed against American aggression in Vietnam, the SDS was engaged in several other activities. Students protested on campus, organized demonstrations against governments, or planned sit-ins in segregated shops and restaurants. In New York, SDS organized the first mass protest against the Chase Manhattan Bank for its loans to South Africa. Indeed, activities and topics increased in number and variety. For the generation of Old Leftists, the activism of the young appeared arbitrary and meaningless. But this judgment was superficial, because the young New Left radicals viewed all their activities as a single struggle against the same threat: manipulation. "The issue was not the issue"[36] anymore, and a single issue was just one part of the enemy: "The name of the system was 'Corporate Liberalism' and its opposition is radical."[37] This shift led to a change in methods, means, and aims, for direct action had lost its special character.

Americanized by radical pacifists and used with great success against racial segregation in the South, direct action was a method to achieve social change in reformist campaigns. Without a doubt, direct action

sometimes provoked violence to stimulate public attention, but it was always a tactical measure, subordinate to strategy. With the significant change in the mood of the SDS and other parts of the movement in 1964/65 and the abandonment of strategy in the wake of Marcuse's theories, direct action became a substitute for strategy. Advanced capitalism, the enemy in Marcuse's works, justified activism everywhere, and the identification with oppressed people in Vietnam made even more activism possible. The theme was interchangeable, but not the tactic, which therefore became a new form of activism against the totality of an abstract system—"symbolic activism." This form of activism was typical for the time after 1964/65 and was characterized by permanent escalation, because the lack of strategy and the excessive emphasis on symbolic activism led to rapidly escalating conflicts that ended as fast as they started. In 1968/69, with the cumulation of massive confrontations—the Democratic Party Convention in Chicago or the crisis at Columbia University in New York—symbolic activism almost became an end in itself.

The first sign of a shift to symbolic activism could be seen in the Free Speech Movement (FSM) at the University of California at Berkeley.[38] It was no accident that this university erupted first. Since the early 1960s, Berkeley had many active students, some of whom were organized in an umbrella organization called SLATE, which anticipated later New Left campus organizations. Berkeley, one of the most liberal universities in the country, was run by a prototype of the bureaucratic "corporate liberal." Clark Kerr was a former member of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID), the parent organization of SDS. The rebellion at Kerr's "knowledge-factory" was triggered by a ban on political campus activities in fall 1964, but for further developments, another factor was much more important. A handful of Berkeley students had taken part in the Mississippi Freedom Summer. After their return, they combined these experiences and the real problems at Kerr's "multiversity" with a Marcusian perspective:

> There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all.[39]

The escalation in Berkeley—the spectacular Sproul Hall sit-in marked the peak with its almost 800 arrests on December 2, 1964—was representative of the new style of "obstruction tactics" and introduced a new

phase in the history of the American movement. Spontaneous direct actions triggered protest that escalated rapidly and then vanished. In many confrontations, student tactics were successful, and mobilized many of their fellow students. But without a long-term strategy, the outburst of symbolic activism had almost no effects on the structure of the confronted institution. The Free Speech Movement, for example, was without a significant successor at the universities for almost three years.

Nevertheless, the Free Speech Movement proved the transferability of symbolic activism, a precondition for the transfer into other countries. German students were in the same situation as American students: The awakening of the German SDS (*Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund*) started in the early sixties, and like its American counterpart, the German organization, although Marxist in its ideology, had a reformist orientation. Despite being deeply interested in American methods of protest, the German SDS was unable to adopt methods of the early period of the movement, which were deeply embedded in the national context of American society. ERAP and national campaigns for voter registration were not transferable at all. But this changed when the American movement transformed itself and its methods and gave up its specific national context by using "obstruction politics" during the Free Speech Movement. "Symbolic activism" was abstract, hence transferable. Students abroad and in the United States found themselves in comparable situations. Young people at the universities in Berlin, Paris, London, Rome, and Tokyo proved that the Free Speech Movement and its methods became one of the most successful exports of the American movement.

## Notes

[1] This essay is a revised version of a paper presented at the Young Scholars Forum at the German Historical Institute on May 30, 2003. I would like to thank all participants for their excellent comments and the stimulating discussion.

[2] Jonathan Eisen, "Only Connected: Reflections on the Revolution," in *The New Student Left: An Anthology*, ed. Mitchell Cohen and Dennis Hale (Boston: Beacon, 1966), 104.

[3] Ibid., 108.

[4] Carl Wittman and Tom Hayden, "An Interracial Movement of the Poor," in Cohen, *The New Student Left*, 214.

[5] Richard Rothstein, "Evolution of the ERAP Organizers," in *The New Left: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Priscilla Long, (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1969), 274.

[6] Staughton Lynd, "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution," in *The New Left: A Documentary*, ed. Massimo Teodori (New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1969), 197–202.

[7] See Kevin Mattson, *Intellectuals in Action: The Origins of the New Left and Radical Liberalism, 1945–1970* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 43.

[8] Bruce Payne, "SNCC: An Overview Two Years Later," in Cohen, *The New Student Left*, 94.

[9] Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon, 1964).

[10] Terry Anderson, *The Movement and The Sixties: Protest in America from Greensboro to Wounded Knee* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Maurice Issermann, *If I had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1989); Siegward Lönnendonker, Bernd Rabehl and Jochen Staadt, *Die Antiautoritäre Revolte: Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund nach der Trennung von der SPD. Band I: 1960–1967* (Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2003).

[11] David Caute, *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988); Ronald Fraser, *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988); George Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968* (Boston: South End Press, 1987); Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, *Die 68er-Bewegung: Deutschland, Westeuropa, USA* (Munich: Beck Verlag, 2001). For comparisons of German and American movements, see Ingo Juchler, *Die Studentenbewegungen in den Vereinigten Staaten und der Bundesrepublik der sechziger Jahre: Eine Untersuchung hinsichtlich ihrer Beeinflussung durch Befreiungsbewegungen und—theorien aus der Dritten Welt* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1996); Michael Schmidtke, "Reform, Revolte oder Revolution? Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund (SDS) und die Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) 1960–1970," in *1968—Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft*, ed. Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 188–206; Michael Schmidtke, *Der Aufbruch der jungen Intelligenz: Die 68er Jahre in der Bundesrepublik und den USA* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2003).

[12] Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, "Deutsch-französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Zu einem neuen interdisziplinären Forschungsprogramm des C.N.R.S.," *Francia* 13 (1985): 502-510; Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, "Deutsch-französischer Kulturtransfer als Forschungsgegenstand. Eine Problemskizze," in *Transferts. Les relations interculturelle dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe-XIXe siècle)*, ed. Michel Espagne and Michael Werner (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1988), 11–34.

[13] Michael Werner, "Dissymmetrien und symmetrische Modellbildungen," in *Kulturtransfer im Epochenumbruch. Frankreich—Deutschland 1770 bis 1815*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Rolf Reichardt, (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1997), 98.

[14] Paul Breines, "Germans, Journals and Jews—Madison, Men, Marxism and Mosse: A Tale of Jewish-Leftist Identity Confusion in America," *New German Critique* 20 (1980): 84.

[15] Letter from Ken Calkins to Dave McReynolds, March 5, 1960, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, War Resisters League Records, Series B, Box 14.

[16] Dan Cohen, "Manifesto for the New Era," *SPU-Bulletin* November (1959): 6 (State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Pamphlet Collection, PAM 68–555).

[17] Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* (New York: Free Press, 1984).

[18] Editorial, "The Radicalism of Disclosure," *Studies on the Left* 1 (1959): 2–4.

[19] The best scholarly book on the SDS and its ideas: Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets*.

[20] See Mattson, *Intellectuals in Action*, 187.

[21] Students for a Democratic Society, *America and the New Era* (1963) (State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Pamphlet Collection, PAM 82-1404). The term "corporate liberalism" was popularized in Studies on the Left and borrowed from William Appleman Williams. See: Editors, "The Ultra-Right and Cold War Liberalism," *Studies on the Left* 1 (1962): 3–8.

[22] SDS, *America and the New Era*, 1–4.

[23] Thomas Hayden and Richard Flacks, "New Possibilities for Peace? End of Cold War," *Liberation* 9 (1963): 14–19; Richard Flacks, "After the Cold War: The Promise and the Peril," *PREP-Newsletter* 4 (1964): 1–3, 20 (State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Historical Society Library Pamphlet Collection, PAM 75-944).

[24] A brilliant book on the Frankfurt School was written by Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973).

[25] Mattson, *Intellectuals in Action*, 252.

[26] Quoted in ibid., 139.

[27] See William A. Williams, *The Contours of American History* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1973); C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); C. Wright Mills, "Letter to the New Left," in Long, *The New Left*, 14–25.

[28] Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, xlvii.

[29] Marcuse clarifies this point in his essay "Repressive Tolerance," written in 1965 and dedicated to his students at Brandeis University. See Herbert Marcuse, "Repressive Tolerance," in *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, ed. Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore and Herbert Marcuse (Boston: Beacon, 1965), 81–117.

[30] Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, xliv.

[31] See Paul Breines, "Marcuse and the New Left," in *The Revival of American Socialism: Selected Papers of the Socialist Scholars Conference*, ed. George Fischer (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 281–296.

[32] "Praxis" in a Marxist interpretation is defined as emancipating, conscious, political action to overcome the existing order of the society. A definition of the term is given in Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison, *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991).

[33] Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, 34.

[34] The term was introduced by Wini Breines, *Community and Organization in the New Left: 1962-1968 (The Great Refusal)* (New York: Praeger, 1982), 46–52.

[35] Greg Calvert, "White America: Radical Consciousness and Social Change," in Teodori, *The New Left*, 414–415.

[36] Quoted in Breines, *Community and Organization in the New Left*, 18.

[37] Teodori, *The New Left*, 41.

[38] On the Free Speech Movement, see William J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[39] Quoted in Hal Draper, *The New Student Revolt* (New York: Grove Press, 1965). Mario Savio's famous speech is heavily influenced by Marcuse's thoughts. For evidence of his Marcuse reception see Robert Cohen, "This Was *Their* Fight and *They* Had to Fight It. The FSM's Nonradical Rank and File," in *The Free Speech Movement. Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, ed. Robert Cohen and Reginald E. Zelnik (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 250.