American Literature Readings in the 21st Century

The Anti-Hero in the American Novel

From Joseph Heller to Kurt Vonnegut

David Simmons

The Anti-Hero in the American Novel

American Literature Readings in the 21st Century

Series Editor: Linda Wagner-Martin

American Literature Readings in the 21st Century publishes works by contemporary critics that help shape critical opinion regarding literature of the nineteenth and twentieth century in the United States.

Published by Palgrave Macmillan:

Freak Shows in Modern American Imagination: Constructing the Damaged Body from Willa Cather to Truman Capote
By Thomas Fahy

Arab American Literary Fictions, Cultures, and Politics
By Steven Salaita

Women & Race in Contemporary U.S. Writing: From Faulkner to Morrison
By Kelly Lynch Reames

American Political Poetry in the 21st Century
By Michael Dowdy

Science and Technology in the Age of Hawthorne, Melville, Twain, and James: Thinking and Writing Electricity
By Sam Halliday

F. Scott Fitzgerald's Racial Angles and the Business of Literary Greatness
By Michael Nowlin

Sex, Race, and Family in Contemporary American Short Stories
By Melissa Bostrom

Democracy in Contemporary U.S. Women's Poetry
By Nicky Marsh

James Merrill and W.H. Auden: Homosexuality and Poetic Influence
By Piotr K. Gwiazda

Contemporary U.S. Latino/a Literary Criticism
Edited by Lyn Di Iorio Sandín and Richard Perez

The Hero in Contemporary American Fiction: The Works of Saul Bellow and Don DeLillo
By Stephanie S. Halldorson

Race and Identity in Hemingway's Fiction
By Amy L. Strong

Edith Wharton and the Conversations of Literary Modernism
By Jennifer Haytock

The Anti-Hero in the American Novel: From Joseph Heller to Kurt Vonnegut
By David Simmons

The Anti-Hero in the American Novel

From Joseph Heller to Kurt Vonnegut

David Simmons

palgrave
macmillan

First published in 2008 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978–0–230–60323–3
ISBN-10: 0–230–60323–8

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Simmons, David, 1979–
The anti-hero in the American novel : from Joseph Heller to Kurt Vonnegut / David Simmons.
p. cm.—(American literature readings in the twenty-first century)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–230–60323–8 (alk. paper)
1. American fiction—20th century—History and criticism.
2. Antiheroes in literature. I. Title.

PS374.A57S56 2008
813'.5409352—dc22 2007044445

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: June 2008

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

To the memory of Kenneth A. Yeoman. A Good Friend.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

The national tradition of the anti-hero is crucial to the American novel of the 1960s. Events such as the Vietnam War and the subsequent peacenik movement, the civil rights crusade, the wide-scale use of hallucinogenic drugs such as LSD, and the emergence of the hippies all suggest that the 1960s was a highpoint for rebellion against the state. Indeed, so great was the amount of opposition to the American hegemony during the 1960s that the anti-state movement was termed the 'counterculture'[1] by Theodore Roszak, an American professor and social critic. The concept of the counterculture quickly entered the national vernacular, being written about by a range of theorists and philosophers such as Herbert Marcuse, whose work came to dominate intellectual discussion of the period.

Given the tumultuous climate of the 1960s, it is perhaps not surprising that the novel should reflect the rebelliousness of the public. Books such as *Catch-22* (1961), *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962), *The Graduate* (1963), *The Man Who Fell to Earth* (1963), *Little Big Man* (1964), *Midnight Cowboy* (1965), *Cool Hand Luke* (1966), and *Slaughterhouse Five* (1969) found immense popularity for their depictions of dissident, subversive individuals opposed to the ideological mores of the establishment. Such was the audience for the anti-heroic that many of these characters quickly transcended the confines of the page to become cultural icons, with novels translated into other mediums such as film and theater.

The sheer breadth of rebellion that occurred during the 1960s makes it clear that it is impossible for a single work to cover every figure classifiable as anti-heroic in the fiction of the period.[2] Instead, each chapter of this book analyzes a 1960s utilization of the anti-hero, and explores, with reference to specific textual examples, how writers criticize the value systems of society through the subversion of traditional heroic exemplars. In accordance with this purpose I single out three of what I consider to be the most important heroic exemplars within American culture: the capitalist or entrepreneurial individual, the cowboy, and the Christ figure. I devote a chapter to

exploring anti-heroic subversions of these figures. Each chapter starts by examining the demythologization of the respective heroic figure, analyzing the reduction of its traditional heroic qualities into the form of the anti-heroic. Then the chapters go on to explore what these anti-heroic reconfigurations substitute for the previously traditional heroic qualities of the exemplar, examining the extent to which these anti-heroic 'heroes' are analogous to the concept of "the unheroic hero."[3]

By investigating the 1960s anti-hero through the framework of these heroic archetypes I hope to suggest that the contemporary novel reflects a desire to reappropriate American narratives, be they historical, cultural, social, or aesthetic. As Robert S. Ellwood notes in *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (1994), "[an] important theme was the recovery of the lost and the past, as though the total experience for which the age yearned could only be complete when one had experienced all of the past as well as all of the present."[4] This notion of a total experience informs my analysis, as I explore the manner in which writers focus upon significant incongruities between the heroic ideal and the reality of American life. The process of foregrounding this disparity is crucial to the larger countercultural movement, as David Farber writes in *The 1960s: From Memory to History* (1994):

> Their investigations of the ideological bulwarks of American society led them to argue that more than individual opportunity needed to be unblocked to create a more just and fair system. They challenged the integrity and virtue of basic institutions and values that had taken on the cover of American tradition, like the nuclear family, anticommunism, the economic bottom line, and material progress.[5]

In many cases, the desire to challenge and revaluate aspects of society explains the use of the anti-heroic. Writers employ the figure as a means to analyze White, Anglo- Saxon, Protestant ideology, often in conjunction with techniques such as demythologization, satire, and parody. While these latter techniques are important I make the assertion that criticism has focused almost exclusively upon a specific set of taxonomies relating to formal experimentation, which has resulted in an undervaluation of the anti-heroic figure. Instead of continuing in this critical tradition, I seek to reinstate a character-based analysis that emphasizes the humanist impetus behind the use of the anti-hero in the 1960s novel.

In taking this unorthodox approach I hope that this book may imbue the 1960s anti-heroic figure with more academic import than

it has previously been credited with. Consequently I wish to suggest that a humanist utilization of the anti-heroic can be seen as one of the more important literary techniques employed by a decade's worth of writers in effectively documenting and conveying the ideological condition of a postwar generation.

Notes

1. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*, rev. ed. (1968; repr., London: Faber, 1969).
2. This volume focuses upon some of the more popular and well-known examples of the anti-heroic figure produced during the 1960s. Due to its structuring around subversions of national archetypes it regrettably excludes many of the interesting anti-heroes contained in the work of Jewish writers such as Saul Bellow, Phillip Roth, Bernard Malamud, and Bruce Jay Friedman, specific comprehensive analysis of which can be found in a range of texts. See Ruth Wisse's *The Schlemiel as Modern Hero* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971) and Sanford Pinsker's *The Schlemiel as Metaphor: Studies in the Yiddish and American Jewish Novel* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971).
3. Ihab Hassan, *Rumors of Change* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995), 56.
4. Robert S. Ellwood, *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 33.
5. David Farber, *The Sixties: From Memory to History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 3–4.

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

The list of individuals that have helped me with useful suggestions, constructive criticism, and moral support while writing this book is extensive, and I offer them all my great appreciation and thanks. However, in particular I must single out Professor Philip Tew for his unfaltering guidance and encouragement, in addition to Dr. John Saunders, and Dr. Gavin Budge for their helpful revisions and corrections. I must also express thanks to my family and Gladys Whitehouse for their assistance, fellow academics Wasfi Ibrahim and Claire Allen for their useful contributions and ongoing friendship, and finally my partner Nicola Allen for her love and support, without which I never would have achieved what I have been able to. I thank you.

Cover Image: *Catch-22* (1970), reproduced courtesy of Paramount Pictures.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 1

The Rebel with a Cause? The Anti-Heroic Figure in American Fiction of the 1960s

The emergence and proliferation of the anti-heroic form within the 1960s creates an aesthetic rendition that mirrors the countercultural zeitgeist. Ihab Hassan notes in *Rumors of Change* (1959): "If the antihero seems to be enjoying just now something of an *estime d' insuccès*, it is probably because we have seen him often enough in the ambience of Zen, jazz, junk, and copulation."[1] However, contemporaneous criticism tends to neglect the anti-heroic as an evolving form, and instead concentrates upon emergent notions such as 'Metafiction', 'Surfiction' (reflexive forms of fiction that often focus upon structure), and 'black humor' (a new mode of writing typified by formal innovation and a fusion of comedy and heavy irony). Subsequently, there was a tendency for the distinct qualities of the anti-heroic figure to be ignored, as David Galloway suggests in *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (1970): "we have perhaps slighted what may well be the most important development in contemporary American fiction."[2]

The impetus behind this book is to present a more comprehensive and less selective analysis of the 1960s novel. Rather than continue in the critical tradition of analyzing the extent to which such texts adhere to a predominantly post-structuralist agenda, I wish to elucidate the fact that the 1960s novel is often a strongly humanist and politically engaged form. We also need to consider the fact that with over thirty years having elapsed between the 1960s and the present, it is now possible for the critic to achieve a greater and more beneficial distance between themselves and the text. This ability to analyze the novels of the 1960s in a specific historical context allows us to present a more comprehensive reading of them, as Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh

suggest in *Modern Literary Theory* (1989): "There is . . . no absolute and autonomous literary text."[3]

The seeming lack of any historical contextualization of the 1960s novel is an obvious result of the very contemporary nature of literary criticism of the 1960s and 1970s. This criticism tends to focus on a post-structuralist, postmodernist reading of the novel born from deconstructionist theory such as Derrida's "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" (1966) and Barthes' "The Death of the Author" (1968). Many of the central principles of these two essays come to dominate subsequent literary discussion, being particularly evident in the work on 'Metafiction' and 'Surfiction' that Raymond Federman and Robert Scholes instigate during the 1970s.

Critics, such as Raymond Federman, Robert Scholes, Ronald Sukenick, Tony Tanner, and Helen Weinberg (alongside many others), have emphasized the absurd qualities of the 1960s novel, suggesting that its primary purpose is to express the disconnection or alienation that has occurred between the individual and society, as Weinberg proposes:

> The world view of the absurdity novel sees the complete disjunction between the social-political systems of men in the world and a system of higher being: the focus of this novel's world view is on this disjunction. To live acquiescent to the terms of this world is to be passive; to allow the nonbeing of worldly routines and reasons to encroach upon the life of the self and its possibilities for true being is to become a victim.[4]

These more negative critics propose that characters in novels of the 1960s either allow, or are incapable of halting, such a process of 'nonbeing' to occur. In such a reading, these characters become pitiable victims whom the reader is able to empathize with, but not admire. Certainly, such an interpretation is possible with characters like Billy Pilgrim in *Slaughterhouse 5* (1969) or Joseph Yossarian in *Catch-22* (1961). It is possible to construe these novels as suggesting that the larger processes of society literally send the individual insane by reducing their possibility for self-actualization.

Weinberg suggests that the protagonists of the contemporary novel are in the absurd tradition of Kafka's characters, embodying similar qualities such as "arrest, guilt, self-victimization, alienation, and the inability to use freedom positively and creatively."[5] While Weinberg's thesis is a strong one, she often sidelines the positive humanitarian elements of the 1960s protagonist. For example, in the preface she

concedes that the contemporary novel "[is] not entirely without some hope for the lives of men."[6] Weinberg's occasional, and brief, allusions to the humanism and idealism of 1960s fiction creates a sense of ambivalence in the reader, wherein the cursory references made toward the positive elements of the 1960s novel work to undermine the validity of the predominant reading.

While it is useful to consider the concepts of metafiction and surfiction in order to explicate their similarity to the anti-heroic form, it is important not to underestimate the significance of the anti-heroic figure itself. Certainly, surfiction and metafiction share many characteristics in common with those novels that foreground the anti-heroic figure. Fundamentally, both are born out of a rebellious desire to subvert what the author (or the reader) considers the standard conventions of fiction.[7]

More specifically, surfiction's reliance upon an intruding narrative voice, as a means of highlighting the subjectivity of fictive reality, reverberates with the 1960s anti-hero's foregrounding of the (equally subjective) nature of the codes that determine what is heroic or unheroic. Furthermore, the notion that reality is no longer understandable, and that history is just a fiction, finds literal embodiment within contemporary anti-heroic figures such as Billy Pilgrim in Kurt Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse 5* and Jack Crabb in Thomas Berger's revisionist Western *Little Big Man* (1964). The characters in both books experience 'real life' events from American history (the Second World War and life on the American frontier) in a manner that reconfigures them as being more mundane than the grandiloquence some history books might suggest, as Crabb recalls of his bison hunting days in Berger's book:

> You got to consider them things before you get to blaming us hunters, the way I see it. We was just trying to make a living, and all we cared about was the market price of hides. Sometimes you get the idea from accounts of this enterprise, wrote by men who wasn't there, that the great army of hunters went out to exterminate every bison on the continent so as to clean up the range for cattle grazing, or to whip the Indians by destroying their source of wild food. These things happened, of course, but it wasn't by our plan. We was just a bunch of fellows carrying Sharps rifles.[8]

While John Barth's infamous statement that literature had reached a state of 'exhaustion'[9] might seem to suggest that the more traditional, 'naturalist' elements of the novel were becoming outdated, the

similarity between the anti-hero and metafiction might, instead, indicate that there is a link between 'naturalist' character-based novels and 'postmodern' characterless novels. Indeed, it is possible to explain the assimilation of many elements of the anti-heroic figure in both metafiction and surfiction by seeing them as the result of applying the ideology behind the anti-heroic figure to the structure and form of the novel as a whole.

In his essay "The Great American Joke,"[10] scholar Louis D. Rubin Jr. suggests that central to all humor is the juxtaposition of an ideal with the reality of life: "The essence of comedy is incongruity." Rubin goes on to propose that this sense of incongruity "lies at the heart of American experience" (*WSF*, 109), and is therefore more central to the literature of America than to that of any other country:

> The clash between the ideal and the real, between value and fact, is of course not an exclusively American motif. Cervantes rang the changes on it in Don Quixote, and Aristophanes before him. But a society based theoretically upon the equality of all men, yet made up of human beings very unequal in individual endowment, and containing within it many striking social, economic and racial differences, is more than ordinarily blessed with such problems in human and social definition, and the incongruities are likely to be especially observable. (116)

Such a statement has connotations for the evocation of the anti-heroic within literature, for there is no better embodiment of this conflict between 'the ideal and the real' than that which exists in a figure essentially directed toward foregrounding "the incongruity between mundane circumstance and heroic ideal" (113). Just as Rubin analyzes a peculiarly American brand of humor; claiming that it "arises out of the gap between the cultural ideal and the everyday fact, with the ideal shown to be somewhat hollow and hypocritical" (115), so the same could be said of the texts that will be considered in this book.

When Joseph Campbell proposes in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1948) that "the democratic ideal of the self-determining individual, the invention of the power-driven machine, and the development of the scientific method of research, have so transformed human life that the long-inherited, timeless universe of symbols has collapsed,"[11] his words seem to reverberate with the decline of the heroic figure in postwar American fiction. Similarly, Lilian R. Furst and James D. Wilson suggest in their introduction to *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (1976): "the anti-heroic mode [has become]

the only viable form of moral and social honesty left available."[12] Furst and Wilson imply that the loss of faith in the heroic ideal has been such that "the individual who embodies the 'official' aspirations and platitudes of his culture . . . seem to the discerning reader more ridiculous than the 'honest' anti-heroes of Sartre, Camus, Salinger, or Heller."[13] Such a rejection of the heroic ideal as little more than "instruments of propaganda and self-congratulation"[14] pervades the counterculture of the 1960s, which challenges the ideology behind such figures both inside and outside of fiction.[15]

At this point, it is interesting to reexamine the (common) suggestion that the 1960s anti-hero has strong ties to Romanticism, as Theodore Roszak suggests in *The Making of a Counter Culture* (1968): "the counterculture draws from a . . . Romantic *Weltschmerz*."[16] While at first it may appear that Romantic fiction continued in a heroic tradition, many critics suggest that Romantic literature can be seen as a significant staging post in the development of the anti-heroic, as Lilian R. Furst notes in her article "The Romantic Hero, or Is He an Anti-Hero?" "[The Hero's] pre-eminence in the writings of the Romantic period is such as to have given rise to the contention that there was in the Romantic movement a distinctive heroic tradition."[17]

In *Love and Death in the American Novel* (1960), critic Leslie Fiedler suggests that Romanticism is responsible for giving birth to popular, widespread support for the anti-heroic. Fiedler proposes that the Romantic movement introduces the rebellious concept that "Whatever has been suspect, outcast, and denied is postulated as the source of good."[18]

However, while Romanticism may have been responsible for popularizing the anti-heroic, the Romantic hero differs from the 1960s anti-hero by virtue of his appearance and elevated position:

> Both his handsomeness and his freedom from mundane concerns raise him to the level of an idealised glamorous figure sharply distinguished from the characteristic modern anti-hero with his petty subsistence-level anxieties, his frequent physical imperfections, his embroilment in the grotesque messiness of day-to-day living. All this is alien to the Romantic hero who exists . . . on a lofty mountain-top high above everyday reality.[19]

Perhaps most significant to the context of this study is Furst's suggestion that while "the Romantic period still wanted a hero, what it actually got was something of a hybrid with features of both hero and

anti-hero."[20] Such a statement seems to resemble the counterculture's own ambiguous position, for while 1960s writers present us with supposedly anti-heroic figures these self-same characters frequently possess admirable elements. This suggests that a desire for the heroic remains, but one that is devoid of its typical, grandiloquent trappings. Rather than supporting the idea that the Romantic hero is an earlier 'unrecognized' incarnation of the anti-hero it may be more accurate to view it as a necessary precondition for the twentieth-century emergence of the figure; as a kind of catalyst for the creation of the 1960s anti-hero.

In contrast to the anti-hero of the 1960s, who often exorcizes his inner torment through an act of humanitarian rebellion, the Romantic hero takes the reverse course of action: "His absorption in his own inner problems also undermines the force of his much vaunted rebellion in that his primary confrontation is with himself rather than society."[21] The rebellion of the Romantic hero stops at the level of the self, meaning its effect can only ever be as "a disruptive, indeed destructive force."[22] Whereas the anti-hero of the 1960s enters into a dialogue with the mainstream, for he perceives that he can do more social and moral good this way.

Indeed, in many ways the insular nature of the Romantic hero serves to reinforce the dialogizing aspect of the 1960s anti-hero—a theme this book explores further by analyzing the extent to which 1960s examples of the anti-heroic utilize previously 'heroic' figures, deconstructing and delegitimizing them, in order to form a discourse with the mainstream on a range of issues perceived as imperative to the well-being of both society and the individual. Seemingly anticipating the process by which the 1960s counterculture would challenge the majority by 'disinheriting' its heroic figures, Campbell states that "the modern individual . . . must not wait for his community to cast off its slough of pride, fear, rationalized avarice, and sanctified misunderstanding . . . It is not society that is to guide and save . . . but precisely the reverse."[23] In their turning away from society, 1960s anti-heroes follow in a tradition established by literary figures such as Huckleberry Finn (1884) and Ahab (1851). Such characters place the self-determination of the individual above the status quo of the state. For example, Huckleberry Finn's sentiments often express a questioning of the traditional path that others have chosen: "I couldn't see no advantage in going where she was going, so I made up my mind I wouldn't try for it."[24]

In the case of the anti-hero of the 1960s it is the questioning aspect of rebellion that advances the figure beyond any point he would have

been able to reach by merely refusing to prolong his adherence to a system of oppression, be it physical or ideological. By exceeding the boundaries established for him by his antagonist the anti-hero demands that he is treated as an equal. What may have originally been nothing more than an adamant resistance on the part of the anti-hero against the oppressive nature of 'the system' becomes the very personification of the figure as he begins to value a humanistic self-respect above everything else, proclaiming that it is preferable even to life itself. The French Philosopher Albert Camus notes the importance of this humanitarian awakening in *The Rebel* (1951), suggesting that it "becomes, for him, the supreme blessing."[25] Camus' musings on the humanitarian, ontological rebel find resonance in the 1960s anti-hero. For every rebellion that the 1960s anti-hero encourages, performs or otherwise induces—be it large or small, actual or metaphysical, success or failure—functions in the same important manner, as a vehement critical challenge to a particular establishment's ideological values or systems, echoing the Camusian belief that "Not every value leads to rebellion, but every rebellion tacitly invokes a value."[26]

Camus' theories appear to work toward an ideal of community as a prerequisite for utopian contentment. Camus rejects the nihilistic notion of a deconstructive, decentered universe in favor of a more idealized belief in a community of atheistic humanity. While he acknowledges that the absurdity of the modern condition could lead to suicide and despair, Camus suggests the need for an ideological approach that would utilize the strength of interdependence and community in order "to find the means to proceed beyond nihilism."[27]

It is through this belief in a compassionate polytheism that Camus most significantly breaks from earlier existentialist thinkers, such as Nietzsche, and becomes increasingly relevant to the humanism embodied by so many 1960s anti-hero figures. Nietzsche's attempts to combat the problem of nihilism resulted in a turning inward that promoted the concept of the isolated, superior individual; 'the *Ubermensch*' and 'Will to Power'. While this individualist approach suited Nietzsche's anti-Christian ideology, its inherent endorsement of the 'great individual' is problematic as far as the more communal 1960s anti-hero is concerned. In contrast to Nietzsche, Camus' existentialism espouses such a communitarian position that views the shared suffering of humanity as a possible means of finding value, as John notes, "[Camus' works] manifest the fraternity of suffering by which men are united."[28]

From his earliest writing, Camus explores the positive force of human relationships: "Human relationships always help us to carry on because they always presuppose further developments, a future—and also because we live as if our only task was precisely to have relationships with other people."[29] Much of Camus' work espouses a kind of communal existentialism, which does not focus primarily on the individual, but rather the individual as a constituent part of a larger psychic community of humankind.

Camus' writing also suggests possibilities for a secular community that exists outside of, and often in opposition to, religion of any sort. In much of his work, Camus depicts a communal sense of justice and a universal commitment to human value. Such a sentiment is evident in his beliefs that hope

> [i]s awakened, revived, nourished by millions of solitary individuals whose deeds and works every day negate frontiers and the crudest implications of history. As a result there shines forth fleetingly the ever-threatened truth that each and every man, on the foundations of their own suffering and joy, builds for all.[30]

In *The Rebel,* Camus explores the belief that human choices contain a moral dimension that endows them with ethical authority, as Doubrovsky proposes, "It is easy to see how an ontology such as this can affect ethics. Vital participation is both act and value."[31] For Camus, these moral concerns are discernible in the exercise of human judgment that the rebel or act of rebellion invokes. The logical extension of which is the existence of a humanitarian link between all individuals, a kind of 'imagined community' whose sense of togetherness is based on a belief in harmony and justice with intuition functioning as a means of truth:

> Camus moves in the opposite direction when at the end of *The Rebel*, he says that "in order to be a man" one "must refuse to be God"; when he breaks away from the ultimate ambition of heroism, it is because he is not thinking in terms of a closed, circular ethic; it is because all his thought tends to define an ethic of "openness" to the world and to others, an ethic of participation.[32]

Doubrovsky's suggestion that Camus denounces an exclusive hierarchy of the divine linked to heroism is obviously significant in the context of this book. For such a sentiment finds a clear voice in the 1960s anti-hero who reflects an ethic of inclusiveness, an 'openness to the world', and encourages the individual to actively participate in the decision-making processes that affect their lives.

It is important to note the general influence of existentialism on contemporary American thought as it forms a guiding principle in the resurgence of the anti-heroic form. The critic Richard Lehan comprehensively details this relationship when talking about the similarities between postwar continental and American fiction:

> Despite the variety of technique, despite the eclectic nature of American existentialism, there is a distinct similarity of theme in continental and American fiction which, it seems to me, goes beyond mere accident. Both orders of fiction reveal the hero functioning in a moral vacuum, a law unto himself, the society a prison restraining his free and natural impulses; both orders of fiction depict the reality of death, a centripetal universe folding in upon the hero, and the feeling of ethical abandonment which accompanies the realization that all activity is directed toward no ethical purpose; both depict the shock of moral recognition which accompanies the realization that the world is absurd and that one has been complicit in its malfunctioning; both extol the sensualist who tries to order his sensations in such a way that the moment says no to death; both express the feelings of loneliness and abandonment which come with the loss of the family and traditional beliefs and values; both employ forms of the demonic and dislocated hero, the Antichrist and conqueror of God, the outsider in search of identity.[33]

Lehan's suggestion that existentialist ideology permeates into the pages of postwar fiction appears accurate if we examine the links between the concept of rebellion presented in Camus' *The Rebel* and that which is acted out by the 1960s anti-hero. The anti-hero incorporates the Camusian proposition that revolt is of central importance in achieving social justice belying the notion that although man's destiny may frequently be in question, man himself is not. This Camusian concept of rebellion undoubtedly finds great support in postwar America, chiming with an American fictional proclivity for the human, as Doubrovsky notes: "I would venture to say that it is not *in spite of* his atheistic humanism, but *because of* it, that Camus is so popular [in America]."[34]

With the figure's incorporation of existentialist tenets and movement toward encouraging a more communal form of rebellion, it may be reasonable to suggest that the 1960s witnessed the creation of a new version of the heroic, distinct from previous types within the novel form. In *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Lilian R. Furst and James D. Wilson note "the intricate relationship between the appearance of the anti-hero and the evolution of various literary genres."[35] They go on to propose that as "tragedy has . . . become an

inappropriate genre [in the postwar era] what we have instead is 'metaphysical farce', a modern hybrid of Classical tragedy and comedy that finds itself 'unable . . . to use heroes'."[36] The suggestion is that there has been such a significant shift in thinking following the postwar period that the forms that once supported the heroic can now only be judged as archaic or obsolete. In their place the anti-heroic comes to fruition as an appropriate model for the representation of twentieth-century themes such as dissidence and individualist alienation. Critic Ihab Hassan notes in his essay "The Antihero in Modern British and American Fiction" (written in 1959) that "[The anti-hero] has remained at the center of our twentieth-century consciousness, and it has impelled the radical vision, the irony, order, and extremity of despair that have come to be associated with that century."[37]

Ken Kesey's novel *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) epitomizes the influence that the anti-heroic had on novel form during the 1960s. The structure of the text is created by the conflict between two recurring character types, the outsider figure of Randle P. McMurphy and the authoritarian Miss Ratched ('Big Nurse'), who has control over the patients in the ward. Over the course of the story, we see anti-heroic McMurphy move from a position of relative distance from the other patients to the one in which the character is willing to forego escape from the hospital in order to stay with them, even though he is likely to suffer greatly for it. The narrator of the novel, Chief Bromden, suggests that it was "like he'd signed on for the whole game and there wasn't any way of his breaking his contract."[38] McMurphy uses rebellion—converting the TV room into a gambling den, organizing a fishing trip which takes the men out of the ward, acquiring prostitutes for the other patients—in order to expose the inanity of the Big Nurse's rules: "lordy, can you imagine? Teeth bein' brushed at six-thirty, six-twenty—who can tell? Maybe even six o'clock."[39] Indeed, McMurphy's unsuccessful attempt to lift the control panel forms a symbolic call to arms, revealing to his fellow patients that they don't have to suffer at the hands of 'the system' as they have been doing: "But I tried, though," he says. "Goddammit, I sure as hell did that much, now, didn't I?"[40]

While it is possible to read the patients' inability to rebel (until the anti-heroic figure of McMurphy arrives) as an allegory of American society's own inability to rebel until the 1960s counterculture 'freed' them through a decade of hedonism, rebellion and personal enlightenment, such an interpretation may also be an oversimplification of real historical conditions. Indeed, as critics such as Christopher Gair have suggested, it is naive to believe that the countercultural

movement happened in any kind of social and historical vacuum. Instead, we should think more in terms of a gradual ripening of discontent that became increasingly widespread as various groups (and the media) recognized their shared sense of dissatisfaction with the present American hegemony. To reflect this 'snowballing' effect it may be pertinent to refer back to actions and events within the 1950s (and before) to elucidate the reasons for the proliferation of anti-heroic figures in the fiction of the 1960s.

Within the confines of the twentieth century it was the chaotic events of the Second World War, and its' far-reaching reverberations, that most challenged people to reevaluate their support for the value systems of the culture in which they lived. This reassessment of hegemony involved a critique of heroic figures thought to embody the values of the state, as Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. notes in his essay, "The Decline of Heroes": "The Second World War was the climax of an epoch of living dangerously . . . it is no surprise that it precipitated a universal revulsion against greatness."[41] The attempt to propagate hero worship that had arisen around figures such as Hitler and Stalin (figures who with hindsight embodied qualities that were contrary to all previously held notions of the hero) inevitably led to a vehement moral questioning of the notion of the heroic ideal. The idea that one man could, or should ever achieve the level of hero worship previously encouraged by the individualism of capitalism began to arouse suspicion and dissent in those who had witnessed the extreme manifestations of such an ideology brought to life. In this manner, it could be suggested that the events of the Second World War, and the misguided allegiances of the supporters of fascism, forever undermined the notion of following one's leader in good faith, effectively burying the hero figure whose "distinctiveness depended on the force of his personal achievement, on the concepts of glory and honour, on noble sacrifice for God, for King, for Country."[42]

While the Second World War damaged belief in the concept of the great individual, it also served to universalize an anti-heroic sentiment that had long been implicit within American ideology—one that perceived an innate conflict existing between the concepts of hero worship and true democracy, as Daniel Boorstin suggests in *The Image, or What Happened to the American Dream* (1961):

> American democracy is embarrassed in the charismatic presence. We fear the man on horseback, the demi-god, or the dictator . . . Our most admired national heroes—Franklin, Washington, Lincoln—are generally supposed to possess the "common touch." We revere them,

> not because they possess charisma, divine favour, a grace or talent granted them by god because they embody popular virtues. We admire them, not because they reveal God, but because they reveal and elevate ourselves.[43]

As a reflection of this new mode of thought, the hero is replaced by a flawed but essentially spiritually intact everyman figure who allows for the empowerment of the individual without the problematic elitism that marked earlier fictional models. Indeed, it is a significant indication of the growing schism between those in American society that just as the country is able to assume a role consistent with the heroic vision, its writers take a U-turn, rejecting the grandiloquence of the conventional heroic figure, and opting instead for the comic everyman, represented in the form of the anti-heroic—reflecting a climate in which "Everywhere, the tragic and heroic were out of fashion."[44]

The intrinsic and interconnected relationship between the war and the anti-heroic is reflected in much of the writing of the 1960s. Many novels of this period, such as *Catch-22*, Kurt Vonnegut's *Mother Night* (1961), and *Slaughterhouse 5,* are set directly during wartime.[45] Alternatively, for many protagonists, such as Reinhart in Thomas Berger's *Reinhart in Love* (1962), Sammler in Saul Bellow's *Mr. Sammler's Planet* (1970), Luke in Donn Pearce's *Cool Hand Luke* (1966), and the patients in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest,* the war has had some lasting, often detrimental, psychological effect. Indeed, for these characters the war seems to mark a turning point in society, one in which conventional morality is inverted as liberty, and individual freedom is either eroded away, or replaced with a marked centralization of power within the state.

In their rejection of war, the lineage of the 1960s anti-hero can be traced back to the protagonists of Ernest Hemingway's novels. While heroic figures before Hemingway traditionally confronted death in battle, Harold Lubin suggests that characters within Hemingway "find no fulfilment in the impersonal mass slaughter of modern warfare."[46] In the writer's most famous war-based novel *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), the central character of Lieutenant Frederic Henry literally rejects the war by deserting the battlefield and running away with his sweetheart Catherine Barkley to safety in Switzerland. Instead of 'realizing' themselves within the sphere of war, which now offers no chance for nobility, Hemingway's characters find personal satisfaction in other physical activities that are shown to allow the individual a greater sense of self-determination such as bullfighting in *Death in*

the Afternoon (1932) or big-game hunting as featured in *The Green Hills of Africa* (1935). These characters' rejection of modern warfare, and their subsequent assertion of the importance of active rebellion, continues to resonate within the anti-hero of the 1960s, as Lubin notes: "The self-consciousness about a proper style of life as the only protection against life itself was one of Hemingway's distinctive contributions to anti-hero literature."[47]

The titular character of Pearce's *Cool Hand Luke* epitomizes contemporary frustration with the direction American society seemed to be heading following the Second World War. The novel presents us with a character that has fought in the war but does not agree with or support its causes. We are told that Luke is a decorated war veteran, "two Purple Hearts, a Bronze Star and a Silver Star,"[48] but has "no Good Conduct Medals," and incongruously "had been given company punishment on a number of occasions" (*CHL*, 37). Luke's problem appears to be the moral confusion he experiences concerning his country's determination to construct a society based on wartime values. He dislikes society's practice of elevating those who proved to be the most effective soldiers despite the unsuitability of their skills in fashioning a stable and healthful peacetime society: "And how come after ah had to do all this burnin' and killin' they made *me* out somethin' special? Music, speeches, flags, medals? Hell, ah was Good Guy Number One" (237–238).

Somewhat ironically it could be suggested that the transferral of a specifically military service–based anomie to a much larger sector of society happened largely as a result of America's supercilious nationalist confidence following its victory in the Second World War; a sentiment epitomized by Lyndon B. Johnson's proclamation in his inaugural speech, "Is a new world coming? We welcome it—and we will bend it to the hopes of man."[49] Johnson's apparent bravado marks the culmination of a growth in American self-confidence as it emerged as *the* major world power at the end of the war. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill famously commented in his 1946 "Iron Curtain" speech that "The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power,"[50] and columnist Walter Lippman speculated that "What Rome was to the ancient world, what Great Britain has been to the modern world, America is to be to the world of tomorrow."[51] Lippman's comparison is perhaps the more apt, for just as the imperial expansion of Rome and Britain involved the use of oppression in the pursuit of controlling and recreating its own ideals in others, so it was that America's gaze began to extend to remote lands that it perceived were a threat to its own capitalist values. This ideological

imperialism would manifest itself in a Cold War between the United States and the countries that it saw as a communist threat, primarily the Soviet Union, Korea,[52] and later Cuba.[53]

America's concerted attempt to eliminate everything it saw as a threat through the process of homogenization did not stop at the level of foreign policy, rather, as historians, such as Elaine Tyler May[54] and Larry May,[55] have persuasively documented, America's Cold War policies accompanied a set of equally constrictive domestic strategies. Braunstein and Doyle highlight the McCarthy hearings as a case in point: "There were of course the well-publicised witch-hunts for enemies of the state presumed to be working within our midst. While the mania to expose and purge 'card-carrying' communists and their 'fellow traveller' sympathisers undermined the very civil liberties that made up the foundation of a self-described liberal democracy."[56]

The postwar hegemonic conviction (exemplified by McCarthyism) that certain ideologies were detrimental to the very fabric of American society undoubtedly contributed to the decline of a traditional American pluralist ideal. For the 'original' belief in "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"[57] no longer sat well in a climate in which an institution such as the House Un-American Activities Committee asserted that there was only one true and proper way to be an American.[58]

The pervasiveness of a homogenizing ideology in the United States during the postwar era means that, though Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. declares mid-century for the American citizen "[t]he century of the common man has come into his own,"[59] the amount of freedom the individual possessed was often relatively small. Though the level of collective expression appears to have risen during the postwar period, with 'watershed' events, such as the university protests, the civil rights and feminist movements, suggesting that the 'regular' person had risen to a position of self-determining, ideological prominence. At the same time, the 'technologizing' of contemporary society meant that many individuals were increasingly becoming dispensable parts of a larger capitalist and industrialist system,[60] as Schlesinger notes:

> The bureaucratisation of American life, the decline of the working class, the growth of the white-collar class, the rise of suburbia—all this has meant the increasing homogeneity of American society. Though we continue to speak of ourselves as rugged individualists, our actual life has grown more and more collective and anonymous.[61]

Significantly, occasional dissenting voices did start to rise during the 1950s, particularly in the literature of authors such as J.D. Salinger

(*The Catcher in the Rye* [1951]), Ralph Ellison (*The Invisible Man* [1952]), and Jack Kerouac (*On the Road* [1957]). These texts insinuated themselves into public discourse by questioning the invasive conditions,[62] exemplifying Herbert Marcuse's suggestion in *One Dimensional Man* (1964) that

> [t]he fact that the vast majority of the population accepts, and is made to accept, this society does not render it less irrational and less reprehensible. The distinction between true and false consciousness, real and immediate interest still is meaningful. But this distinction itself must be validated. Men must come to see it and to find their way from false to true consciousness, from their immediate to their real interest. They can do so only if they live in need of changing their way of life, of denying the positive, of refusing.[63]

The sense that society was becoming too homogenized and impersonal leads to a critique of increasing levels of mechanization and an adoption of the notion of 'irrational rationality'. Irrational rationality attempts to deconstruct the enlightenment myth of an objective, scientific consciousness, as Lewis Mumford suggests in *The Myth of the Machine* (1967), "Since ritual order has now largely passed into mechanical order, the present revolt of the younger generation against the machine has made a practice of promoting disorder and randomness."[64] This implicit endorsement of the anarchistic is evident in the ongoing tension between the individualist qualities of McMurphy and the homogenizing, technocratic impulses of the Big Nurse in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.*

McMurphy's individualist rebellion echoes an earlier notion of selfhood that is evident in the Beat movement of the 1950s. Indeed, one of the clearest manifestations of 1950s dissent, and perhaps *the* major instance of the anti-heroic form before the 1960s, is to be found within the literature of the Beats. The high profile of members of the movement, such as authors Jack Kerouac, Allen Ginsberg, William S. Burroughs, and nonconformist figures Neal Cassady, Gary Snyder, and Lawrence Ferlinghetti, served to elevate the Beats to a position of ideological prominence within mainstream society though it is questionable whether their numbers ever approached the status of a fully formed 'Beat Generation'. The Beat's vehement condemnation of Cold War militarism, anti-communist sentiment, racial segregation, social regimentation, and rampant consumerism foreshadows many of the themes that the counterculture of the 1960s would attack in their own rebellion. Edward J. Rielly suggests in *The 1960s* (2003): "The line

of descent from Beats to hippies is traced through such common ground as support for peace, love, drugs, and sexual freedom, and opposition to conformity and received authority."[65]

Just as the ideological beliefs of the Beats foreshadowed that of the 1960s counterculture, so the fiction produced by Beat authors prefigured many of the themes and motifs that would be instrumental in the work of 1960s writers. Beat literature, such as John Clellon Holmes' *Go* (1952), Kerouac's series of novels,[66] and Burrough's *Junkie* (1953) and *Naked Lunch* (1959), dealt with issues that would become integral to novels of the following decade. Perhaps most significantly, in writing the seminal *On the Road*, Kerouac presents a template used, albeit in an adapted form, by many later 1960s anti-heroic texts.[67] Kerouac's story follows the character of Sal Paradise as he and his friends (made up of a selection of thinly veiled versions of his fellow Beatniks)[68] travel on four separate road trips across America, visiting Colorado, California, Virginia, New York, and Mexico.

Kerouac's novel seems to have acted as a consolidating force for postwar disillusionment concerning the heroic ideal, and the increasingly bureaucratic, conformist, and above all 'un-American', direction the country was perceived to be heading in.[69] Ann Charters notes that "Challenging the complacency and prosperity of postwar America hadn't been Kerouac's intent when he wrote his novel, but he had created a book that heralded a change of consciousness in the country."[70] In such a reading Sal Paradise's journeys across America become quests, testing the existence of the American Dream: "trying to pin down its promise of unlimited freedom by following the example of Dean Moriarty.[71] The anti-heroic, as it is manifested within Dean, becomes "the dream's reality,"[72] and Paradise's inclination toward Dean reflects the emergent counterculture's love for the rebel.

In "The Anti-Hero in Contemporary Literature" (1967), Joseph E. Brewer discusses the perceptible link between the anti-heroic characters of *On the Road* and those of later fictions. Brewer proposes that Sal Paradise and Dean Moriarty attempt to leave American society behind completely, refusing to engage in any meaningful and potentially transformative sense with the mainstream; they instead "glory in their own system."[73] This conscious decision to exclude themselves from the structures of the American hegemony indicates an important difference between Kerouac's characters and many of the anti-heroes of the 1960s novel, which are often distinctly more dialectical in their approach. Characters such as Randle P. McMurphy, Cool Hand Luke, and Eliot Rosewater in Kurt Vonnegut's *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* (1965) enter into a dialogue

with the mainstream, confronting it head-on in an attempt to change it for the better.

While the desired ends of the rebellion instigated by Kerouac's characters may be decidedly more self-contained than that sought by the 1960s anti-hero, both sets of characters frequently do share a longing to "run away from marriage and responsibility";[74] to escape from a concept of civilization gendered as female and therefore thought of as negative. This wish for an escape from the domestic 'womanly' sphere intensifies in the 1960s novel, often manifesting in a misogynistic rejection of everything associated with the female of the species. For example, Eddie Felson in Walter Tevis' *The Hustler* (1959) and Harry Angstrom in John Updike's *Rabbit Run* (1960) both feel dissatisfied with, and subsequently leave, their wives, while an array of critics have highlighted the deeply unflattering depiction of women in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* as either oppressive matriarchs or welcoming prostitutes. Indeed, it is interesting to note that while writers, such as Joan Didion, Sylvia Plath, and Margaret Walker Alexander, brought a female perspective to the forms of journalism, autobiography and the extended essay, the novel remained predominantly masculine in orientation throughout the whole of the 1960s. This resistance may be due to the fact that "the counterculture was predominantly white and male"[75] or a reflection of an implicit sexism within many areas of the movement: "It was often, indeed, not only predominantly male but openly sexist…women were commonly 'chicks'; when they were in relationships with men, they were 'old ladies'."[76] Women remained largely excluded from the decision-making processes of the counterculture just as they had been subjugated in the mainstream. James J. Farrell notes how "[The] SDS had welcomed women, but not as leaders. The Free Speech Movement defined itself mainly in masculine terms. By focusing upon male opposition to the draft, the resistance implicitly excluded women from the most radical aspects of the antiwar movement."[77] Such chauvinistic attitudes meant that although the counterculture sought to radicalize the novel, they did not, or would not, consider the radical power of presenting central female anti-heroic characters.[78]

While *On the Road* prefigures the anti-heroic novel of the 1960s in a general ideological sense, the character of Dean Moriarty can be seen as a specific prototype for many aspects of the 'reduced' or subverted heroic figure of the 1960s.[79] Indeed Kerouac's presentation of Moriarty as a hybrid between "some kind of angel or archangel come down to this world"[80] and "the cowboy crashing"[81] gives the character a strong thematic connection to a range of 1960s

anti-heroic characters that subvert iconic heroic archetypes of American culture.[82]

At this point, it seems pertinent to note the influence of the satirical American writer Nathanael West on the 1960s anti-hero. For West's novels seem almost solely devoted to examining the conflicts inherent within American cultural ideals.[83] They expose the incongruity between these ideals and the reality of contemporary society, as R.K. Sharma suggests, "The mode of comedy West employs is black, violent and grotesque and in his novel he dramatizes the American dream of liberty and the pursuit of happiness being turned into an illusion by corrupting and destroying means of a selfish society."[84] In a move that directly foreshadows anti-heroic novels of the 1960s, West's fiction often contains characters that reconfigure traditional heroic archetypes. Miss Lonelyhearts is a version of the 'Christlike' savior figure while Lemuel Pitkin is an adaptation of the Horatio Alger 'rags to riches' figure. West does this in order to invoke a reevaluation of the ideology behind the prototype, as Sharma confirms, "[West's characters are] created to satirize the age-long cultural and intellectual traditions [of America]."[85]

In the novel of the 1960s, we see a reengagement with many of America's heroic archetypes through their transmutation into an anti-heroic form. Countercultural writers begin to utilize the established and potent symbolic power of these iconic figures in order to attack many of the societal values they perceive to be negative. This interaction with heroic American archetypes is not limited to the novel. For example, the pop band The Charlatans models itself on the cowboy figure of the American West; something they see as being "authentically American."[86] While Ken Kesey occupies much of his time on the Merry Prankster's psychedelic trip across America sitting atop their bus reading aloud from Captain America comics. Within the novel this subversion of national iconography seems to center on critiquing mainstream WASP assumptions behind three major facets of American life; religion—through subversions of the Christ or Christlike figure, the national proclivity toward violence—through subversions of the cowboy figure, and support for capitalist ideologies—through subversions of the entrepreneurial or big business figure.

While it is true that many in the counterculture chose to attack established national heroic ideals this is not to say that a straightforwardly 'heroic' idiom ceases to exist in the 1960s. The incongruous continuation of belief in a heroic ideal, even among those in the supposedly rebellious counterculture itself, is perhaps most evident

in the rhetoric surrounding one of the 1960s most important, and revered, figures—John F. Kennedy. While some commentators, such as Norman Mailer, saw Kennedy in a countercultural, anti-heroic mould, "Kennedy is a hipster,"[87] the general population's concept of the Kennedy administration was much closer to that of the heroic.

Indeed, many appropriated JFK, and his administration, in a particularly classical, Arthurian heroic mould; evident in Jackie Kennedy's plea following her husband's assassination, "[not to forget] that for one brief shining moment there was Camelot."[88] Such an appropriation consciously drew from romantic notions of the chivalric drawn from the myth of King Arthur and the Round Table, reconfiguring the position of president into that of a 'gallant knight'. Evan Thomas suggests,

> The Kennedy's [*sic*] found inspiration in Lord Tweedsmuir's description of statesmen who were "debonair and brilliant and brave"—and died young in battle—who "held to the old cavalier grace and wherever romance called…followed with careless gallantry." Two hours before he was shot to death in 1968, Robert Kennedy quoted Lord Tweedsmuir to a gaggle of newsmen standing outside his hotel suite in Los Angeles. "I like politics. It's an honorable adventure," Kennedy said. "That was Lord Tweedsmuir. Does anybody here know who he was?" The half-dozen reporters looked back in baffled silence.[89]

However, and as with previous (Christian) appropriations of Camelot, the reinvocation of such a monolithic mythos can often exclude the possibility of dialogue by serving to reassert or maintain a set of increasingly conservative values. Many within the counterculture thought this to be the case and subsequently began to reject the Kennedy administration believing that while the youthful president professed to have decidedly more libertarian goals than his predecessors he was in fact just better at lying to the general populace than they were, as Ellwood proposes, "Kennedy's liberalism eventually disappointed the era's activists. His anti-communism and his confrontational Cold War foreign policy, his all-too-deliberate speed on civil rights and poverty legislation, convinced many…that liberalism was merely the most human face of a dehumanising system."[90]

Though sectors of the counterculture were experiencing a nascent rejection of the Kennedy administration and its policies, by the latter half of 1962 the president's assassination in 1963 served, somewhat ironically, to bring the two together again. Indeed, this act both

crystallized a latent disillusionment felt by many within society and served as a catalyst for its expression through rebellion:

> Probably the Sixties would have happened more or less as they did (though one can argue how far JFK would have proceeded in Vietnam) with or without the assassination. The forces that goaded on the titanic struggles over race, that made the music and the counterculture, that set hardhats against peaceniks and fathers against sons, were already there in the emerging issues, the chemistry labs, and the demographics, like a fully formed fetus [*sic*] in the womb awaiting the trauma of birth. But the assassination was the birth pangs of that tempestuous child . . . Oswald's shot was indeed a trumpet blast marking the end of one *kairos* and the start of a new one under Uranus, the planet of revolutionary change.[91]

We do not know whether the widespread dissent of the 1960s coalesced as a result of the Kennedy assassination or merely intensified following the death of the president. Whatever may be the case, rebellion undoubtedly came to define the decade. Be it in the form of the New Left and SDS's rebellion against traditional politics, the women's liberation movement, the anti–Vietnam War protests, the civil rights crusade, or the hippie's rebellion against aspects of traditional lifestyle and culture, the 1960s witnessed an immense upsurge in insurgency against the American hegemony.

The contemporary interest in rebellion is evident in the work of Herbert Marcuse, whose theories came to both inform and reflect the ideology of the 1960s counterculture. In his most famous text *One Dimensional Man*, Marcuse draws from a range of sources to create a work that is immensely relevant to the period of its production. In the book, Marcuse utilizes the theories of Wilhelm Dilthey, Georg Lukács, and the *Geisteswissenschaftliche* movement of the early twentieth century, to inform his suggestion of the need for an educational philosophy and protest aimed at reinstating the human. Marcuse's tendency to look backward in order to elucidate the potential for humanist-centered rebellion in the present echoes the wider counterculture's penchant for reclaiming elements of America's history in order to support their own cause; a process that is evident in the subversion of heroic exemplars in the 1960s novel.

In *One Dimensional Man*, *Repressive Tolerance* (1965), and *An Essay on Liberation* (1969) Marcuse develops an idealistic philosophy centered on the belief that human, spiritual and emotional, fulfillment is of paramount importance to the well-being of society. Reitz suggests that "[Marcuse's] critical theory replaced the progress-orientated philosophy of history of Hegel and Marx with his ontological aesthetic,

developed upon the basis of classical German idealism following Kant, Schiller, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Dilthey, and Heidegger."[92] Marcuse's appreciation for a particular kind of existence centered on the importance of compassion for the human aligned him with the counterculture, leading many to consider him an "intransigent radical and ideologue for the Left."[93] Despite conservative opposition, Marcuse nevertheless received a great deal of support during the 1960s. Celebrated in the media as the "Father of the New Left," he wrote articles and gave lectures and advice to student radicals, who were willing to travel all over the world to see someone they considered to be culturally significant. Critic Douglas Kellner notes how "[Marcuse] travelled widely and his work was often discussed in the mass media, becoming one of the few American intellectuals to gain such attention."[94] Enamored with the counterculture, Marcuse's *An Essay on Liberation* sought to bring the movement to the world stage, and its celebration of contemporary liberation movements inevitably found great support among radicals. Indeed, the theorist's work lent an important "philosophical expression to ideas that circulated widely among young American dissidents, both political and cultural, in the 1960s"[95] while simultaneously undermining those within the establishment who sought to oppose them.

Although it is not explicit in the novels discussed in this book, the effect of Marcuse and his theories is evident in many sectors of the 1960s counterculture. It must therefore be considered to exert a significant influence over the fiction associated with the movement, as Farrell's comments suggest: "Students of the Sixties practiced 'the great refusal' that Marcuse preached, rejecting the consumerism and conformity of consensus culture, and enacting a vision of a society that encouraged multidimensional persons."[96] This influence is evident in the famous Port Huron statement of 1962. Written by Tom Hayden and the Students for a Democratic Society, the manifesto aimed to espouse the views of a young generation that was dissatisfied with the university system:

> The Port Huron statement was written by students who had learned from C. Wright Mills, Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, Albert Camus, and the communitarian anarchists. They adapted the work of these influential teachers to their own needs, creating in the process the eclectic and original spirit of the New Left.[97]

The implicit adoption of Marcuse's theories continues throughout the 1960s. The counterculture's rejection of the 'bombing morality'

of Vietnam in which an individual could destroy hundreds (if not thousands) of people through the push of a button echoed Marcuse's assertion that "to the degree to which the agent of destruction is a thing and the person is removed from the victim, guilt and the sense of guilt are reduced. One of the most effective barriers against cruelty and inhumanity has therefore collapsed."[98]

Marcuse's critique of the capitalist hegemony echoed the concerns of the 1960s counterculture, whose desire to move away from what they perceived as the totalitarian processes of society seemed to find philosophical justification in Marcuse's work. In *Eros and Civilization* (1955) Marcuse calls for a return to the 'pleasure principle' that is denied by society; a cry seemingly heeded by the 1960s hippie movement. Similarly, in *Repressive Tolerance* Marcuse advocates a coup by that minority in society in search of a true democracy that would authenticate every individual, regardless of race, culture, or age—a suggestion that echoes countercultural goals.

Marcuse's attempts to link his theory with radical politics (along with his support of reason in an age of postmodernity) have seen his work decline in favor in the latter part of the twentieth century. Kellner writes, "Marcuse has . . . a dialectical imagination that has fallen out of favor in an era that rejects totalizing thought and grand visions of liberation and social reconstruction."[99] However, in spite of his waning influence on subsequent philosophy (perhaps as a result of conservative authors such as Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate[100]) Marcuse remains important as a theoretical indicator of cultural trends, and it is on this line that I make use of his work.

While Marcuse and his writings are important as a representation of the general ideology of the 1960s counterculture, he also has a significant relevance to any analysis of 1960s fiction. In his writing, Marcuse continually suggests that art is a necessary catalyst for political change, suggesting that in both its polemical and aesthetic incarnation, art has the ability to expose the authentic qualities that may be lacking in contemporary human existence. Marcuse calls for a repositioning of art as a radical, critical force, "[proposing] the restoration of the *aesthetic dimension* as a source of cultural critique, political activism, and the guiding principles for the social organization of the future."[101] Marcuse's desire for a radical reappropriation of art has a historical precedent within the work of both Plato and Nietzsche, echoing the *Aristen-Metaphysik* of Nietzsche, which suggested that art could counter alienation in both an educational and political sense. It is not too much of a leap to suggest that such an aim is evident within the predominance of anti-heroic fictions that emerge

during the 1960s with writers evoking the anti-hero as a reflection of their Marcusian-like belief in the need for a more socially radical literature.

While Marcusian ideology definitely seems to inform much of the writing discussed in this book the lack of specific references to Marcuse, in the work of 1960s writers and their critics, is perhaps attributable to two significant factors. First, the ostensibly anti-intelligentsia, anarchistic attitude of much of the counterculture, exemplified by Ken Kesey and The Merry Pranksters, means that many 1960s writers were inherently unlikely to cite the influence of a philosopher such as Marcuse in their work. Interestingly, by the advent of the 1970s Marcuse is mentioned explicitly in fiction; with the narrator of Bellow's *Mr. Sammler's Planet* remarking that the central character "had been reading historians of civilization . . . Side excursions into Adorno, Marcuse and Norman O. Brown."[102] Second, the focus on an ironic, distanced mode of reading 1960s texts in literary criticism has traditionally excluded the possibility for the inclusion of Marcuse as a determining factor with the theorist's humanist and politically engaged theories refusing to adhere to the postmodern readings of critics such as Scholes and Federman.

The post-structuralist approach that critics, such as Federman, Scholes, and Weinberg, apply to the 1960s novel seems to owe much to a concept of the Nietzschean rejection of universal metanarratives—the notion that "[t]here are no facts, only interpretations," as Patricia Waugh notes,

> "Strong" deconstructive postmodernism probably begins with Nietzsche's critique of metaphysics. In a famous statement in The Genealogy of Morals, he declared that "There is only a perspectival knowing" (Nietzsche 1969:111, 3). He suggests that we are deluded in our belief that we can find universal metanarratives which may ground knowledge or ethics.[103]

In its adoption and application of Nietzsche's rejection of metanarratives on to the 1960s novel, post-structuralist criticism tends to interpret such literature as inherently skeptical; extolling the absurdist notion that 'we can't know anything for certain'. Post-structural critics propose that part of this skepticism manifests itself in a knowing sort of irony in the novel of which the anti-hero is undoubtedly a part.

Given the proclivity toward Nietzschean ideology in such readings it is interesting to note that a less postmodernist reading of Nietzsche, such as the one carried out by Colin Wilson in *The Outsider* (1956),

suggests that the philosopher can be seen in a more humanist, less deconstructionist light. Wilson foregrounds Nietzsche's rejection of traditional Christian doctrine, in particular the notion that the fall made man a slave of outward things, and that, therefore, he should turn inward. Instead of focusing on an interpretation of Nietzsche as primarily deconstructionist, Wilson proposes that, in fact, Nietzsche desires the creation of a spiritual body that would by its very nature bring people together, "What Nietzsche wanted to do was start a new religion."[104] Wilson's elucidation of the existence of communal aspects in Nietzsche's existentialism implies that deconstructive postmodernism has selectively omitted such elements in favor of presenting a more unified whole. For the same philosopher who could comment that "The blissful ecstasy that arises from the innermost depths of man, ay, of nature, at this same collapse of the *principium individuationis*"[105] seems at odds with the utilization of Nietzsche as a forbearer of post-structuralist debate.

While the confines of this book do not allow me to fully argue with the adoption of Nietzsche as an ideological forbear to post-structuralism, the exclusion of his more humanist elements is symptomatic of an imbalance engendered by postmodernist critics concerning the novel of the 1960s that I seek to redress.

While the irony of the anti-hero can certainly be read in a detached satirical manner, in this book I wish to suggest that there is another equally valid interpretation of the figure. My interpretation does not attempt to exclude or diminish the predominant post-structuralist reading but rather works alongside it to substantiate a more comprehensive reading of the 1960s incarnation of the anti-heroic form. I hope to propose that it is equally valid to see the 1960s novel, and the anti-hero therein, as a constructive, politically engaged force, as Marguerite Alexander suggests of *Catch-22*: "[Heller's novel] was measurably subversive in effect: published in the early 1960s, it soon became a cult book among the young and helped fuel the protests against the Vietnam War."[106]

Part of the basis of my argument is the belief that utilizations of irony in the novel of the 1960s have been read in too isolated and negative a fashion. Often the post-structuralist interpretation of irony tends to see it as a means of detachment or as a method of devaluing something rather than recognizing its creative, constructive possibilities. Implicit in the thesis contained in this book is the proposal that the 1960s novel uses irony, in a constructive, socially informed manner, to expose and suggest viable alternatives to (among other things) capitalist society's materialistic epistemology and negation of the spiritual and communal impulses of human beings.

Kurt Vonnegut is one of the more prominent exponents of irony during the 1960s. His novels, *Cat's Cradle* (1963), *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, and *Slaughterhouse 5*, manage to incorporate cosmic, romantic, and structural versions of the form, yet the proliferation of irony in Vonnegut's work does not lead to the emotional detachment of the reader. Rather, the presence of a strongly humanist aspect in Vonnegut's novels works to counteract any distancing effects the irony might have, in a manner replicated in many 1960s novels but overlooked by post-structuralist critics such as Federman and Scholes.

My reading of irony as a (at least partially) positive force owes much to the work of Camus who states at the beginning of *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942):

> The pages that follow deal with an absurd sensitivity that can be found widespread in the age . . . But it is useful to note at the same time that the absurd, hitherto taken as a conclusion, is considered in this essay as a starting point.[107]

Camus' interpretation of the absurd as a starting point for more constructive thinking is crucial to my own approach to the 1960s novel, which I consider in an equally affirmative way. While I do not wish to entirely deny the possibility of viewing the 1960s novel in a post-structuralist fashion, in the following chapters I utilize the theories of Marcuse and Camus alongside a reading of the 1960s novel as a politically engaged and humanist art form. I take this approach in order to reinterpret and present an equally valid understanding of the 1960s novel that academic criticism has largely overlooked.

Post-structuralist analysis of the 1960s novel has also tended to place a greater emphasis on the signifier than the signified. Echoing Barthes's assertion that "Writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin . . . that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where identity is lost"[108] This approach can be misleading as it overlooks discussion of character in favor of analysis of formal experimentation, implicitly denying the importance of the former. In *Flights from Realism: Themes and Strategies in Postmodernist British and American Fiction* (1990), Alexander examines the postmodernist depiction of war in three postwar American novels: Thomas Pynchon's *Gravity's Rainbow* (1973), Kurt Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse 5,* and Joseph Heller's *Catch-22*. Alexander suggests that what distinguishes these novels as definably postmodern is their formal experimentation: "*Catch-22* in

particular shows a keen awareness of the ways in which the devaluing of language assists the devaluing of the individual,"[109] and their nihilistic outlook: "Catch-22 makes the transition from comedy of the absurd to tragedy of the absurd."[110] While such a postmodernist reading of Heller's novel contains much that is valid, I would suggest that it does not pay enough attention to the prominent humanist and idealist aspects of the text. For *Catch-22*'s formal experimentation does not occur at the expense of a novelistic devaluing of characterization, instead we are presented with distinctive characters, most obviously Yossarian, that we are able to empathize with when reading the novel. Similarly, Alexander's assertion that *Catch-22* should be read primarily as an absurd tragedy seems at odds with the novel's themes of humanitarianism and compassion in the face of the bureaucratic machinery of war.

While Alexander's reading of Heller's novel is only one example it serves as a representative indication of the often overly nihilistic interpretations of the 1960s novel that exist within post-structuralist criticism. In their attempts to conceptualize 1960s fiction as belonging to a deconstructionist mode, critics have displayed a tendency to imply that all the significant novels of this period focus only upon depicting the disorder or randomness experienced by the postwar individual.

In *City of Words,* Tony Tanner discusses the notion of entropy as being central to the novel of the 1960s. Tanner suggests that 1960s fiction foregrounds the decentered or decomposed subject, who is unable to communicate with his fellow human being: "One notable characteristic of many of the books we have considered or will be considering is that they concentrate on people who precisely are turning themselves into 'isolated systems'."[111] In a manner akin to Helen Weinberg's somewhat cursory detailing of the idealist ideology of 1960s novels in *Fables of Subversion: Satire and the American Novel, 1930–1980*, in the midst of his account of the nihilistic propensities of 1960s novelists Tanner also briefly notes the contradictory notion that such writers often "bespeak a compassionate humane spirit."[112]

The more conventional critical approach of figures such as Alexander, Tanner, and Weinberg can also be considered misleading in its propensity to focus upon a relatively narrow and highly selective range of texts. While there is always an obvious need to choose a germane selection of material, critics, such as Weinberg, exhibit a clear predisposition toward a collection of writers (including Bellow, Burroughs, Barth, Donald Barthelme, and Pynchon) whose work can be said to overlap with, or represent the beginnings of, a postmodern deconstruction of the novel form. While these authors

undoubtedly represent an important movement within American fiction, the manner in which much critical discussion has made them as exclusive representatives of the 1960s novel form ignores a swathe of novelists who are equally important for their greater focus upon social and cultural concerns. The humanism of writers such as Tevis, Vonnegut, Kesey, Thomas Berger, and James Leo Herlihy constitutes a significant body of work, the importance of which this book attempts to explore in order to present a more accurate, and less partisan, reading of 1960s fiction.

Although this study primarily examines the 1960s anti-hero through a Marcusian framework, it also refers to a selection of other theorists, most notably (the aforementioned) Camus and Nietzsche. The theories of these two philosophers seem to inform aspects of the counterculture and Marcuse's work, as Reitz suggests, "In contrast to the passive version of existentialism thought to be represented by Sartre, Marcuse favors the active and rebellious philosophies of Camus and Nietzsche."[113] Marcuse's inclination toward these two writers is attributable to their belief in a humanitarian activism. That is, they do not submit to the given social situation even though it leaves no room for hope or escape, choosing instead to explore the possibilities of rebellion in its many forms.

Such an eclectic selection of theories has the potential to appear somewhat inconsistent, even paradoxical; as is the case with Nietzsche's theories that suggest that we need to move beyond ethics (beyond good and evil) when compared to Camus' proposals for a distinctly ethical "new humanism."[114] However, in the light of this incongruity it is important to note that I am not trying to suggest any causal link between the theorists I employ. Rather, I wish to reflect the opportunistic aspect of the counterculture that saw it draw from a eclectic range of both interrelated and disparate sources, borrowing "from depth psychiatry, from the mellowed remnants of left-wing ideology, from the oriental religions, from Romantic *Weltschmerz*, from anarchist social theory, from Dada and American Indian lore, and, I suppose, the perennial wisdom."[115]

I also take this sometimes paradoxical approach in an attempt to capture the essence of the unstructured and multifaceted 'melting pot' of ideas that constituted the ideology of the counterculture, and thus its anti-heroic figures. Though such a position risks appearing disjointed and unsatisfactory, it is perhaps more suitable to view the counterculture and its writers in an 'anarchic' manner. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle note in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, "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."[116] Instead of the counterculture's beliefs forming a cohesive and linear whole, they resemble a more inconsistent entity that is unsuited to rationalist, empirical methodology.[117] Indeed, the problems inherent in trying to apply a consistent theoretical framework to the ideology of the counterculture are twofold. Undoubtedly, there is a degree of inadequacy in using the umbrella term 'counterculture' to group together a disparate collection of movements and individuals whose only tangible similarity is a broad opposition to the state. There is also the issue of the self-consciously inconsistent ideological processes within those disparate groups, as Braunstein and Doyle suggest, "The countercultural mode revelled in tangents, metaphors, unresolved contradictions, conscious ruptures of logic and reason; it was expressly anti-linear, anti-teleological…disdainful of thought processes that were circumscribed by causation and consequence."[118]

Given the often-disparate nature of the counterculture it is perhaps no coincidence, therefore, that historians frequently utilize events that challenged the aesthetic traditions of 1950s American society and culture as a means of marking the start of the movement. For during the middle decades of the twentieth century American art begins to signify and engage directly with the hegemony of everyday life, breaking with classical traditions in the process. Examples of such art include the 'POPart' of Andy Warhol and the Beatles' first American tour in 1964, as Nik Cohn notes, "If the Beatles meant a lot in Britain they meant very much more in America. They changed things."[119] A marked contest to authority is notable in contemporary art forms as 'mainstream' as the Hollywood caper film, as Peter Braunstein suggests

> "Implicit in caper films was the antagonism between the individual and society…As rejuvenated adult and capricious bank-robbing millionaire McQueen confesses [in *The Thomas Crown Affair* (1968)] "It's not about the money. It's about me and the system."[120]

The employment of the anti-heroic in the novel can be seen as another example of this widespread artistic seditiousness; resembling a somewhat didactic attempt to encourage a humanitarian protest against a society considered to be corrupt: "a way of saying that the world should and perhaps could be a better place in which to live."[121]

To this end, the rebellion of the 1960s anti-hero frequently contains a particularly benevolent element with characters embodying a form of dissidence that has primarily humanitarian goals. As Galloway suggests, "[the] emphasis on the manifestation of love is of particular significance, for . . . concern has been either with learning how to love or with finding an environment in which love can be constructively expressed."[122] This form of humanist rebellion reflects the counter-cultural notion of 'Personalism'. Farrell states, "One of the most important developments of the American 1960s was the understanding that the personal is political," and goes so far as to suggest that Personalism is "the defining spirit of the Sixties."[123] While the term is often used in a somewhat loose manner, Personalism generally refers to a personal adoption of responsibility for the moral well-being of each individual within society, regularly involving the use of rebellion, be it political, social, or cultural, as an effective means to achieve this goal:

> Personalists believed in the "revolution of the heart" and "the here and now revolution" that came from the personal practice of moral beliefs. Political personalists did not think that the revolution was optional; instead they saw it as an essential obligation of vocation and of citizenship. They believed, as the Greeks did, that the purely private life is deprived. Rejecting important assumptions of liberal individualism, they thought that people were created for and constituted in community, and were morally responsible for each other.[124]

My employment of the term 'Personalism' in the chapters that follow is taken chiefly from Farrell's definition in *The Spirit of the Sixties*. Farrell suggests that American postwar radicalism is intrinsically linked to the philosophy of political Personalism, which espoused the notion that the political was intrinsically bound up with the conditions of the individual, stating that "by the early 1960s, American radicalism had to a large extent been personified by activists with personalist perspectives. It was this tradition that would shape the distinctive spirit of the Sixties."[125] It is therefore possible to see Personalism as a reaction against the homogenizing and depersonalizing processes of the 1950s. While McCarthyism and sectarianism attempted to eradicate the Old Left, selected liberal groups began to promote the idea that the well-being of the individual was paramount for the well-being of society. Instead of the Old Left's focus on economic issues, the spiritual idealism of Personalism was concerned with cultural matters and quality of life. Farrell suggests that

Personalists created a loosely defined manifesto based upon the following humanitarian beliefs:

1. Every economic decision and institution must be judged in light of whether it protects or undermines the dignity of the human person.
2. Human dignity can be realized and protected only in a community.
3. All people have a right to participate in the economic life of society.
4. All members of society have a special obligation to the poor and vulnerable.
5. Human rights are the minimum conditions for life in community.
6. Society as a whole, acting through public and private institutions, has the moral responsibility to enhance dignity and protect human rights.[126]

This emphasis upon the human is certainly evident in many areas of the counterculture. Radical religious factions and figures like The Catholic Workers and Martin Luther King Jr. combined Personalist tenets with the social gospel and Gandhian nonviolence to encourage social change. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee added an existential politics of action to Personalism in their attempts to enfranchize the young, while the Committee for Nonviolent Action employed the Personalist policy of nonviolent direct action in its anti-nuclear protests. In addition to this overt Personalism, many groups, such as Women Strike for Peace, adopted aspects of the philosophy in their own proto-feminism without explicitly acknowledging its influence. Personalist principles were also reflected in postwar mainstream popular culture. The Beat movement and the hippies used their own lives and literature in order to criticize the impersonal conventions of American society, while a range of musicians, from Bob Dylan and Joan Baez to The Beatles, and the Grateful Dead, brought the concerns of Personalism to a mass audience, providing hugely popular topical songs that often critiqued elements of mainstream society.

Given the pervasiveness of Personalist ideas, it is also possible to see the influence of the ideology in many 1960s novels. The 1960s anti-hero often resembles a kind of Personalist spokesperson, embodying or espousing the creed of Personalism with a particular emphasis placed upon the humanitarianism and the importance of the relationship

between the individual and his community. As Lehan notes, "The modern hero stands at a crossroads—one path leads to the society, the other away from the community . . . It is interesting to note that the . . . hero of late is taking the path to community."[127]

Ihab Hassan examines the relationship between the anti-heroic and the self in further detail. Hassan, whose career spans five decades, is still one of the most significant figures on the literary critical scene, as Frank L. Cioffi suggests, "[Hassan has] had an enormous impact on literary culture and theory."[128] Initially traveling to the United States to further his study of electrical engineering, Hassan soon changed to the field of literature, and in particular, the emerging notion of postmodernism. This critical path located him in postmodernist countries, such as Japan and the United States, where he wrote several highly revered critical texts including *Radical Innocence: The Contemporary American Novel* (1961), *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature* (1971), and *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (1987). Consequently, Hassan's decision to write about the anti-heroic in his 1959 essay "The Anti-Hero in Modern British and American Fiction" lent the subject a significance that it had previously been denied. Hassan's work in general appears to embody a similar sentiment to that of the contemporary anti-heroic; both share a fundamental preference for the country of America and its ideological foundations yet both feel a need to critique what they see as its contemporary problems, as Hassan notes while discussing his affiliation with the United States:

> The point, then, is that my relation to America has never been as equivocal or ambivalent as that of some later immigrants. I feel satisfied in my life in America, though I am increasingly critical of American society itself, especially its media and its "*idollartry*."[129]

In *Radical Innocence: The Contemporary American Novel* and *Rumors of Change* Hassan explores the notion of the self in recoil: "Mediation between Self and World appears no longer possible—there is only surrender or recoil."[130] He elucidates one of the most significant roles of the anti-heroic within contemporary fiction discussing the extent to which the individual is constricted, rather than freed, by the technological processes of society. In his writing, Hassan proposes, "The Individual's sense of his own potency, his power to effect change and mold events, seems in steady decline."[131] The suggestion that the individual now faces the impossibility of directly attacking a system he has little chance of defeating wholesale leads to

a nihilistic situation in which the alienated and dejected self is "thrust into the nudity of [its] own isolated individual existence."[132] It is at this point that Hassan's ideological discussion converges with the 1960s anti-heroic figure. Hassan suggests that a nihilistic condition is a prerequisite for the creation of a new set of affirmative values echoing the anti-hero's typical movement through the stages of nihilism, struggle, and, finally, humanist affirmation. Hassan's *Radical Innocence* culminates by proposing that the process of rebellion provides the individual with both a means and an answer to the question 'why exist?':

> "The recoil of the self in passion (from which new values may be created) and its extension in gratuitous actions which refer to no accepted norm (the need to act precisely because action is no longer intrinsically meaningful) constitute the means by which modern man is forced to cope with the fact of nihilism."[133]

Hassan's stance here resembles that of the 1960s anti-hero, which, through its incorporation of Camusian ideas concerning the rebel, affirms the importance of the self through the process of rebellion. In concluding that "the modern self has . . . discovered that all truths must be . . . experienced in anguish and action."[134] Hassan echoes Camus' notion of the individual gaining further knowledge of themselves through the process of rebellion: "An awakening of conscience, no matter how confused it may be, develops from any act of rebellion."[135]

The utopian notion, inherent in much of the writing of the 1960s, that art could indeed establish "a sense of what *should be* rather than what *is*"[136] reflected the equally positive ideology prevalent within the countercultural movement during the first half of the 1960s: "the white youth-dominated, highly optimistic, even utopian counterculture of the 'Flower Children' period."[137] This optimism was the result of several key factors. The sustained boom in the economy, "The full employment prosperity of the era and the optimistic economic prognostications [this] engendered"[138] led many to start believing in the idea of a "post-scarcity" American society.[139] This vision was based "on the optimistic view that the United States was reaching a stage of automation, industrial development, agricultural productivity, and economic growth in which the need to work for a living might soon be radically diminished, if not eliminated altogether."[140] Interestingly, belief in postscarcity was widespread within both the mainstream and the counterculture. As Kennedy's

successor, president Lyndon B. Johnson, suggested in 1964, "In the past we fought to eliminate scarcity. In the future we will also have to learn the wise use of abundance."[141] Beat Generation writer Alan Watts envisaged a time when the traditional relationships concerning work could be reversed, creating "a huge leisure society—where they're going to reverse taxation and pay people for the work the machines do for them."[142] In a similar fashion, the yippies[143] called for a reformulation of society that would work toward and actively promote the concept of 'full employment' under the slogan 'Let the machines do it'.

The belief that America was close to becoming an entirely 'leisure-based' society finds due representation in the 1960s anti-hero. The figure becomes a vehicle for the new, more active role many perceive art as having, and a personification of many of the utopian goals post-scarcity thinking engenders within the population: "in which human pursuits, liberated from the drudgery of alienating, soul-slaying labor, might be redirected to self-actualisation involving the cultivation of each individual's creative talents."[144] This renewed desire for self-actualization can be interpreted as both a direct reaction against the depersonalizing practices of the 1950s, and a clear indication of the contemporary emphasis on personal and spiritual fulfillment. Therefore, many members of the counterculture reject such homogenizing policies because they restrict the individual's capacity "to exert autonomy over a life that would be [their] own."[145]

The widespread conviction among the counterculture that the capitalist system was inherently opposed to any increase in the individual's freedom is discussed in further detail in Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*: "Freedom of enterprise was from the beginning not altogether a blessing . . . the disappearance of this kind of freedom would be one of the greatest achievements of civilization."[146] In order to reflect this aspect of countercultural ideology, the first chapter of my book examines novels of the 1960s in which the anti-heroic is used as a means to articulate and endorse the idea that a reconfiguration of society along more spiritually fulfilling lines was imminent. In order to encourage this change many novels of the period adopt a distinctly moral and didactic tone. Texts such as Bellow's *Henderson the Rain King* (1958), Charles Webb's *The Graduate* (1963), and Vonnegut's *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* subvert the Horatio Alger myth.[147] They criticize the prevalence of capitalist ideology within society, attacking its undemocratic, 'un-American' nature and the constrictive, detrimental effects they perceive it has upon the population at large. In particular, characters, including Eliot Rosewater in *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, Eugene Henderson in *Henderson the*

Rain King, and Guy Grand in Terry Southern's *The Magic Christian* (1960), subvert the archetypal image of the entrepreneurial or big business figure. These novels present us with characters that initially embody the capitalist ideal yet reject their 'spiritually unfulfilling' material wealth in favor of a lifestyle aligned with the more humanitarian values of the contemporary counterculture.

The contemporary inclination toward self-actualization that these characters realize also has connotations for the traditional distinctions between childhood and adulthood, as Peter Braunstein suggests:

> The implications of this orientation were far-reaching: not only would the work/play dichotomy be erased, but so would the distinction, on a certain level, between childhood and adulthood, given that adults could be considered for all practical purposes simply damaged children with jobs.[148]

The blurring of divisions between the young and old contributed to an emergent youth culture during the 1960s. Many of those under thirty felt "profoundly, even fanatically, alienated from the parental generation,"[149] and aware of "the potential power of their numbers as never before"[150] mobilized in movements such as the SDS[151] and the yippies.[152] The young undoubtedly served as a force for change throughout the 1960s, as Roszak suggests, "the age old process of generational disaffiliation [is] now transformed from a peripheral experience in the life of the individual and the family into a major lever of radical social change."[153]

The emergence and empowerment of the young also had significant implications for the position of the traditional heroic figure, who often embodied the values of an 'establishment' staffed by those above the age of thirty rather than those below it. Indeed, in an ideological stance reminiscent of *The Catcher in the Rye*'s Holden Caulfield, during the 1960s the adult world is largely delegitimized as "phoney"[154] or corrupt. In the 1960s, youth is positioned in opposition to the corrupt adult world and imbued with a distinctly savior-like role,[155] possessing the sole capacity to rejuvenate American society: "it is the young who find themselves cast as the only effective radical opposition within their societies."[156]

Interestingly, though events such as the election of President John F. Kennedy and his first lady Jacqueline Kennedy give the impression of a society racing toward the exaltation of youth, until nearly the middle of the decade social critics were still remarking upon how the youth of the 1960s appeared to be conservative in nature. Indeed, as Peter Braunstein

notes, "the University of California at Berkeley president, Clark Kerr, made the retrospectively embarrassing assertion that 'employers are going to love this generation' because they're 'easy to handle.'"[157] While the general youth of America seemed to be upholding, rather than disrupting the status quo, across the Atlantic the situation was very different. In the United Kingdom, the emergence of the 'Mod' movement during the early 1960s had led to a vocal rejection of the values and structures of previous generations.[158] Indeed, during the early 1960s the perception was that London, as opposed to anywhere in America, was the center of the world for bohemian transgression. The city was infamously renamed 'Swinging London',[159] and was home to 'transgressive' individuals such as the fashion designer Mary Quant, the artist David Hockney, the photographer David Bailey, and new radical bands like the Kinks and the Who.

It was not until 1964 that a transposition of Mod culture to American soil occurred, causing American youth to embrace the radical and the bohemian. The so-called British invasion (launched by the Beatles' U.S. tour, and subsequent domination of the American pop charts[160]) created an explosion in the prominence of the young within American culture. Andy Warhol recounts the period in *POPism: The Warhol 1960s* (1980): "Everything went young in '64 . . . The kids were throwing out all the preppy outfits and the dress-up clothes that made them look like their mothers and fathers, and suddenly everything was reversed—the mothers and fathers were trying to look like their kids."[161] While previously conservative, the radical and bohemian were now embraced by American youth so rapidly that by the middle of the 1960s the fashionable center of youth culture had inarguably shifted from London to San Francisco. As part of their rejection of the conventions of the mainstream, the newly energized youth of America also frequently turned their attentions toward challenging aspects of the adult establishment that they disliked such as the "Vietnam war, racial injustice, and hard-core poverty."[162]

Many 1960s novels reflect this youthful adoption of the 'Great Refusal'.[163] Chief among them is Webb's *The Graduate*, which builds upon many of the themes explored in Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. Webb introduces us to the character of Benjamin Braddock, a graduate in the mould of Holden Caulfield. Like *The Catcher in the Rye*, Webb's novel presents the young as innocent, and the world of adults as corrupt. Benjamin has difficulty fitting into the adult world of his parents, telling his father at his homecoming party, "Those people in there are grotesque. You're grotesque . . . I'm grotesque. This house is grotesque. It's just this feeling I have all of a sudden.

And I don't know why."[164] In an essay on the novel and film, "'Plastics': *The Graduate* as Film and Novel," B.H. Fairchild suggests that Webb's novel resonates with "the essential ambivalence of popular culture in the mid-1960s: 'You can't trust anyone over thirty.'"[165] Similarly, in "Isolation Imagery in *The Graduate*: A contrast in Media," Carrol L. Fry and Jared Stein suggest that one of the novel's predominant themes is "the alienation and exploitation of youth in a society with bankrupt values."[166]

Interestingly, the depiction of dispossessed young characters in both *The Catcher in the Rye* and *The Graduate* would later to develop into a more widespread "orphan myth,"[167] propagated by many of those within the counterculture. This allegory used the figure of the orphan as a metaphor for the individual's rejection of corrupt and unreceptive authority structures, as Braunstein notes:

> The orphan myth lends itself to another reading. Given the deaths of John F. Kennedy, the symbolic father of 1960s youth, followed by Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy, one could make the case that late—'60's youth *had* been orphaned by America: their legitimate leaders (i.e., natural parents) had been brutally assassinated, succeeded by their current, illegitimate leaders (i.e., adoptive/foster parents)—Nixon, Agnew.[168]

The succession of 'illegitimate leaders' that Braunstein talks about creates an 'opening' for a set of more favorable, 'unofficial' leaders to occupy. Subsequently, figures such as Timothy Leary, Gary Snyder, Allen Ginsberg, Ken Kesey, and Abbie Hoffman become spokespeople for large sectors of the counterculture on the basis of their radical opposition to the values espoused by 'official' leaders such as President Richard Nixon.[169] The adoption of these unorthodox figures as 'unofficial' leaders is indicative of a wider-scale real-life inclination toward the 'anti-heroic'; a fact that Kesey refers to when talking about his public persona; "If society wants me to be an outlaw, then I'll be an outlaw and a damned good one. That's something people need. People at all times need outlaws."[170]

A cultural desire for the dissident is evident within the criticism of Leslie Fiedler, who introduces much of the ideology behind the anti-heroic figure into the critical arena, and to whom I refer throughout this book. Fiedler's commitment to "eluding partisanship"[171] seems to have seeped into his own life[172] lending him an anti-heroic quality common to other contemporary figures such as Marcuse, Kesey and Noam Chomsky.

Perhaps, most significantly, in the hugely influential *Love and Death in the American Novel* Fiedler discusses many canonical texts in a decidedly subversive manner, as the author himself indicates in the preface to the revised edition: "It is my hope that to new readers and old, it will seem still as lively and in the best sense of the word, as vulgar as ever."[173] In so doing, *Love and Death in the American Novel* exemplifies Fiedler's acute interest in the areas of the unconfessed and the inadmissible. Fiedler's desire "[t]o redeem our great books from the commentaries on them"[174] unquestionably opened the floodgates for a swathe of more experimental, avant-garde critical works, such as those of Scholes[175] and Federman,[176] and influenced a generation of novelists in displaying irreverence and skepticism toward cultural shibboleths such as religion, capitalism, and history.[177]

The growing desire for oppositional ideology also led to the increasing popularity of individuals like Timothy Leary. During the 1960s, Leary became a figurehead[178] for many of those within the counterculture. Assuming a distinctly religious appearance, as Ellwood notes in *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (1994), "He took to wearing a white robe and golden crownlike headband";[179] Leary proved to be an incredibly charismatic and popular spokesperson, to the extent that badges appeared proclaiming, 'Leary is God'.

Large sectors of the counterculture quickly adopted Leary's mantra to 'Turn On, Tune In, Drop Out' taking the hallucinogenic drug LSD in order to escape the social conditioning of mainstream culture.[180] The notion of an "irrational rationality"[181] motivated this LSD culture, propagating the idea that "drugs reinforced . . . countercultural critiques of rationality, religion, and nature because they provided an escape from the objective consciousness of the brain and the conditioning of the culture."[182] This focus upon the self had implications for the traditional constituents of the 'superhuman' heroic figure, as Allen Ginsberg notes: "'wisdom drugs' were causing people to see that the Kingdom of God is within them, instead of thinking its outside, up in the sky and that it can't be here on earth."[183] This drug-induced move toward the human also sought literary avenues, as Farrell suggests, "Tuning in also meant tuning in to the ideas that were circulating in the new America. It meant reading fiction like Salinger and Heller and Vonnegut."[184]

In order to reflect the counterculture's changing attitudes toward the divine, and their subsequent interest in unconventional Christlike figures, chapter 3 of this book sets out to examine anti-heroic subversions of the grandiloquent Christlike figure. In particular, it looks at novels such as Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Tevis'

The Man Who Fell to Earth (1963), Vonnegut's *Cat's Cradle*, *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, *Slaughterhouse 5*, and Pearce's *Cool Hand Luke*. In these texts, the figure of Christ is reconfigured in a more rebellious (Camusian) fashion apposite for a counterculture whose attitudes toward religion represented "a time of rediscovery, as well as a time of invention."[185] These contemporary versions of the Christlike figure choose to reject organized and ecclesiastical systems of religion in favor of more life-affirming humanist ideologies. This change in attitude also has obvious parallels with the manner in which members of the counterculture rejected traditional, dogmatic religious systems, and instead embraced unorthodox procedures such as Zen Buddhism and spiritual communes.

Abbie Hoffman represents a more political, albeit nonparty version of the 'unofficial' leader than Leary. Originally part of the New York wing of the Diggers, Hoffman was later responsible for the formation of the yippies, "whose goals were . . . to politicize members of the hippie counterculture."[186] Hoffman was often seen as a countercultural leader[187] for the more activist side of the movement. While Leary urged those within the counterculture to remain apolitical, Hoffman chose to use a politically motivated theatrical activism[188] in order to alert the American people to what he perceived as the problems of society.

Hoffman's brand of political activism is evident on two notable occasions. In the autumn of 1967, Hoffman joined with Jerry Rubin to lead a different kind of protest against the Vietnam War as Farrell notes, "Instead of sedate parades of earnest citizens, they preferred a politics of spectacle, using flowers, flags, toys, puppets, and props to garner an audience on the other side of the camera."[189] Then in 1968, the yippies held the Festival of Life. Hoffman and Rubin suggested that the festival presented "a real opportunity to make clear the two Americas,"[190] in order to offer, "our alternative and it's not just a narrow, political alternative, It's an alternate way of life."[191] However, the event was met with strong police resistance, which escalated into violence as the festival proceeded.

Indeed, in many ways, the years between 1968 and 1970 marked the end of the utopian phase of the counterculture. The intensification of conflict in Vietnam, the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Malcolm X, The Manson murders, and Nixon's election to office on a distinctly "law and order" (anti-countercultural) platform, combined to severely deflate the positivity of the earlier part of the decade. To those within the counterculture, society seemed more hostile, and it was hard for many to

sustain belief in the worth of pacifist, liberation movements such as the hippies.

Nowhere is the decline of optimism during the late 1960s more apparent than in attitudes displayed concerning the Vietnam War.[192] Anti-war feeling seemed to escalate in parallel with the intensification of American military activity to the point that many individuals took a decidedly nihilistic view of the future of American society; as The President's Commission on Campus Unrest reported in 1970, "nothing is more important than an end to the war in Indo-China. Disaffected students see the war as a symbol of moral crisis in the nation which . . . deprives even law of its legitimacy."[193] The motivations for the war were complex, and included the recurrent fear that unstable regimes within Southeast Asia might fall under the control of Soviet communist expansion, American aspirations to enlarge their empire within the Indochina area and the desire of successive presidents from Eisenhower to Nixon to retain control within the region in order to maintain political countenance. No matter what Johnson's reasons were for sending more and more troops into South Vietnam the results were unmistakeable, popular opinion against the war increased, with many rejecting the conflict as both morally corrupt and illegitimate.

Such was the level of popular opinion against the war that the movement acquired its own name: "the Vietnam syndrome, which can be defined as a serious lack of blood lust on the part of the public (as opposed to secretaries of state, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or many elected representatives)."[194] This lack of faith in the nation's leaders had a negative effect on the heroic ideal. Many individuals, such as Hoffman, questioned the principles of a society that would allow a war like Vietnam to take place: "The Viet Kong are defending their parents, children and homes—their deaths are noble and heroic. The Americans are fighting for nothing you can see, feel, touch or believe in."[195]

As the amount of U.S. soldiers returning home in body bags increased from the hundreds into the thousands, the Vietnam War indubitably started to undermine the American propensity to eulogize violence without considering its human cost. The growing public awareness of the human price of the war intensified anti-Vietnam sentiment, and a number of countercultural 'celebrities' famously pledged their support to the movement. John Lennon released "Give Peace a Chance" and Jimi Hendrix[196] devoted his 1969 performance of "Machine Gun" at the Fillmore East to all of the soldiers fighting in Vietnam. While contemporary musicians expressed their opposition to the war in an overt fashion, writers took a slightly more oblique angle in questioning the conflict.

Critics, such as Leslie Fiedler, Richard Slotkin, and Will Wright, have traced the presence of an abiding American predisposition toward violence in the heroic archetype of the cowboy or frontier hero. It is therefore significant that many 1960s appropriate the cowboy as a means of criticizing the mindset behind the atrocities in Vietnam. To reflect the importance of this requisition, chapter 2 of this book examines the importance of the cowboy figure in novels of the 1960s, exploring its subversion through anti-heroic forms that challenge the figure's role as an exemplar of American values. In particular, chapter 2 engages with a selection of pertinent texts, and the anti-heroic figures therein, in order to analyze how they interact with the image of the cowboy figure as an ideal model for rebellion. These characters include Jack Crabb in Berger's *Little Big Man*, Joe Buck in Herlihy's *Midnight Cowboy*, Rooster Cogburn in Charles Portis' *True Grit* (1968), Dingus Magee in David Markson's *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* (1965), and the Loop Garoo Kid in Ishmael Reed's *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down*. While the traditional cowboy's rebellion is of an 'immediate' kind fuelled by what Marcuse might call the "vital needs"[197] (a mode of rebellion followed by the more spontaneous, apolitical members of the counterculture like Timothy Leary and Ken Kesey), many examples of the cowboy in the 1960s novel reject this form of rebellion as ineffective. Instead, these novels tend to embody a desire to promote the need for more organized, structured modes of rebellion in a definably Marcusian mould.

By the end of the 1960s, the counterculture was experiencing a crisis of direction. Devoid of the optimism that had marked out the early part of the decade, deprived of the figureheads that had once appeared to signal a shift toward a more countercultural standpoint, and confronted with the rise of a new socially and politically conservative right, many began to feel that their protest had amounted to little of lasting value.

The uncertainty felt by many in the counterculture is mirrored in anti-heroic narratives of the late 1960s and early 1970s that seem decidedly more ambivalent in tone. Jerzy Kosinski's *Being There* (1970) epitomizes the static, indefinite feelings of the phase. Kosinski's novel contains a central character called Chance, who succeeds in attaining the accoutrements of success but is so bereft of personality and emotion that we cannot tell whether he is fulfilled or not. In "The Dialectics of Getting There: Kosinski's *Being There* and the Existential Anti-Hero" Scott C. Holstad suggests, "Chance simply exists. He watches television, is unable or unwilling to function within prescribed cultural paradigms, and finally, is simply a mirror."[198] In a

socially informed reading Chance demonstrates the individual's increasing "complicity in a generation of apathy and nihilistic mindlessness."[199] His absence of thought, feeling and opinion suggest "a manifestation of the idea that we have lost our collective capacity to feel."[200] These two aspects of Chance's personality (or lack thereof) unite to suggest that the character can be read as an attack upon a possible future; one in which the "spirit of freedom, of hope, of happiness, of change and of revolution"[201] that characterized the 1960s and the anti-heroic has been all but forgotten.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 2

Individualism and the Anti-Capitalist, Anti-Heroic Figure in American Fiction of the 1960s

In discussing American fiction there is perhaps no more important and pervasive an issue than individualism. From the late eighteenth century onward, both the politics of America and its culture have been based upon a belief in the importance of the individual and their personal freedom. This has led to a subsequent rejection of concentrated power and hierarchical systems that would act to repress this reaching toward liberty and democracy.

The notion of the individual as the single most important constituent of society is an imperative element of American ideology, as Theodore Roosevelt demonstrates in his 1910 speech in Paris entitled "The Man in the Arena":

> The success of republics like yours and like ours means the glory, and our failure of despair, of mankind; and for you and for us the question of the quality of the individual citizen is supreme. Under other forms of government, under the rule of one man or very few men, the quality of the leaders is all-important. If, under such governments, the quality of the rulers is high enough, then the nations for generations lead a brilliant career, and add substantially to the sum of world achievement, no matter how low the quality of the average citizen; because the average citizen is an almost negligible quantity in working out the final results of that type of national greatness. But with you and us the case is different.[1]

In addition to its prominence in the public rhetoric of America, the ideology of individualism has also been a steady part of the American novel. In Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* (1851), the central character of Ahab often espouses a belief in the greatness of the individual,

"there is a Catskill eagle in some souls that can alike dive down into the blackest gorges, and soar out of them again."[2] Ahab asserts the importance of the individual in the face of the inexorable forces of the external universe, "come and see if ye can swerve me. Swerve me? Ye cannot swerve me."[3] Similarly, in Mark Twain's paean to American individualism *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884),[4] Huck tries to escape the conforming clutches of "The Widow Douglas [who] allowed she would sivilize me."[5] Instead, he finds solace in a more 'original' America situated within the towns and villages along the Mississippi river bank: "I got into my old rags and my sugar-hogshead again, and was free and satisfied."[6]

Despite the above claims for the individual, postwar America stands as one of the most successful examples of a capitalist country in the modern world. J.K. Galbraith notes the incongruity between these two factors: "The experience of nations with well-being is exceedingly brief. Nearly all throughout all history have been very poor. The exception… has been the last few generations in the comparatively small corner of the world populated by Europeans. Here, and especially in the United States, there has been great and quite unprecedented affluence."[7] That is to say that while America ostensibly validates the importance of the individual more than any other country, it has simultaneously embraced the ideological principles of capitalism at the cost of diminishing certain individual choices and freedoms. This adoption of capitalist ideology negates the active public role of the individual, as the character of Eliot Rosewater notes at the start of Kurt Vonnegut's novel *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* (1965):

> When the United States of America, which was meant to be a Utopia for all, was less than a century old, Noah Rosewater and a few men like him demonstrated the folly of the Founding Fathers in one respect: those sadly recent ancestors had not made it the law of the Utopia that the wealth of each citizen should be limited.[8]

It could be suggested that the very logic of capitalism militates against equality and personal liberty. As Marcuse suggests, "If society cannot use its growing productivity for reducing repression (because such usage would upset the hierarchy of the *status quo*), productivity must be turned *against* the individuals; it becomes itself an instrument of universal control."[9] Therefore, many aspects of American ideology seem to be fundamentally at odds with each other. The superficial notion of prizing the individual belying a quite different reality in which "Those who reach the top level of hierarchies are,

increasingly, those who have successfully shed their rough edges of individualism."[10]

In the period following the Second World War the inherent contradictions within American individualist ideology start to undergo a process of reevaluation in a series of major sociological works that include C. Wright Mills' *The Power Elite* (1956), J.K. Galbraith's *The Affluent Society* (1958), Vance Packard's *The Status Seekers* (1959) and Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*. These texts invoke an intense questioning of capitalist society and the effects it has on personal liberty, as Galbraith notes, "Biological progress is no longer threatened by measures which lessen the perils of economic life for the individual. But liberty still is."[11] Running throughout all these works is the suggestion that capitalism has subverted an 'original' American individualism into something negative. This negative and 'false' capitalist individualism has damaged the well-being of society, and in the process created an America in which "the American Dream is losing some of its lustre for a good many citizens who would like to believe in it."[12]

Such a distinctly anti-capitalist, yet pro-individualist sentiment is evident in F. Scot Fitzgerald's seminal novel *The Great Gatsby*.[13] The story tells us of the (eponymous) Jay Gatsby, who is seduced into a life of crime and corruption by the lure of fortune and glory: "Gatsby believed in the green light, the orgiastic future that year by year recedes before us."[14] The novel stands as perhaps the first significant critique of the reality of the capitalist 'American Dream'. *The Great Gatsby* marks an important starting point for twentieth century anti-capitalist attitudes which intensified further in the period following the end of the Second World War.

Kerouac's *On the Road* presents us with a group of intellectual 'dropouts' who reject the structures and rules of urban society. The characters in the novel instead opt to travel on a series of unplanned journeys across America in the individualist hope of rediscovering the spiritually fulfilling aspects of the 'American Dream'. The protagonist of the novel, Sal Paradise, declares that the group's journeys "will finally take us to IT,"[15] referring to the concept of a space in which the individual will be able to achieve true self-actualization. Paradise locates this new individualist space in the country of Mexico: "I couldn't imagine this trip. It was the most fabulous of all. It was no longer east-west, but magic *south*."[16] Kerouac's narrative reasserts a countercultural individualism that becomes explicit through the views of Paradise and Dean Moriarty. Paradise tells us "the only people for [him] are the mad ones…the ones who never yawn or say a

commonplace thing, but burn, burn, burn like fabulous yellow roman candles exploding like spiders across the stars and in the middle you see the blue centerlight pop and everybody goes 'Awww!"[17] Interestingly, while Paradise appears to embody a pro-individualist stance he simultaneously criticizes the 'selfish' individualism of contemporary American society for stunting the individual's means of self-expression, and encouraging people to pursue only their own self-interests.

The paradoxical attitudes toward individualism found in *On the Road* permeate much of postwar American fiction. While a historically located version of libertarian individualism is presented as crucial to maintaining a sense of true 'Americanism' the individualism of the capitalist system and its leaders is castigated for being dehumanizing, undemocratic, and essentially, 'un-American' in nature. Indeed, countercultural sociologist Paul Goodman likens the situation to one of colonial rule when he comments, "I would almost say that our country is like a conquered province with foreign rulers, except that they are not foreigners and we are responsible for what they do."[18]

A division arises in postwar America between those who see capitalist individualism as the continuation or adaptation of an 'original' Americanism, and those who perceive such individualism as antithetical to the societal aspirations of 'true' American ideology. The concept of distinct positive and negative kinds of individualism is explored further in Joseph Heller's influential anti-war novel *Catch-22*. The book tells the story of Yossarian, a bombardier in a Second World War flight squadron who "struggles against a hostile establishment and the code it maintains for controlling the society it rules, that is, Catch-22, the principle of power which states 'they have a right to do anything we can't stop them from doing'."[19] Yossarian can be seen as an example of the ultimate individualist as he apparently chooses to save himself and not those around him. However, when this decision is placed in context Yossarian's actions are more understandable: "Yossarian decides that self-preservation is more important than the insane commands and rituals of military life, but . . . he deserts only after he has tried all that can be expected of him as an individual."[20] At the end of the novel, when Yossarian's commanding officers, Colonels Cathcart and Korn, offer to relieve him of his military duties if he is willing to advocate their inhumane policies, he is unable to place his own safety above that of the other men: "Don't worry', Yossarian said with a sorrowful laugh after several moments had passed. 'I'm not going to do it.'"[21] Rather than only being concerned with what is best for him, Yossarian's brand of individualism

incorporates a strong humanitarian concern for others, as critic David H. Richter suggests:

> Yossarian is indeed concerned about his own survival and with the forces that threaten it, but at the same time he is concerned for the survival of his friends, acquaintances, and mere colleagues. It is because of this that he is willing to pursue "through all the words in the world" the answer to his riddle, "where are the Snowdens of yesteryear?"; because of this that he mourns in his own unconventional way when Orr is lost over the Adriatic; because of this that he takes his life in his hands to break the news of Nately's death to the latter's girl friend.[22]

Significantly, Yossarian's compassionate, 'good' individualism contrasts with that of the enterprising Milo Minderbender. "A pure capitalist"[23] who represents the principles of that ideology taken to their most inhumane extremes, Milo starts a business in black market eggs that escalates into a worldwide syndicate in which he suggests that "everyone has a share"(*C*, 288). In reality, the reverse is true, and Milo's 'international cartel' (named M & M Enterprises) only serves to make him rich by dehumanizing others. This includes members of his own squadron when he makes a business deal with the Germans to attack them:[24] "I'm just trying to put it on a businesslike basis. Is anything wrong with that? You know, a thousand dollars ain't such a bad price for a medium bomber and a crew. If I can persuade the Germans to pay me a thousand dollars for every plane they shoot down, why shouldn't I take it?" (294)

In the 1960s novel, society takes on an increasingly bureaucratic and frightening element in which the individual's autonomy is replaced by the technical autonomy of the organization. In this supposedly more efficient and organized system, compassion for the individual is reduced. Human satisfaction is repositioned as something entirely technical in nature, which can be fulfilled through the formal analysis of certain technical specialists with the ability to synthesize these needs into material products and services for the public. This rationalization denies the possibility of reflection and evaluation, for these activities would contravene the individual's allotted role within the system.

The Marcusian fear that increasingly "Men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions"[25] seems to permeate *Catch-22*.[26] At the start of the novel Yossarian observes the soldier in white, a person devoid of individuality. The soldier's distinguishing features are completely covered, as he is "encased from head to toe in plaster and gauze" (10). His life is governed by a cyclical exchange of

fluids that seems more akin to that of a machine than a human being, as Yossarian notes, "When the jar on the floor was full, the jar feeding his elbow was empty, and the two were simply switched quickly so that the stuff could drip back into him" (10). As the novel progresses, the soldier is kept alive even though he is no longer sentient. Indeed, the discovery of his eventual death is the result of a chance observation, "One afternoon when she had completed her first circuit of the ward and came a second time to the soldier in white, she read his thermometer and discovered that he was dead" (11). The soldier thus becomes an apt metaphor for capitalist society's reliance upon functional continuums, suggesting the extent to which the individual is neglected by the modern military industrial state, as Richter notes, "the soldier in white is connected up with the war and his lack of human identity in such a way as to associate the war with dehumanisation."[27]

The character of Doc Daneeka (one of the military doctors in the novel) further exemplifies the individual's loss of autonomy in the larger systems of society. Daneeka, who is scheduled to join McWatt's ill-fated flight, is effectively killed when those around him refuse to acknowledge his continuing existence because of a bureaucratic technicality:

> "You're dead, sir," one of his two enlisted men explained.
>
> Doc Daneeka jerked his head up quickly with resentful distrust. "What's that?"
>
> "You're dead sir," repeated the other. "That's probably the reason you always feel so cold."
>
> "That's right, sir. You've probably been dead all this time and we just didn't detect it."
>
> "What the hell are you both talking about?" Doc Daneeka cried shrilly with a surging, petrifying sensation of some onrushing unavoidable disaster.
>
> "It's true, sir," said one of the enlisted men. "The records show that you went up in McWatt's plane to collect some flight time. You didn't come down in a parachute, so you must have been killed in the crash."
>
> "That's right, sir," said the other. "You ought to be glad you've got any temperature at all." (392)

Daneeka's 'death' represents the ultimate assimilation of the individual by the capitalist system, imbuing it with the power of life and death. Sanford Pinsker notes that in *Catch-22* "bureaucracy is a more efficient killing machine than German bullets."[28] The novel's nihilistic

outlook on the power of the bureaucratic system is further compounded by the actions of Mrs. Daneeka. Although Mrs. Daneeka is initially "distraught for almost a full week" (393) at the news of her husband's death, she soon embraces the idea. Mrs. Daneeka even chooses to ignore letters written by her husband that convey his well-being when she discovers the endowment she stands to inherit if he is declared 'officially' dead: "her grief was mitigated somewhat by a notification from Washington that she was sole beneficiary of her husband's $10, 000 GI insurance policy" (393).

In *Catch-22* Heller offers us a wealth of characters who are compliant with bureaucracy taken to its logical extremes. As a positive contrast to the acquiescence of these more corrupt characters, he presents us with Yossarian. Yossarian refuses to let the system dehumanize him, and asserts his and other's humanity throughout the novel. Indeed, Yossarian's escape from military service at the end of the novel may suggest, "the individual, not bureaucracy or the establishment, still holds the final trump."[29]

In a Marcusian context, the delineation of a 'good' (American) individualism and a 'bad' (capitalist) individualism closely resemble the opposing notions of the reality principle and the pleasure principle discussed in Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization*.[30] Although *Eros and Civilization* is chiefly concerned with an analysis of historical human oppression and manipulation, Marcuse substitutes the socioeconomic, Marxist approach that we might expect given the subject matter, with concepts and content drawn from psychoanalytical theory (primarily those of Sigmund Freud).[31] In the text, Marcuse suggests that an opposition always exists between the individual's desires and organized society's need to suppress these wants: "[There] is at one and the same time a conflict between the individual and his society."[32]

Marcuse's concept of the pleasure principle resembles the 'good' individualism of precapitalist America, while the reality principle resembles the 'bad' individualism of capitalism. While the pleasure principle prizes "pleasure" and "joy (play)," the reality principle enforces a "restraint of pleasure" in the form of "toil (work)." Similarly, as the pleasure principle values "receptiveness" and the "absence of repression," so the reality principle measures the individual's worth in line with their "productiveness" and values the maintenance of "security."[33]

Marcuse's work in *Eros and Civilization* owes much to the humanism of *Lebensphilosophie* (life philosophy), as Reitz suggests, "Marcuse explicitly draws on *Lebensphilosophical* themes."[34] This inclination toward the positivism of *Lebensphilosophie* informs both Marcuse's

reading of Freud's psychoanalysis and the philosopher's own theory of rebellion:

> It would seem that *Lebensphilosophie*, as an essentially life-centred approach to an understanding of humanity and the world, also functions as the foundation of Marcuse's . . . "protest" philosophy by offering its orientation to "life" as an alternative to the philosophy of sheer "reason" that was thought to predominate in certain interpretations of the Hegelian tradition in philosophy and education.[35]

Marcuse's adoption of *Lebensphilosophical* tenets seems to be shared by many in the counterculture, albeit implicitly. Indeed, the notion that the hegemonic reality principle is an attempt to reconfigure and control the satisfaction of the individual may suggest some of the reasons for the counterculture's desire to return to a precapitalist state in which the individual's liberty would increase.

In "Growth Liberalism in the Sixties" Robert M. Collins proposes that "Economic growth—as an idea, as a policy goal, and as a social reality—helps to define the sixties."[36] This significance is certainly apparent in the fact that opposition to the pursuit of a production ideal intensifies to an all time high during the 1960s. Such is the level of hostility toward traditional capitalist models that even the president is required to consider its significance, as Schlesinger notes:

> Despite his support of economic growth and his concern over persisting privation, the thrust of [Kennedy's] preoccupation was less with the economic machine and its quantitative results than with the quality of life in a society which, in the main, had achieved abundance.[37]

The implicit *Lebensphilosophical* aspect of the counterculture held a "desire to transcend the attachment to growth by means of a new emphasis on the pursuit of quality in American life."[38] As such, it operated in a historical tradition that is traceable back to the Transcendentalists, for whom human consciousness and the capacity for self-determination were paramount constituents for the well-being of society.

Though I wish to suggest that the counterculture attempted to change society into a more compassionate, life-affirming entity it is also important to remember that despite their ostensibly communal stance, many countercultural activities contained a capitalist element. In his comprehensive record of the decade, *The Sixties* (1998), historian Arthur Marwick suggests that "most of the movements, subcultures,

and new institutions which are at the heart of the sixties change were thoroughly imbued with the entrepreneurial . . . ethic."[39] Those within the counterculture seemed not to view this entrepreneurial element as negative because of its intended goals. Instead of focusing upon making money, the primary aim of such activities was (supposedly) to encourage and share the pleasure principle with others. Allen Ginsberg articulates the important differences between the two forms of entrepreneurialism at the Houseboat Summit of 1967:

> There's an organized leadership, say, at such a thing as a Be-In. There is organization; there is community. There are community groups which cooperate, and those community groups are sparked by active people who don't necessarily parade their names in public, but who are capable people . . . who are capable of ordering sound trucks and distributing thousands of cubes of LSD and getting signs posted.[40]

It is clear that the 'good' individualism of the counterculture was a contributory force behind many of the rebellious actions of the 1960s. Protests concerning Vietnam, civil rights, and women's liberation all sought to affirm the importance of the individual against the larger forces of society. Activities such as consciousness raising and the growth of independent communes attempted to reposition the needs of the individual as paramount, while individuals, such as Leary, Kesey, Hoffman, and Ginsberg, rose to infamy due to their 'larger than life' personalities. The profuse drug taking among members of the counterculture also reflected an implicit repositioning of individual consciousness as important, embodying a desire to expand one's consciousness in order to engage with the 'true self', as Marcuse suggests in *An Essay on Liberation* (1969):

> Today's rebels want to see, hear, feel new things in a new way: they link liberation with the dissolution of ordinary and orderly perception. The trip involves the dissolution of the ego shaped by the established society—an artificial and short-lived dissolution. But the artificial and "private" liberation anticipates, in a distorted manner, an exigency of the social liberation: the revolution must be at the same time a revolution in perception which will accompany the material and intellectual reconstruction of society.[41]

The Marcusian concept of private liberation as an 'anticipatory' force is significant here for it can be used as a means of explaining the reasons behind the counterculture's continued dependence upon a strong sense of individualism in spite of its professed communal

goals. In *An Essay on Liberation,* Marcuse suggests, "It is indeed only the individual, the individuals, who can judge, with no other legitimation than their consciousness and conscience."[42] He goes on to propose the theory that a focus upon the individual will inevitably lead to a transcendence of the self: "Ultimately, such heightened consciousness would lead the user to see that his or her original priorities were wrong, that the quest for the rewards of capitalism had led them astray."[43] This Marcusian process of individualism leading to liberation suggests that if the individual is a suitable catalyst for revolution it is for the greater good of society that his importance and the significance of his access to the pleasure principle be (re)asserted.

The belief that individual dissent would (inevitably) lead to a larger-scale rebellion is however fraught with complications when applied to the actions of the counterculture. Certainly, in a 1960s context we can see that such causality does not always exist. As Kesey seems to realize in Tom Wolfe's *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (1968) when he comments: "I know we've reached a certain point but we're not moving anymore, we're not creating anymore, that's why we've got to move to the next step."[44] While the counterculture tended to place intense emphasis upon living 'in the moment' this obsession with the present meant that a (re)assertion of the pleasure principle could easily lead the individual into a position of ideological stasis; as Peter Braunstein proposes in his essay "Forever Young":

> The hippies' presentist orientation fostered a belief that inserting all phenomena within teleologies [*sic*] of causation and resolution, grading all human experience as "success" or "failure," even asking questions like "what's the next step for the counterculture?" was an epistemological trap, a connivance by Western capitalism.[45]

The counterculture's rejection of teleological thinking often meant that their rebellion became somewhat self-absorbed; no longer a means to an end but rather the expression of a narcissistic desire for disruption for its own sake.

Terry Southern's satirical novel *The Magic Christian* attacks the values of mainstream society while examining the complexities of rebellion as a means of social justice. The central character of the novel, Guy Grand, represents the sometimes precarious balance that Southern sees between rebellion as social conscience and mere self-indulgence. Grand straddles a divide between being embraced by the system, and rebelling against it into the position of "a proto-Situationist

agent provocateur."[46] A self-made "Eccentric" and "Crackpot,"[47] Grand is a billionaire anarchist whose fortune allows him the freedom to act in whatever way he chooses, with the character remaining unpunished for his frequently irresponsible behavior due to his immense wealth. While Grand's pranks alert others to his active subversiveness, he always chooses to disguise the full extent of his involvement by buying the silence of any witnesses.

Grand plays elaborate pranks that serve as didactic 'lessons'. For example, in one such episode he convinces a random passerby to eat the parking ticket he has just found on his car by offering to give him six thousand dollars. When the passer-by is overcome by his own greed and agrees to the request, Grand exposes the purpose of his outlandish proposal by suggesting, "'You needn't actually eat the ticket,' he explained. 'I was just curious to see if you had your price.' He gave a wink and a tolerant chuckle. 'Most of us have, I suppose. Eh? Ho-ho'" (*MC*, 17).

The majority of the chapters in *The Magic Christian* follow a similar structure. We are first acquainted with the particularities of one of Grand's elaborate pranks. We then witness the anarchic eventualities of the 'joke'. Finally, at the end of each chapter we discover that Grand is able to avoid reprisal because he has so much money with which to bribe others. As the narrator suggests, "As quickly as witnesses were uncovered . . . they were bought off by Grand or his representatives, so that nothing ever really came of it in the end—though, granted, it did cost him a good bit to keep his own name clear" (38). Through this patterning, the novel encourages the reader to question whether they would be willing to be bought in this manner, causing them to reevaluate their proclivity for money above everything else; to "ask again what is good and evil."[48]

In its ambivalent depiction of Grand *The Magic Christian* also brings into question American notions of the entrepreneur (or immensely wealthy individual). Indeed, it is difficult to discern the novel's stance toward its central character as we are told that Grand can appear "sinister, poignant, all-knowing, enigmatic, silly or genteel by turns."[49] The relative ease with which Grand is able to manipulate, embarrass, and degrade the other characters initially makes him appear cruel, even sadistic. However, this aspect of the character may operate on a more complex level. Grand's immense power over others is interpretable as a critique of the unthinking adulation of the entrepreneurial or wealthy individual in American society. By depicting Grand as 'untouchable', Southern foregrounds the absurdity of allowing an individual such a level of power based upon nothing more than their material wealth.

Southern confuses issues further by presenting the victims of Grand's pranks as deserving their 'punishment'. Grand targets a range of characters who personify elements of American society perceived as negative by the counterculture: "Cold War America's repressive media and political culture, the public's willingness to parrot the received ideas of the status quo, the unquestioning acceptance of consumerism, the banality of middle-class notions of good taste, and the amorality of the wealthy."[50] Grand's pranks can therefore be seen as a form of poetic justice that punishes the nefarious qualities within the populace at large; as Southern's biographer Lee Hill notes, "Guy Grand is a Zen master of subversion unconcerned with any interpretation of why he does what he does—believing instead that the pranks and their planning already embody a critique."[51]

It is significant that when Grand's 'aunts' suggest that he should fix the stock market so that one of their friends can capitalize upon the manipulation, Grand appears to reject the suggestion because of its immorality:

> "Good," said Aunt Agnes. "Now then, what if you sold all your shares of that? What would happen to the price of it?"
>
> "Take a nasty drop," said Grand, with a scowl at the thought of it. "Might cause a run."
>
> "There you are then!" cried Agnes. "And Clemence's young man *buys*—when the price is down, *he buys*, you see—then the *next* day, you buy back what you sold, wouldn't it?"
>
> "Might and might not," said Grand, somewhat coldly. (32–33)

While Grand seeks to expose the corruption of those within the capitalist system, he refrains from utilizing his position to increase his own wealth and the wealth of others. He is willing to exist nominally within the system only as long as he does not encourage others to do so as well.

Grand acquires a certain authority from remaining within the system and maintaining the superficial appearance of the entrepreneurial or wealthy figure. Guy's exterior is notable for its ability to encourage others to project whatever they want onto it, in a similar manner to the character of Chance in *Being There*:

> In the beginning, Grand's associates, wealthy men themselves, saw nothing extraordinary about him; a reticent man of simple tastes, they thought, a man who had inherited most of his money and had preserved it through large safe investments in steel, rubber, and oil.

> What his associates managed to see in Grand was usually a reflection of their own dullness: a club member, a dinner guest, a possibility, a threat—a man whose holdings represented a prospect and a danger. But this was to do injustice to Grand's private life, because his private life was atypical. (13)

By conforming to the conventions of the system Guy can utilize the symbolic power of the wealthy entrepreneur (as a respected orator and revered role model) while simultaneously subverting the values that such figures traditionally embody. Grand seems to relish the opportunity to disrupt the status quo, as the narrator of the novel notes, "For one thing, he was the last of the big spenders; and for another, he had a very unusual attitude toward *people*—he spent about ten million a year in, as he expressed it himself, '*making it hot for them*'" (14).

In his elevated position, Grand embodies the Marcusian belief that those who have succeeded in the system are most likely to be able to rebel effectively against it. Yet it is questionable whether Grand instigates any wider-scale rebellion of the kind that Marcuse proposes is likely to come from the middle classes. The novel does not imply that Grand achieves anything of lasting value, and his pranks are shown to have an immediate, rather than long-term effect on their victims: "Fortunately, what did happen didn't last too long" (60). Instead, it is possible that the enduring qualities of Grand's rebellion are not found in the novel itself but rather in the effect the pranks are intended to have on the reader. The novel presents us with a series of seemingly unrelated episodes so that we, as readers, concentrate on issues of ideology rather than matters of character or plot.

Grand also exhibits personality traits that are akin to Marcuse's understanding of the Orpheus and Narcissus figures as they are conceptualized in *Eros and Civilisation*.[52] Instead of depicting the anti-heroic as a "rebel against the gods, who creates culture at the price of perpetual pain,"[53] Southern's text introduces an Orphic and Narcissistic element to the figure based upon a "revolt against culture based on toil, domination and renunciation."[54] This aspect of the anti-hero rejects productivity, and instead recalls "the experience of a world that is not to be mastered and controlled but to be liberated."[55]

While Marcuse proposes that the Orphic and Narcissistic archetypes are "committed to the underworld and to death [stating that] they do not teach any 'message,'"[56] Grand incorporates the trickster's tendency for "objective and meaning"[57] in order to impress the reader with a particular viewpoint oppositional to that of mainstream ideology.

In its need to encourage monopoly and control, consensus capitalism requires individuals to embody the tenants of its ideology. These individuals must be capable, and willing to symbolize all that is perceivable to be good about capitalism without being concerned about the deceptive omission of its more negative points. As the character of Henderson remarks in *Henderson the Rain King*, "A man like me may become something like a trophy."[58] In America, the figure of the entrepreneur has traditionally occupied this role. The entrepreneur is intrinsic to the notion of the 'American Dream', being presented as an individual whose skill, acumen, effort, and hard work have contributed to his success within the system of laissez-faire capitalism. Innate within the image of the entrepreneur is the supposition that anyone can succeed within the 'open' egalitarian structure of American society if he or she is willing to put in a sufficient amount of effort. While such a belief remained a constant within American society for several decades,[59] by the advent of the 1960s authors, such as Bellow, Kosinski, Southern, and Vonnegut, were beginning to note the increasing gap between the image of the entrepreneur and its reality. The work of these writers implies that a representation of the entrepreneur had arisen within American popular culture that worked to obscure the truth. The suggestion is that a subjective, ideologically infused image of the entrepreneur determines the manner in which real entrepreneurs are perceived, transforming the figure into an aesthetic tool.

The realization of the entrepreneurial figure as a fiction means that where once it functioned as a model of aspiration for all, it now became a scapegoat for increasing disillusionment concerning the stratification of American society. The figure's implicit leaning toward hierarchal systems worked against the egalitarian elements of the 'American Dream', as Packard notes:

> In modern big business, it is becoming more and more difficult to start at the bottom and reach the top. Any leaping aspiration a non-college person has after beginning his career in big business in a modest capacity is becoming less and less realistic.[60]

The absurdity of such stratification is examined further within Kosinski's novel, *Being There*. The story tells of a simpleton gardener, the aptly named Chance, who accidentally ascends to the upper echelons of American society through a series of fortuitous events. The manner in which Chance rises to the top through sheer luck and coincidence serves to disrupt some of the more aspirational tenants of the

'American Dream', as Holstad comments, "Everything has been predetermined. Not only is freedom to form identity limited, but pointless."[61] While the ideology of American egalitarianism espouses the idea that success relates to individual exertion, Chance puts no discernible effort into anything he does. Indeed, Chance lacks even the most basic qualities conventionally suggested as necessary for societal advancement: "'I can't write,' said Chance . . . 'I can't even read.'"[62] Chance frequently protests his incompetence regarding his suitability as capitalist model; yet the novel suggests that those around Chance project their ideals onto him in order to fashion Chance into what they want him to represent, as Holstad suggests: "[Chance] is simply a mirror, reflecting back to others sublimated images of desires projected onto him."[63] In projecting their own wants onto Chance the other characters expose their inclination for an exclusive system that rejects true egalitarianism: "others violate [Chance's] integrity by refusing to allow him to be himself [yet such violations] result in fame, power, and wealth."[64]

In many ways Chance is akin to "a blank page" (*BT*, 109). Through his continual imitation of the images he sees on television Chance allows society to dictate what he should be: "In deciding how to behave, Chance chose the TV programme of a young businessman who often dined with his boss and the boss's daughter" (31). It is deeply ironic therefore that in a society that supposedly links individualism with leadership, Chance is able to reach the uppermost echelons of power. Indeed, at the end of the novel Chance is considered as a potential presidential candidate due to this very homogeneity, as one character puts it: "He's personable, well spoken, and he comes across well on TV! And, as far as his thinking goes, he appears to be one of us" (117–118).

Throughout *Being There*, characters judge Chance to be an exemplary individual because of comparisons with other 'individualist' figures, using superficial impressions to make claims about his character: "'This Gardiner has quite a personality,' his wife mused. 'Manly: well-groomed; beautiful voice; sort of a cross between Ted Kennedy and Cary Grant. He's not one of those phony idealists, or IBM-ized technocrats'" (59). Chance's audience believe him to be the embodiment of a capitalist ideal of individualism, yet in believing this, they reveal the paradox involved in the creation of a model for individualism. While the other characters in the novel think that what they desire radical individualism in a leader, it is in fact something far more conservative that they seek, "Thank God there are still men like you around to give aid and comfort" (97).

By presenting us with a central character who conforms to a 'deceptive' type of individualism that is promoted through the television personality, *Being There* highlights the degree to which the individual is under threat by a society that unwittingly prizes conformity above all else. "While Chance may be in some sense of the word free, he is a victim of an ideology preaching self-imposed awareness deprivation."[65] The other characters in the novel are also trapped by a belief in capitalist society's deceptive interpretation of individualism, which conditions them into viewing nonconformist behavior as negative:

> O'Flaherty spoke easily: 'What was the trouble with Duncan? With Frank and with Shellman, for that matter, and with so many of the others we've considered and have had to reject? The damn trouble was that they all had background, too much background! A man's past cripples him: his background turns into a swamp and invites scrutiny!' (117)

In *An Essay on Liberation*, Marcuse develops his discussion of the pleasure and reality principles from *Eros and Civilization*. He argues that capitalist society attempts to deceive the individual with a 'subverted' form of individualism. This artificial individualism maintains the status quo through the promotion of self-interest. It also has the power to make victims of those that are supposedly benefiting from the 'freedom' it offers in the form of potentially unlimited material wealth.[66] Rather than encouraging personal liberty, capitalism fosters a kind of addiction to the system within which the individual is convinced of the almost 'biological' necessity to buy and work as the only direct means of asserting their own individuality. In this manner, Marcuse suggests that capitalism creates a continuous cycle that enslaves those that it purports to unfetter:

> The so-called consumer economy and the politics of corporate capitalism have created a second nature of man which ties him libidinally and aggressively to the commodity form. The need for possessing, consuming, handling, and constantly renewing the gadgets, devices, instruments, engines, offered to and imposed upon the people, for using these wares even at the danger of one's own destruction, has become a "biological" need.[67]

Marcuse's use of the term 'biological' here denotes the level to which the capitalist version of 'bad' individualism has permeated those within the system, becoming so ingrained that it appears as a seemingly 'natural' part of the individual's life. In *An Essay on Liberation* Marcuse suggests that because capitalism has managed to

influence and determine the individual's own 'biological needs', it is only by starting with a reevaluation on the level of the individual that a true rebellion can be achieved:

> The rebellion would then have taken root in the very nature, the 'biology' of the individual; and on these new grounds, the rebels would redefine the objectives and the strategy of the political struggle, in which alone the concrete goals of liberation can be determined.[68]

The Marcusian concept of the individual as a vehicle for qualitative social change becomes a crucial element within the 1960s. It is present in fiction, and within a wide range of nonfictional philosophical, social, and psychological works. In the radical theories of Paul Goodman and the humanist psychology of R.D. Laing the importance of the individual is reassessed in the light of society's present procedures. Laing (whose work was seized upon by writers and social thinkers of the 1960s and 1970s[69]) proposes that the differences between traditional binaries such as insanity and sanity, madness and insight, and conformity and nonconformity, are not as great as had been previously suggested:

> Laing conceived of madness as a struggle for liberation from false attitudes and values, an encounter with primary feelings and impulses that constitutes a possibility for the emergence of the "true self" hidden from the false outer being, whose chief function is adjustment to the demands of society.[70]

In its 1960s configuration, the anti-heroic figure demonstrates Laing's struggle for the 'liberation' of the 'true' American 'self' from the 'false' attitudes and values of the American hegemony. In the 1960s novel the notion of the individual as the primary agent for social change comes to the fore as anti-heroic characters reclaim the individual and the pleasure principle as important catalytic parts of social change: "To be sure, no revolution without individual liberation, but also no individual liberation without the liberation of society."[71] Consequently, the 1960s anti-hero attempts to deconstruct and expose capitalism's bogus interpretation of individualism, asserting in its place a 'truer' individualism that elevates the human.

In a Marcusian fashion, the novel of the 1960s suggests that there is a greater possibility for qualitative change when individuals remove themselves from the system:

> Left to itself, and supported by a free intelligence aware of the potentialities of liberation from the reality of repression, the libidinal energy

> generated by the id would thrust against its ever more extraneous limitations and strive to engulf an even larger field of existential relations, thereby exploding the reality ego and its repressive performances.[72]

The potential of the individual when freed from the reality principles of their society is explored within Kurt Vonnegut's novel *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater.* Indeed, in *Kurt Vonnegut* (1982) Jerome Klinkowitz notes that the novel is akin to "A manipulation of the prince-and-the-pauper formula."[73] The protagonist of *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater,* Eliot Rosewater, shares several elements in common with the archetypal savior figure. Eliot occupies a privileged and elevated position in society at the start of the novel but descends from 'on high' to promote a lifestyle and a set of values demarcated as dangerous by the state (but which present a more humane alternative). In offering an alternative ideology to that of the capitalist hegemony Eliot is labelled a 'radical' by a society that seeks to isolate individuals from any form of communal ideology, as the narrator of the novel adroitly notes: "They were [communists] No one was sorry to see them go" (*GBY*, 28).

God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater criticizes those who would use bureaucracy to protect their own venal interests at the cost of depriving others of a basic standard of living. This kind of "surplus repression,"[74] as Marcuse tells us, "is exercised by a particular group or individual in order to sustain and enhance itself in a privileged position."[75] The novel suggests that an inclination toward hierarchal structures conflicts with the egalitarian ideology of the 'American Dream' by creating an undemocratic situation in which the chances of success are not distributed equally. Eliot rails against the system of the 'money river' that privileges only those who know about it. The river helps the rich to get richer and causes the poor to get poorer: "you'll be shown your place on the riverbank, and handed a bucket all your own. Slurp as much as you want, but try to keep the racket of your slurping down. A poor man might hear" (75). In his rebellion against the hierarchy of the 'money river' Eliot defies the prevailing belief in nineteenth-century Social Darwinism and seeks instead to replace it with a system containing more democratic parity.

Though Eliot is the heir to the immense fortune ($87,472,033.61) of the Rosewater family, he rejects the structures of capitalist society by refusing to support the inequalities that such a system endorses: "He started talking . . . about how the government ought to divide up the wealth of the country equally, instead of some people having more than they could ever use, and others having nothing" (23). Eliot gives

up his position and material accoutrements in order to adopt a more fulfilling alternative lifestyle. This decision leads to both his spiritual salvation (as he literally regains his sanity) and the salvation of others, most noticeably those living in Rosewater County. After renouncing the values of capitalist society as corrupt at the start of the novel, Eliot chooses to go and live in the rundown town of Rosewater. Eliot's self-appointed task while in Rosewater is to bring more compassion into the lives of its inhabitants to, as he puts it, "love [these] discarded Americans" (27). Eliot sees the town's inhabitants in a distinctly Rooseveltian fashion,[76] proposing to those who will listen that they represent "what's good about America" (16). Eliot's father, Senator Rosewater, thinks that his son has gone mad:

> "Him! Him! Captain Eliot Rosewater—Silver Star, Bronze Star, Soldier's Medal, and Purple Heart with Cluster! Sailing champion! Ski champion! Him! Him! My God—the number of times life has said, 'Yes, yes, yes,' to him! Millions of dollars, hundreds of significant friends, the most beautiful, intelligent, talented, affectionate wife imaginable! A splendid education, an elegant mind in a big, clean, body—and what is his reply when life says nothing but, 'Yes, yes, yes'"?
>
> "No, no, no."
>
> "Why? Will someone tell me why?"
>
> No one did. (37)

The senator is unable to understand the reasoning behind his son's actions because Eliot chooses to remove himself so completely from the reality principles of society that to engage in a dialogue with him becomes impossible for his father. This inability for communication has important implications for Eliot's rebellion. For in totally rejecting the system that his father still adheres to, Eliot arguably limits the effects his dissidence can have, as Marcuse warns, "The infecting agents cannot be pushed aside, they must be combated on their own grounds."[77] The result of Eliot's wholesale rejection of the capitalist system is that many of the other characters in the novel classify him as mentally insane, echoing the Marcusian belief that "[i]n a repressive order, which enforces the equation between normal, socially useful, and good, the manifestations of pleasure for its own sake must appear as *fleurs du mal*."[78] While Eliot's decision to completely remove himself from the mainstream might indicate a reluctance to engage with the socially transformative potential of rebellion his actions nevertheless manage to force a questioning of the conventional hegemonic order. While the senator's belief is that the more the individual has

conformed to the capitalist system the happier they will be, Eliot finds scant contentment in the immense material wealth he possesses. He cannot live with the absurdity of his own situation and so rejects the arbitrary nature of his privileged position:

> "Look at the powers of an Earthling millionaire! Look at me! I was born naked, just like you, but my God, friends and neighbours, I have thousands of dollars a day to spend!"
>
> He paused to make a very impressive demonstration of his magical powers, writing a smeary check for two hundred dollars for every person there.
>
> "*There's* fantasy for you," he said. "And you go to the bank tomorrow, and it will all come true. It's insane that I should be able to do such a thing with money so important." (14)

Eliot's desire for greater parity within society not only signifies a rejection of capitalist ideology but also refuses a particular type of capitalist hero worship that locates the reasons for greatness within a primarily economic sphere.

In *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater,* instead of worshipping free enterprise, capitalism takes on the qualities of an oppressive and monstrous force that has manipulated and subverted the egalitarian tenets of the 'American Dream', as Klinkowitz notes, "Lust for money, by despicable people . . . sets the tone."[79] If Eliot resembles the savior archetype then his most significant function in the novel is to deconstruct reverential attitudes toward capitalist ideology. Eliot drops out of the capitalist system because he seems to have a desire to authenticate the importance of the human. He tries to assert the status of humans as individuals rather than as depersonalized parts of a larger capitalist machine.

In this manner, Eliot's actions seem to embody a rejection of the "technocratic"[80] elements of the contemporary American hegemony. Roszak notes the manner in which the 'technocracy' seeks to place expertise into the hands of an elite minority, limiting the majority of the population from access to the uppermost reaches of its hierarchal structures: "Expertise—technical, scientific, managerial, military, educational, financial, medical—has become the prestigious mystogogy of the technocratic society. Its principal purpose in the hands of ruling elites is to mystify the popular mind by creating illusions of omnipotence and omniscience."[81]

In contrast to more classical heroic individuals, who had embodied virtues such as valor, courage, or bravery, the technocratic hegemony creates its own version of the 'great individual' based upon a set of

criteria that is more appropriate to its capitalist principles, and tends to favor an elite minority. Consequently, figures such as John D. Rockefeller,[82] the Guggenheims, and William Randolph Hearst were deemed heroic, based primarily on their capacity to maintain and propagate the apparatus of the capitalist system.

These entrepreneurial figures were idolized by a large sector of the population, as Harold Lubin suggests in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*: "Countless inspirational portraits of the 'captains of industry'... appeared in magazines and newspapers. Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford, among others, fired the imagination of countless young people."[83] In an America in which production occupied such a central position, individuals such as Rockefeller and Hearst became important icons within the social assemblage, as the literal embodiment of what was classified as the "success myth."[84]

This modern day mythology quickly entered popular discourse, taking on a moral element when it appeared in fiction, as Richard Weiss notes: "when the notion of the self-made man began to gain broad currency... writers explicitly linked virtue with success and sin with failure."[85]

While the individualist morality of the 'success myth' permeated American society during the nineteenth century with relatively little resistance, by the middle of the twentieth century a growing sense of inequality began to supplant respect for this element of capitalist ideology. In the postwar era, the entrepreneur as the embodiment of such rhetoric started to lose some of its potency as many began to realize that the individualist tradition of the capitalist hegemony was not necessarily conducive to the well-being of society, as Paul Goodman suggests in *People or Personnel* (1963):

> Oddly, the rhetoric of independence and civil liberties is now spoken only by Big Business, at least by the branches of Big Business that are not immediate partners of government and operating on cost-plus. But the tone of Business rhetoric is no longer the social-Darwinism of rugged individualism, but rather defensive complaint against the encroachment of the other entrepreneur.[86]

In *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, Eliot rebels against the exclusivity of the entrepreneurial figure, randomly redistributing his 'greatness' by legitimizing all the children of Rosewater County as his heirs: "Let their names be Rosewater from this moment on... And tell them... to be fruitful and multiply" (167). Eliot's radical actions suggest that a greater emphasis on humanitarian equality is needed to

halt the encroachment of a neo-class system. This increased parity would return the means for societal advancement into the hands of the individual. By disowning his family's immense fortune, Eliot encourages others to question his right to inherit such a fortune without having to work for it. Eliot's foregrounding of the absurdity of inherited wealth reflects a recurring feature of the contemporary anti-heroic figure; one that deconstructs the conventional entrepreneurial image in order to reveal the manner in which this symbol has been used as a conformist tool by the capitalist system.

This novelistic technique resembles that of eidetic variation wherein deformations of an original model are produced with the aim of enabling us to understand the most essential elements of the original. The anti-heroic figure seems particularly suited to this task because of its intrinsically dissident and individualist nature. By presenting us with anti-heroes who are 'deformations' of an original entrepreneurial figure, writers of the 1960s alert their audience to the inequalities inherent within the archetype. This process is reminiscent of the Marcusian suggestion that

> Where the Establishment proclaims its professional killers as heroes, and its rebelling victims as criminals, it is hard to save the idea of heroism for the other side. The desperate act, doomed to failure, may for a brief moment tear the veil of justice and expose the faces of brutal suppression; it may arouse the conscience of the neutrals; it may reveal hidden cruelties and lies.[87]

In the case of Eliot, he rebels against an image of the entrepreneur as a grandiloquent figure.[88] Eliot rejects the idealized image of the successful capitalist, and chooses instead to replace it with something more mundane: "'I don't want to look like me,' Eliot replied. 'I want to look like you'" (16). In temporarily repositioning himself at the bottom of the system, Eliot universalizes his own struggle, and eliminates the pretentious aspects of the entrepreneurial figure, denying it the pedagogic, exemplary functions it once held.

It is important to note that while Eliot is depicted as a rebel who seeks an alternative lifestyle through which he can promote a set of more communal values, like Grand in *The Magic Christian* Eliot arguably does not attempt to destroy the capitalist system. Instead, it would be more accurate to suggest that Eliot wishes to expose the rationality of the capitalist system as unequal.

Eliot's actions in the novel are also interpretable as an attempt to reclaim the importance of the pleasure principle. Eliot tries to expose

the defects of surplus repression in order to replace them with a pleasure principle that espouses the need for a collective humanism as a means to true self-actualization:

> Father, nobody can work with the poor and not fall over Karl Marx from time to time—or just fall over the Bible, as far as that goes. I think it's terrible the way people don't share things in this country. I think it's a heartless government that will let one baby be born owning a big piece of the country, the way I was born, and let another baby be born without owning anything. The least a government could do, it seems to me, is to divide things up fairly among the babies. Life is hard enough, without having to worry themselves sick about *money*, too. There's plenty for everybody in this country, if we'll only *share* more. (73–74)

The critique of the 'technocracy' that takes place during the 1960s involves a discussion of the negative effects that alienation from labor has on the individual; as Marcuse suggests, "Nobody truly occupies a station in life any more. There are mostly people who feel that they occupy the place that belongs to another by rights. There are displaced persons everywhere."[89] This estrangement becomes an important issue in postwar America in both a Marxist-economic and Freudian psychoanalytical sense. The Marcusian desire to reassert the importance of the link between the worker and his work is not made simply to improve the conditions of those who reside lower down the capitalist system; rather it also forms a personal response by those at the top who feel a growing dissatisfaction with working conditions. These latter individuals are not concerned with issues such as hygiene and safety, but with the lack of spiritual fulfillment they experience in the work environment, as Marcuse notes

> Men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions. While they work, they do not fulfil their own needs and faculties but work in *alienation*. Work has now become *general*, and so have the restrictions placed upon the libido: labor time, which is the largest part of the individual's life time, is painful time, for alienated labor is absence of gratification, negation of the pleasure principle.[90]

Marcuse is particularly relevant to this aspect of 1960s thought for rather than suggesting that a Marxist class conflict will lead to significant social revolution, Marcuse instead places an emphasis upon the role of the emotional, as Reitz notes, "Anticipating charges of the dematerialization of Marx, [Marcuse's] particular version of critical

theory claims to furnish philosophy with the sensuous."[91] This theory of an ideological and psychic 'top-down' revolution is reflected in many of the characters discussed in this chapter nearly all of whom initially occupy a relatively privileged position in society. These figures choose to drop out of the system even though it affords them material comfort because they find it ideologically or spiritually lacking in some manner.

Interestingly, there is evidence that suggests that changes in the working environment during the postwar period did cause a sense of isolation to grow among those at the top of already feudal-like structures.[92] In *The Status Seekers,* Vance Packard notes how

> Employees in big offices, as well as big plants, are finding their work roles fragmentized and depersonalized. There has been, perhaps unwittingly, a sealing-off of contact between big and little people on the job. And there has been a startling rise in the number of people who are bored with their work and feel no pride or initiative or creativity. They must find their satisfactions outside their work. Many do it using their pay-checks to consume flamboyantly, much as the restless Roman masses found diversion in circuses thoughtfully provided by the emperors.[93]

While a sense of isolation may have lead a number of individuals to seek solace in the hedonistic entertainments offered by some sectors of the counterculture, in the 1960s novel, loneliness, engendered by material success, tends to lead characters along an (arguably) more constructive path. Material success encourages the anti-hero characters in these novels to begin finding and reconstructing a more valid purpose for the human that can then be applied to the situation of the contemporary individual.

A desire for the liberation of the individual from the dehumanization of the contemporary workplace is traceable in the 1960s penchant for decentralization. Indeed, such enthusiasm demonstrates the possibility that those within the counterculture saw in the individual as a vehicle for collectivist ideology. The rejection of a "centralising style [which] makes for both petty conforming and admiration for bigness,"[94] and the adoption of an unofficial "political *maxim*: to decentralize where, how, and how much is expedient"[95] exemplify a 1960s reevaluation of the relationship between the individual and the larger community. Many members of the counterculture believed that by 'decentralizing' power back into the hands of American citizens, inevitably, conditions would be improved for all.

The counterculture's desire to reassert the rights of the individual when coupled with many members' belief in a system of libertarian socialism led to the development of a contemporary, specifically American type of existentialism during the 1960s, as Farrell proposes: "The success of the Sixties . . . was the success of Sisyphus. Like Camus' character, condemned to push a rock over and over again to the top of the hill, Sixties activists succeeded in maintaining their commitments despite the apparent futility of their activism."[96] This modified American version of existentialism emphasized the original philosophy's concern with personal freedom, encouraging the individual to "Do Your Own Thing."[97] Contemporary American existentialism also relied upon a specifically humanitarian, communal element. This focus upon the human evoked a national tradition dating back to Emerson, and the Transcendentalists, who emphasized the pluralist, populist, and libertarian notion of the individual in opposition to the exclusiveness, mandarin, and controlled nature of the establishment.

Like *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, Saul Bellow's picaresque novel *Henderson the Rain King*[98] explores the need to "generate a *new* reality principle."[99] In many ways, the novel can be read as an extended analysis of the contemporary individual's condition, related through the story of its protagonist Eugene Henderson. Henderson is a middle-aged millionaire suffering from a crisis of direction who decides to abandon his wife and children in order to go travelling in the African outback. At the beginning of the novel, Henderson is confused by the sense he has of an unfulfilled desire,—what Marcuse might call "the self-repression of the repressed individual."[100] The feeling that something is missing from his life causes Henderson to reevaluate the dissatisfaction he experiences because of his material wealth: "So what do you do with yourself? More than three million bucks. After taxes, after alimony and all expenses I still have one hundred and ten thousand dollars in income absolutely clear. What do I need it for [?]" (*H*, 23–24)

The character of Henderson represents a progression from the capitalist notion that job satisfaction is located solely in material fulfillment to a view that 'spiritual' fulfillment is equally important. This spiritual fulfillment results not from what we achieve in our professional capacities but rather in the realization of the individual as a whole and integrated person. Such a concept brings us back to the idea of a 'sensuous' rebellion and the Marcusian, anti-Marxist suggestion that those in the upper echelons of hierarchal structures are as likely to rebel as those at the bottom. As Roszak states, "If one sets about looking for sane and happy people, one is not likely to find

them at the top of the social pyramid. For by whom is the life-depriving fiction of money more pathetically reified than by the successful capitalist."[101]

At the start of the novel Henderson lacks almost all of the qualities associated with the entrepreneurial ideal. He is not especially proficient at multitasking: "Things got worse and worse and worse and pretty soon they were too complicated" (3), and he is neither handsome nor healthy: "old, bulging out and sweating turbulently" (68). Indeed, Henderson's image of himself is initially almost entirely derogatory:

> If I am to make sense to you people and explain why I went to Africa I must face up to the facts. I might as well start with the money. I am rich. From my old man I inherited three million dollars after taxes, but I thought myself a bum and had my reasons, the main reason being that I behaved like a bum. (3)

The portrayal of the privileged Henderson as a 'bum' serves to question the validity of the entrepreneur as an ideal. Like *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, Bellow's novel also repudiates the image of the entrepreneur as the embodiment of the supposedly egalitarian nature of American society. Henderson tells us how "[his] ancestors stole land from the Indians. They got more from the government and cheated other settlers too, so I became heir to a great estate" (21).

Henderson's refutation of his family's material wealth and capitalist productivity represents a rejection of a significant part of the reality principle, bringing into question the established bonds between financial success and personal fulfillment, as Marcuse suggests in *Eros and Civilization*:

> Behind the reality principle lies the fundamental fact of Ananke or scarcity (*Lebensnot*), which means that the struggle for existence takes place in a world too poor for the satisfaction of human needs without constant restraint, renunciation, delay. In other words, whatever satisfaction is possible necessitates work, more or less painful arrangements and undertakings for the procurement of the means for satisfying needs.[102]

Henderson challenges the suggestion that capitalist hegemony denies the individual the pleasure principle founded upon the notion of 'scarcity'. For the character presents us with a case of what might happen to the individual if they were to achieve a condition without scarcity. Interestingly, the novel suggests that this material plenty in

fact does not create a utopian situation for the individual. Rather, Henderson still possesses an insatiable longing for something else: "[I had] a ceaseless voice in my heart that said, *I want, I want, I want, oh, I want*" (12).

The 'ceaseless voice' in Henderson's heart remains because the surplus repression of the capitalist system has become an ideological impediment to anything else. The pervasiveness of this repression prevents Henderson from reaching his full potential as a human being even when he chooses to try to leave it behind. Literally, currency itself impedes Henderson's quest for self-knowledge at the start of the novel, when he attempts to explore his family's library for potential answers: "I searched through dozens of volumes but all that turned up was money, for my father had used currency for book marks" (3–4).

In the 1960s novel, money comes to function as a kind of "corrupted magic"[103] that only serves to alienate the individual from his inner self. While it is true that the successful capitalist who chooses to 'drop out' is unlikely to suffer in the same manner as the worker, the fact that Henderson is so disenfranchised with his affluence can be seen as an even more damning condemnation of a capitalism system that is deficient in satisfying the emotional and spiritual needs of the individual.

Through the character of Henderson, Bellow's novel suggests that the individual cannot participate in the capitalist system without severely minimizing their chances for spiritual independence. For though Henderson realizes that he is unhappy at the start of the novel, he experiences great difficulty in working out how best to go about solving his problem. Indeed, all Henderson seems to know is that he must remove himself from the reaches of the capitalist system if he is to begin discovering what is wrong, a sentiment that echoes the Marcusian notion that "freedom in civilization is essentially antagonistic to happiness: it involves the repressive modification (*sublimation*) of happiness."[104]

The novel suggests that the permeation of capitalist values in the everyday life of the individual is so great that when this system is renounced it creates a massive chasm of purpose, of value, and of ideology. The desire to fill this void leads the individual to an existentialist dilemma.

In the case of Henderson, part of this process of 'filling the void' manifests in an intense yearning for a more pastoral existence, the validity of which the modern urban environment seems to reject. As Galloway notes, "It is not merely his dislocations and frustrations which make Henderson a questing man; for inside him is a

voice . . . which says '*I want*', and it is through his voyage into the Africa of his own soul that he will finally satisfy this cry."[105] Henderson imbues the pastoral with a positive, romantic quality, and conceives of Africa as a prelapsarian state in comparison to the postlapsarian condition of the urban environment. Corruption is associated with the capitalist space of the city, and a sense of innocence and purity with the noncapitalist, rural landscape of Africa:

> I got clean away from everything, and we came into a region like a floor surrounded by mountains. It was hot, clear, and arid and after several days we saw no human footprints. Nor were there many plants; for that matter there was not much of anything here it was all simplified and splendid, and I felt I was entering the past—the real past, no history or junk like that. (46)

The expedition to Africa that Henderson decides to travel on becomes a kind of extended quest for the pleasure principle. By moving away from the United States, Henderson escapes the shackles of the reality principle (of American society), and uncovers a version of true greatness, spiritually transcendent of the capitalist ideal, echoing the Marcusian notion that "Liberated from the tyranny of repressive reason, the instincts tend toward free and lasting existential relations."[106]

Henderson's time in pastoral Africa contrasts with the corrupt and complicated urbanity of modern America. African society is presented as being devoid of the constrictive reality principles that are so prevalent in America. The first tribe Henderson encounters possesses an asexual rather than patriarchal hierarchy, while the peoples who live there seem to prize manual ability over the clerical: "I saw that to regain his respect I must activate myself, and I decided to wrestle him after all" (66). These features of African life deviate from capitalist values and through this deviation act to metaphysically free Henderson from the tyranny of a monotheistic ideology, reflecting Marcuse's notion that

> The emergence of a non-repressive reality principle involving instinctual liberation would *regress* behind the attained level of civilized rationality. This regression would be physical as well as social: it would reactivate early stages of the libido which were surpassed in the development of the reality ego, and it would dissolve the institutions of society in which the reality ego exists.[107]

In *Henderson the Rain King*, Henderson undergoes a type of regression by living among the tribal people of Africa. He tells us that "I had sensed from the first that I might find things here which were of old, which I saw when I was still innocent and have longed for ever since, for all my life—and without which *I could not make it*" (102). The tribe's people work to liberate Henderson to a state of self-actualization, as one of the tribal kings tells him: "I intend to loosen you up . . . because you are so contracted. This is why we were running. The tendency of your conscious is to isolate self. This makes you extremely contracted and self-recoiled" (264).

Henderson's firsthand experience of an alternative lifestyle while in Africa serves to weaken the ideologically totalitarianism grip the capitalist system had previously held him in. The increased awareness that Henderson acquires in Africa lead him toward a more knowledgeable existence in which the possibilities for self-actualization increasingly reveal themselves, as Galloway notes, "[while in Africa] Henderson achieves a vision which permits him to take hold of his own fate."[108] It is only by moving beyond the conventional structures of capitalist society (even though this involves a drop in status within that system) that Henderson is able to feel truly happy and fulfilled on a spiritual level:

> And I was obliged, it was my bounden duty to hear. And nevertheless you are a man. Listen! Harken unto me, you shmohawk! You are blind. The footsteps were accidental and yet the destiny could be no other. So now do not soften, oh no, brother, intensify. Should you be overcome, you slob, should you lie in your own fat blood senseless, unconscious of nature whose gift you have betrayed, the world will soon take back what the world unsuccessfully sent forth. Each peculiarity is only one impulse of a series from the very heart of things—that old heart of things. The purpose will appear at last though maybe not to you. (*H*, 187–188).

The dislocation of time that Henderson experiences while in Africa is also important to his attainment of a sense of spiritual well-being. He feels freed by the tribes' independence from a capitalist obsession with timekeeping: "There is no time in bliss. All the clocks were thrown out of heaven" (314). In Africa Henderson also undergoes a form of regression to a state of enlightening simplicity, in which he is able to "look into some of the fundamentals" (331) of his life, and begin assessing what is important to him. Henderson's desire to go back as a means of uncovering some more profound 'truth' resembles

the Marcusian suggestion that what is needed in order to combat the dominance of capitalism ideology is

> [A] return to an imaginary *temps perdu* in the real life of man-kind: progress to a stage of civilization where man has learned to ask for the sake of whom or of what he organizes his society; the stage where he checks and perhaps even halts his incessant struggle for existence on an enlarged scale, surveys what has been achieved through centuries of misery and hecatombs of victims, and decides that it is enough, and that it is time to enjoy what he has and what can be reproduced and refined with a minimum of alienated labor.[109]

By removing himself from the hierarchies of the capitalist system, Henderson does indeed appear to heighten his awareness of the structures that are left behind. This increased self-awareness then leads him into a beneficial questioning of the ideologies that fuel these structures. It is in Africa that for the first time Henderson can truly evaluate the constitutive elements of what capitalism tries to claim for its own:

> We're supposed to think that nobility is unreal. But that's just it. The illusion is on the other foot. They make us think we crave more and more illusions. Why, I don't crave illusions at all. They say, Think big. Well, that's boloney of course, another business slogan. But greatness! Oh, God! Romilayu, I don't mean inflated, swollen, false greatness. I don't mean pride or throwing your weight around. But the universe itself being put into us. (318)

Henderson's almost Transcendentalist notion of 'the universe itself being put into us' would seem to indicate a spiritual dimension to his reclamation of the pleasure principle. This religious facet reconfigures his rebellion into an ontological, humanitarian cause,[110] as Henderson suggests, "The eternal is bonded unto us. It calls out for its share. This is why guys can't bear to be so cheap. And I had to do something about it" (318).

This compassionate element of the 1960s anti-hero's rebellion is also evident in the character of Benjamin Braddock in Charles Webb's novel *The Graduate* (which given the huge success of the movie version[111] tends to be less well known). In many ways, the novel is an exploration of "The replacement of the pleasure principle by the reality principle,"[112] which Marcuse tells us "is the great traumatic event in the development of man—in the development of the genus as well as of the individual."[113] Benjamin is a graduate student who upon

facing entry into adult, bourgeois life, chooses to rebel, dropout, and strike up an adulterous sexual relationship with the wife of his father's business partner. Benjamin's rebellion is borne out of the feelings of ennui he experiences once he has left the academic system: "All of a sudden none of it seems to be worth anything to me."[114]

A favorable, sociocultural reading of *The Graduate* might draw parallels between Benjamin's rebellion and that of the 1960s youth movement. This element of the counterculture involved members of student bodies assuming the role of activist revolutionaries,[115] fighting for the rights of students and nonstudents alike against what they saw as "the alienation and exploitation of youth in a society with bankrupt values."[116] As Marcuse discusses in *Counterrevolution and Revolt*

> Where the resistance of the poor has succumbed, students lead the fight against the *soldateska* and the police; by the hundreds, students are slaughtered, gassed, bombed, kept in jail…In the United States, students are still in the forefront of radical protest: the killings at Jackson State and Kent State testify to their historical role.[117]

While Webb's novel ostensibly reflects this youthful rebellion, it also explores the inherent problems with the counterculture's emphasis upon the individual's pleasure above everything else. Initially, Benjamin's rebellion appears collectivist in the fashion of those contemporary "students…at the forefront of radical protest"[118] yet it quickly shifts to a more individualist mode centered upon the character's own spiritual well-being: "I'm a little worried about my future" (*G*, 9). Indeed, Benjamin's confusion as to what the purpose of his rebellion is could be interpreted as an illustration of the similar conflict between the counterculture's focus upon the self, and its' professed wider-scale, humanitarian goals.

At the beginning of the novel, Benjamin rejects almost everything offered to him by a society that seeks to initiate him into its structures. Most noticeably, he rejects the Italian sports car that his parents give him as a graduation present (eventually selling it at a financial loss), not because he dislikes it per se, but because he refuses to idolize a symbol of capitalist 'worth'. He rejects the car's iconic status as an indication of individualism, and essentially breaches the bounds of ownership and possession by offering anyone who asks (and some who do not) the opportunity to drive it without his supervision: "'Here,' he said. 'You take the car.' 'What?' 'Borrow the car. I'll come and get it tomorrow'" (15). Benjamin's refutation of the sports car

echoes the more general youth-orientated rejection of the traditional producer/consumer role, which Marcuse suggests is "nothing else than an intellectual manifestation of the will to go beyond the industrial era, the search for a new profile of society which is placed somehow beyond a society of producers."[119]

The desire of many countercultural youth to renounce the aspirational goods of their own forebears is discernible through Benjamin's refusal of his parent's gifts, which while offered in an apolitical spirit, are rejected because they implicate Benjamin in an ideological system that he wishes to oppose. In this way, youth is posited as a source of anti-capitalist vitality within the novel. Benjamin's youth functions as a space in which he can refuse the trappings of the capitalist system,[120] and contrasts with the more rigid, fatalistic nature of the adult world that his parents' generation inhabit. Because Benjamin is yet to enter fully into adult life he is in a sufficiently distanced position to be able to comment upon its more distressing foibles and idiosyncrasies, questioning its entrenched value systems in order to expose the reality therein:

> "Ben I—I want to talk about values. Something."
>
> "You want to talk about values," Benjamin said.
>
> "Do you have any left?"
>
> Benjamin frowned, "Do I have any values," he said.
>
> "Values, values." He shook his head. "I can't think of any at the moment. No."
>
> "How can you say that, son."
>
> "Dad, I don't see any value in anything I've ever done and I don't see any value in anything I could possibly ever do. Now I think we've exhausted the topic. How about some TV." (66)

In its characterization, *The Graduate* establishes an oppositional relationship between two distinct groups of people, those who have retained some aspect of the pleasure principle, and those who have not: "the villains in a sterile, inhuman culture."[121] The novel presents those who have given in to the amorality of capitalist ideology in a negative light; as Benjamin suggests of the people his parents invite to his graduation party: "Those people in there are grotesque" (12).

The Robinsons in particular represent those for whom capitalist society has proved materially beneficial, yet spiritually barren: "I'm afraid they're a pretty miserable couple" (75). Though Mr. Robinson has achieved great financial success, the novel implies that his personal life is a failure. His marriage is little more than a sham: "I guess you don't sleep together or anything" (82). While Mr. Robinson appears

to be content, at one point in the novel he pleads with Benjamin not to relinquish the opportunity for enjoyment that being young (and without responsibility) offers: "Sow a few wild oats . . . Take things as they come . . . and make up a little for my mistakes" (27). The Robinsons have attained all that consumer capitalism promotes as essential for happiness, yet they are not happy. Instead, they have entered a kind of spiritual wasteland; one, which the novel suggests, is indicative of contemporary, Middle America.[122] The spiritual deficit of the Robinson's lives allows Benjamin his first entry into this adult world. Benjamin seeks to reinvigorate the adult world, first sexually but then also morally, as he attempts to establish a dialogue between himself and the more jaded figure of Mrs. Robinson. However, the relationship between the two characters serves to reveal the undesirable underbelly of capitalist society in which people occupy the same status as objects. In this environment, sexual relationships have become devoid of emotion, seeming almost businesslike in nature: "If you won't sleep with me this time, Benjamin, I want you to know you can call me up any time you want and we'll make some kind of arrangement" (24).

In *Eros and Civilization,* Marcuse suggests that people become products within a capitalist society: "The human existence in this world is mere stuff, matter material."[123] This Marcusian notion is prevalent throughout Webb's novel. Mrs. Robinson is little more than a trophy wife, Elaine is constantly 'sold' to Benjamin in terms of her homely and feminine qualities by her own father, and Benjamin is treated as a kind of status symbol by his parents: "a goddamn ivy-covered status symbol" (67).

Initially Benjamin chooses to exile himself from the society of his parents because he believes that he wants a lifestyle devoid of the bourgeois trappings his family's status have made available to him. As B.H. Fairchild notes, "Benjamin's problem, his struggle, is in fact to break through the mechanical, conformist shell of himself and his social class."[124] While Benjamin's parents seem content to follow the reality principle of capitalist society and suppress the pleasure principle, Benjamin is concerned that his future is being determined by factors that he has little personal control over:

> "You're twenty one years old," his father said.
>
> "Come on, Dad."
>
> "You have a wonderful mind and you're a well-educated young man."
>
> "Dad," Benjamin said, reaching into his shirt pocket for another cigarette, "let's not beat around the bush. If you're trying to tell me you're throwing me out of the house why not come out with it."

"I'm not Ben."

"Excuse me then. It sounded like you might be leading up to something of that nature."

"I'm leading up to this, Ben. There are certain things you seem completely unaware of."

"Such as."

"Well," Mr. Braddock said, "such as a few economic facts of life if you want to put it that way . . . For all your education, Ben, you seem rather naïve about certain things. One of them is that someday you are going to have to earn a living."

"Am I?" (66–67)

In order to try to reclaim some control over his own life, Benjamin rejects the Frank Halpingham Educational Award that was offered to him on the condition that he becomes a teacher. Instead, he chooses to drop out and go "On the Road" (37). Following the template set down by Kerouac's characters, Benjamin hopes that his travels will allow him to meet, and get to know, those people who have not already been corrupted by the capitalist system: "[the] simple honest people that can't even read or write their own name . . . Truck drivers. Ordinary people who don't have big houses. Who don't have swimming pools" (40).

However, while Benjamin intends his journey to form a significant part of his own personal rejection of the capitalist system, by the time he returns back home his stance has changed somewhat. Having had a bad time on the road because of the reality of the events he has witnessed, Benjamin suddenly rejects Marcusian notions of collectivism, telling his father that "the trip was a waste of time and I'd rather not talk about it" (45). He describes his time spent communally fighting a fire in Shasta as "a bore" (45), the people he met on the road as "Queers [and] tramps [and] whores" (45–46) and states, "None of them were particularly interesting" (44). Working with others does not seem to be the answer to Benjamin's problems, as the character notes: "That's not the way I am at all" (102).

Instead of the more communal form of revolt of characters, such as Eliot and Henderson, Benjamin embodies an individualist rebellion more focused on the needs of the self. For though Benjamin disagrees with his father's assertion that he must have learnt something of worth from the process of higher education, Benjamin has acquired a particularly existentialist outlook, which, as the novel progresses, he chooses to apply in a personal, rather than collective manner.

While Benjamin's rebellion is undoubtedly more insular than that of characters such as Rosewater and Henderson, it does reaffirm the

human need for disorganization in a society that encourages people to deny their own individuality in order that it might function more effectively:

> In exchange for the commodities that enrich their life, the individuals sell not only their labor but also their free time. The better living is offset by the all-pervasive control over living. People dwell in apartment concentrations—and have private automobiles with which they can no longer escape into a different world. They have huge refrigerators filled with frozen foods. They have dozens of newspapers and magazines that espouse the same ideals. They have innumerable choices, innumerable gadgets which are all of the same sort and keep them occupied and divert their attention from the real issue—which is the awareness that they could both work less and determine their own needs and satisfactions.[125]

Indeed, if we choose to believe the Marcusian proposal that "The reality principle materializes in a system of institutions,"[126] then Benjamin's actions at the end of *The Graduate* indicate a concerted desire to break the establishment's suppression of the pleasure principle. Symbolically, at the novel's climax Benjamin stops the marriage between Elaine and Carl Smith from taking place because he refuses to see Elaine suffer by conforming to a system that he despises.[127] In the film adaptation of *The Graduate*, this leads to the significant exchange between Elaine and her mother: "Mrs. Robinson's scream, 'It's too late', and Elaine's response, 'not for me'."[128] Though Benjamin's actions throughout the novel suggest that the character may be unsure of the exact direction his life should take, the ending of the novel seems to indicate that it will be a path that increases his own, and other character's capacity for self-determination.

In conclusion, writers of the 1960s utilize a distinctly anti-capitalist configuration of the anti-heroic figure as a means to convey the importance of a 'good' individualism that stands in opposition to the 'bad' individualism of the capitalist hegemony. In the context of the counterculture, a necessary part of this more seditious individualism is the reassertion of an intrinsic humanitarian element in the act of rebellion. One that is in touch with the suppressed pleasure principle, and which centers upon increasing the personal liberty of the individual, as Marcuse notes,

> The question is no longer: how can the individual satisfy his own needs without hurting others, but rather: how can he satisfy his needs without hurting himself, without reproducing, through his aspirations and

> satisfactions, his dependence on an exploitative apparatus which, in satisfying his needs, perpetuates his servitude.[129]

Like Marcuse, the novels examined in this chapter seem to adopt *Lebensphilosophie* as an entirely positive system. Indeed, in their desire to assert the need for a more spiritually satisfying reconfiguration of society many of the aforementioned writers choose to overlook the potential pitfalls inherent in reasserting the individual's own pleasure as a suitable starting point for larger-scale societal change. In promoting such an initially self-centered ideology, contemporary writers risk encouraging a narcissistic egotism, a condition, Farrell notes, that often blighted the counterculture:

> Too often the freedoms of the counterculture—like those trumpeted by middle-class America—were simply freedom from cultural norms and freedom for individual choice and selfishness . . . When concern for the person became concern for the self, then the culture of compassion became the culture of narcissism.[130]

In spite of the potential for self-absorption that such an individualist philosophy might have caused, many of the writers in this chapter seem to retain a belief in the implicit morality of the individual when set free from the corrupting influences of a technocratic, capitalist society. As part of their desire to criticize the negative individualism of the capitalist system, these writers deconstruct the entrepreneurial figure as a capitalist exemplar, encouraging others to start questioning the values that it embodies. Indeed, this fictionally based reassessment of the entrepreneur seems to have been achieved with some degree of success if we are to believe the comments made by David Rockefeller (son of renowned entrepreneur John D. Rockefeller) in a meeting of executives held in 1971:

> It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that right now American business is facing its most severe public disfavour since the 1930s. We are assailed for demeaning the worker, deceiving the consumer, destroying the environment and disillusioning the younger generation.[131]

By adjusting their focus to the needs of the individual, the novels in this chapter often reach conclusions that suggest a necessity for societal change along more communal and humanist lines,[132] as Marcuse suggests, "The social expression of the liberated work instinct is *cooperation*."[133] Characters such as Braddock, Henderson, and Rosewater move beyond the repressive tendencies of the capitalist

hegemony to present alternative methods of achieving personal satisfaction that indicate possible models for the creation of a Marcusian 'free society'. These new models "no longer demand the exploitative repression of the Pleasure Principle"[134] but instead encourage its reassertion as a means of facilitating self-determination and actualization; in the process creating a space in which the individual would, for the first time, "be free to think about what [they] are going to do."[135]

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 3

The Outlaw Returns: The Cowboy in American Fiction of the 1960s

Before the 1960s, American culture and popular narratives—both textual and filmic—offered a reassuring icon of masculinity and individualistic certainty in the figure of the cowboy, or so it appeared. As the conventional cowboy figure rides the wilds of the Western frontier, his actions embody a set of individualist ideals. The cowboy presents an archetype with wider ramifications for American society, as sociologist Will Wright notes in *The Wild West: The Mythical Cowboy and Social Theory* (2001), "Most American popular stories . . . are in some sense versions of Westerns, because they are always versions of individualism."[1] The 'traditional' cowboy figure[2] fights for a postfeudal, posthierarchal society dominated by the notions of the market and the individual. However, while the cowboy represents these relations in an entertaining and accessible manner, its relevance diminishes in a postagrarian, industrial society.

James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) is the most famous of the 'Leatherstocking' series of novels, and has long been accepted as the begetter of many of the popular conventions of the Western genre. *The Last of the Mohicans* contains the anti-heroic character of Hawkeye, "an ambiguous type,"[3] whose actions often seem to embody a particularly countercultural, individualist ideal. As Wright notes, "[Hawkeye is] defined by his strength, honor, and independence, his wilderness identity,[4] not by his job."[5] Moreover, Hawkeye's pastoral lifestyle was implicitly emulated by many of those in the 1960s counterculture, who "attempted to live off the land; scorning materialism, they sought a simple life more attuned to the natural world."[6]

Indeed, the parallels between Hawkeye and the counterculture go beyond a shared individualism, and a desire for a more pastoral way of

living. The character embodies many of the beliefs that the counterculture adopted. For example, Hawkeye is presented in a populist manner,[7] he possesses no sort of privileged lineage, has no aristocratic status, and consequently is accessible to everyone. Hawkeye is known by a variety of names,[8] the multitude of which indicates a transcendence of one dimensionality. Hawkeye is also of white ethnicity, yet works and fights alongside the Mohicans, Chingachgook, and Uncas.

The beneficial relationship that Hawkeye shares with the Native American Indians implicitly suggests that the individual is capable of effective resistance, only when they agree to work alongside others, and that racial harmony is advantageous to all:

> "No, no," cried Hawk-eye, who had been gazing with a yearning look at the rigid features of his friend, with something like his own self-command, but whose philosophy could endure no longer. "No, Sagamore, not alone. The gifts of our colours may be different, but God has so placed us as to journey in the same path. I have no kin, and I may also say, like you, no people. He was your son, and a redskin by nature; and it may be that your blood was nearer—but if ever I forget the lad who has so often fought at my side in war, and slept at my side in peace, may He who made us all, whatever may be our colour or our gifts, forget me! The boy has left us for a time; but, Sagamore, you are not alone."[9]

While Hawkeye appears to establish an almost countercultural, seditious template for the protagonist of the Western society to follow, the more complex elements of Cooper's novel (concerning plot and character) were simplified, and subsequently lost, in the innumerable, "unapologetically formulaic and subliterary,"[10] 'dime store' Western novels of the late 1800s. These 'penny dreadfuls' piggybacked the phenomenal success of Cooper's text, replicating its features albeit in a diluted form: "the [Dime store] Westerns sprang from Cooper's tales, an ancestry that is evident in the large numbers of characters who assume the Leatherstocking *persona*."[11]

The Dime store novel set about mythologizing frontier life, infusing it with a simple narrative of good versus evil that proved to be hugely popular.[12] The immense success of these populist texts meant that they, rather than Cooper's novels, were responsible for establishing many of the basic characteristics of the stock 'cowboy', not least the structuring of the figure's rebellion as a kind of criminal yet laudatory act. Such texts depicted the rebellion of the cowboy as a positive act in a manner that displeased the establishment, as one critic

notes, "Novels about the escapades of Jesse and Frank James were eventually banned from distribution by the Postmaster General of the United States, because they turned outlaws—still living at that time and still dangerous—into heroes."[13] However, while writers of Dime Store fiction did indeed attribute a rebellious characteristic to the protagonists of their stories they also established a pattern that works to undermine the validity of this rebellion. For Dime Store novels often contain a generic plot structure in which an insubordinate character (usually a cowboy) eventually comes to realize the futility of his wayward lifestyle, and subsequently chooses to return to the establishment he so once vehemently opposed:

> And yet the paradox is that at the end of many of these stories, the characters wind up settling down on farms and getting married. The stories make heroes of outlaws, but then imply that part of the destiny of a hero is to become civilized.[14]

This 'traditional' aspect of the cowboy is, in many ways, ideologically opposed to the 'truly' rebellious aims of the 1960s counterculture, which, as David Farber suggests, sought "a new cultural orientation . . . a cultural rebellion."[15] In contrast to the intended aims of the more socially and politically motivated insurgence of the counterculture, the rebellion of the traditional cowboy is shown to be ineffectual. Indeed, it is possible to read the figure as setting an example to others of the pointlessness of revolt, and, therefore, as posing no real threat to the status quo. As Wright notes, "[the cowboy never seeks dominant control] He always rides away or settles down after the community has been saved, surrendering his social authority."[16]

Marcuse's ideas concerning 'counterrevolution'[17] seem to have relevance here. In such a reading, the cowboy's failure to challenge the system is interpretable as a success on the part of the State, which tries to transform rebellion into "an image of disruption as a source of order."[18] In *One Dimensional Man,* Marcuse suggests that in late capitalist society dissident literary figures, such as the anti-hero, only serve to reinforce the status quo, rather than disrupt it: "The negation which is inherent in the aesthetic *oeuvre* will thus itself be negated by advanced industrial society."[19] While it is important to remember that this belief represents only one side of Marcuse's, often contradictory, statements concerning the critical role of art, it does seem applicable to the traditional cowboy whose superficial rebellion serves to uphold, rather than disrupt, the status quo. In a Marcusian reading, the figure comes to function as a kind of deceptive exemplar, whose rebellion is

an "introjection of social needs required by the established order,"[20] rather than a truly liberating force.

My vitiation of the cowboy is due to the predominantly personal qualities of the figure's rebellion, what Marcuse defines as "spontaneous."[21] In Marcuse's view, this immediate and unmeasured form of rebellion is always ineffectual as it can only ever involve the oppositional expression of "a set of values and goals derived from the established system."[22]

It is important to note that the presence of a Marcusian element in the 1960s version of the cowboy stands in opposition to much of the cultural rebellion going on in the 1960s counterculture. Indeed, Marcuse's measured approach to rebellion in *Counterrevolution and Revolt* angered many within the counterculture, who saw it as conservative. Ben Agger notes in "Marcuse in Postmodernity," "By 1972, the year of publication of Counterrevolution and Revolt, Marcuse had already put distance between himself and the student movement, which he deemed overly irrationalist and insufficiently theoretical."[23]

Yippies were not content to spend time educating others into organizing themselves; instead, they wished to instigate radical and dramatic social change as quickly as possible. As such, the yippies encouraged transgressive activities such as mass drug taking, countercultural demonstration, guerrilla theater, and street violence, yet their rebellion ended up being largely ineffective. The temporary nature of such anarchistic practices meant that the yippies usually had little lasting effect. As the influential founder of the White Panthers, John Sinclair noted in a 1991 interview: "[We had] a simplistic picture of what the 'revolution' was all about [We] said that all you had to do was 'tune in, turn on, and drop out,'…what we didn't understand…was that the machine was determined to keep things the way they were."[24] Indeed, the yippies' lack of enduring success seems to reinforce a Marcusian belief in a need for a more ordered form of opposition, incongruent with the conventional, apolitical resistance of the cowboy.

If it is possible to see the cowboy's rebellion as ineffectual, it seems incongruous that the figure is still held aloft as an ideal embodiment of the national character into the twentieth century. A situation that Henry Kissinger's comments in a 1972 interview, held by *New Republic* magazine, demonstrate: "The main point stems from the fact that I've always acted alone. Americans admire that enormously. Americans admire the cowboy leading the caravan alone astride his horse, the cowboy entering a village or a city alone on his horse."[25]

It would appear that the cowboy's individualist rebellion has become such an ingrained model for defiance in the United States, that one must consciously step back, and reexamine its structure, in order to uncover an agreeable explanation for its persistence. One of the reasons behind the endurance of the figure is, undoubtedly, the links it has retained with American national identity, as Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies suggest in *Why Do People Hate America?* (2002): "In the post-war world, a new Cold War became America's global metaphor, its externalisation of its own Western mythology as the means for understanding the whole world."[26] America seems to employ the cowboy as an emblem of its national character, as an aesthetic model that symbolizes elements of the country's history and ideology that are recognizable, and agreeable to a majority of the population.

In *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981), the French philosopher, Jean Baudrillard, suggests that "the imaginary power and wealth of the double—the one in which the strangeness and at the same time the intimacy of the subject to itself are played out . . .—rest on its immateriality, on the fact that it is and remains a phantasm."[27] During the 1960s a range of writers, including Thomas Berger, E.L. Doctorow, James Leo Herlihy, David Markson, and Ishmael Reed, attempt to examine the immateriality of the cowboy figure, reassessing both the validity of the cowboy as a national exemplar and its uses, and possible reinterpretations, in the postwar period.

Max Evans' somewhat overlooked comedic novel *The Rounders* (1960) exemplifies this contemporary reappraisal of the cowboy. In the case of Evans' text, this process of reassessment results in the cowboy's relegation into the realm of the 'ordinary' or 'mundane'. For, while President Kennedy's cowboy image was founded upon "the Emersonian concept of the hero as 'representative man,'"[28] a reduction of the figure's formerly superior nature is an intrinsic part of the anti-heroic cowboy of the 1960s novel.

The Rounders tells the story of two horse breakers, an anonymous narrator and a character named Wrangler. The novel follows these two down and out characters as they try to earn enough money to survive while working for the corrupt, cattle rancher Jim Ed Love: "without a doubt the lowest-life son of a bitch in the world."[29] Evans' novel is one of the first of a spate of 1960s texts, which represent the cowboy as an everyman. Both the narrator and Wrangler are noticeably devoid of the figure's more conventional, heroic trappings, as one character says, "I never knew of a couple of dumber cowboys than us."[30] The ennui experienced by the two cowboy characters, as they

struggle to subsist on a meager income, can be read as a reflection of the boredom experienced by many 1960s blue-collar workers, who, as Vance Packard notes, "are bored with their work and feel no pride or initiative or creativity."[31]

The two protagonists of the novel also stand in opposition to an encroaching and oppressive capitalism: "The country is goin' to hell in a hurry. If these ranchers keep buying these pickup trucks, there ain't goin' to be no use for horse breakers like us."[32] In spite of their awareness of the immense changes that capitalism is bringing to the horse-breaking profession, the cowboys are unable to do anything about their situation and, as such, become increasingly absurd figures:

> I felt kind of embarrassed walking into camp with one boot off. The boys all laughed and wanted to know if I'd felt sorry about my horse carrying such a big load. They acted like I had just got down and walked on purpose. It would have been easy to have killed the whole bunch, including Old Fooler, right on the spot. I was just too tired to do it.[33]

Marilyn B. Young claims in her foreword to *Imagine Nation* (2002), "The sixties were centrally about the recognition, on the part of an ever-growing number of Americans, that the country in which they thought they lived—peaceful, generous, honourable—did not exist and never had."[34] The realization that much of American history may have been a selective reinterpretation of events led to a marked withdrawal of confidence in the legitimacy of such narratives, "both contemporaneous and retrospective, as the whole of the national epic and its ethos came into question."[35]

As an intrinsic part of the national epic, it is perhaps inevitable that the cowboy figure should come under an immense degree of critical reappraisal during the 1960s, a process that William W. Savage suggests is "indicative of his stature as myth."[36] Writers of the era create a number of novels and characters that explore the cowboy's historical truth, its ideological significance and its traditionally exemplary role. Contemporary authors exhibit a particularly Marcusian attitude toward the cowboy, echoing the belief that a reassessment of historical narratives is an effective means of evaluating the present:

> By virtue of this transformation of the specific historical universe in the work of art—a transformation which arises in the presentation of the specific content itself—art opens the established reality to another dimension: that of possible liberation. To be sure, this is illusion, *Schein*, but an illusion in which another reality shows forth. And it

> does so only if art *wills* itself as allusion: as an unreal world other than the established one. And precisely in this transfiguration, art preserves and transcends its class character. And transcends it, not toward a realm of mere fiction and fantasy, but toward a universe of concrete possibilities.[37]

The idea that a process of transcendence is achievable through a reconsideration of the historical undoubtedly informs much of the contemporary modification of the cowboy figure in 1960s fiction. Several literary critics note the presence of the Marcusian concept that "Freedom implies reconciliation-redemption of the past."[38] In *The Return of the Vanishing American* (1968), Leslie Fiedler suggests that many 1960s novels reconceptualize the cowboy, moving the figure from its traditional position as a historical, heroic exemplar to one that is more carnivalesque in nature. This transformation is carried out in an attempt to better comprehend the ideological complexities of the present:

> Those more sophisticated recent pop novels which play off, for the laughs, the seamier side of Western history against its sentimental expurgations are not quite satisfactory either. Yet to understand the West as somehow a joke comes a little closer to getting it straight.[39]

This shift in the way that writers employ the cowboy seems, retrospectively, more profound. For, in altering the ideological purposes of the figure, contemporary writers arguably produce a new, subgenre of the Western. This fresh iteration of the genre is classifiable as the self-referential, anti-Western. In opposition to its 'original' form, the anti-Western attacks the individualistic monotheism of the cowboy, thriving instead on notions of plurality and community that more closely reflect the counterculture's own ideological beliefs.[40] The anti-Western also uses humor, with many 1960s writers sharing a desire to make a joke out of the conventions of the Western. This satirical element is particularly evident in Berger's *Little Big Man*, Herlihy's *Midnight Cowboy*, Markson's *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* (1965), Reed's *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* (1969), and Charles Portis' *True Grit*. These novels take a revisionist approach to the Western, shifting traditional genre perspectives and tone in order to deflate the heroic mythology surrounding the cowboy. They attempt to expose the artificiality of the traditional Western by proposing that the cowboy would have been more likely to experience a mundane and unheroic way of life than is typically depicted,

reminding us of Theodore Roszak's hypothesis that "myths so openly recognised as myths are precisely those that have lost much of their power."[41]

Thomas Berger's *Little Big Man* is perhaps the epitome of writers' attempts to undermine the heroic and didactic qualities of the quasi-mythic Western. Indeed, the novel is a version of the picaresque form in which the central character of Jack Crabb retells the story of his life on the West. Right from its opening, the novel suggests that the frontier was little more than an aesthetic construction: "some kind of exhibit put on for . . . education and entertainment."[42] Crab recounts his interaction in key events (Custer's Last Stand), and with key characters (Calamity Jane, Wyatt Earp), drawn from the pantheon of Western mythology. This revisionist approach constantly reminds the reader of the sizeable gaps that exist between the myth of the West and its' supposed, historical truth:

> I immediately reduced that by half in my mind, for I had been on the frontier from the age of ten on and knew a thing as to how fights are conducted. When you run into a story of more than three against one and one winning, then you have heard a lie. (*LBM*, 269)

In *Little Big Man,* the process of demythologizing goes so far as to subvert specific historical figures. In particular, the novel focuses upon dispossessing Wild Bill Hickok of his traditionally heroic qualities. Historians as late as Stout and Falk (1974) continue to perpetuate the heroic image surrounding Hickok, noting how he was described as "the handsomest man west of the Mississippi."[43] In contrast to this heroic representation of Hickok, Berger's narrator forms a decidedly different opinion of the onetime marshal and icon:

> His hands was [*sic*] right small for a man his size, and his feet as well—as little as my own, almost. Then he turned and walked away down the street, straight as a die and certainly not swaying, yet with that hair hanging down his back and the long buckskin tunic descending almost to his knees like a dress, I was reminded of a real tall girl. (299)

The true relevance of the cowboy figure's masculine bravado is deconstructed in *Little Big Man*. Crabb rejects an overt and 'brutish' display of masculinity as the only suitable attestation of the heroic. In particular, he dislikes the use of violence as a legitimate part of masculine expression: "All my life I have had a prejudice against overgrown louts" (91). Crab's aversion to violence, as a potentially valid

means of achieving personal and social justice, further manifests itself in the novel's forlorn depiction of Hickok's day-to-day life: "the only thing he was suited to be was a peace officer, patrolling the streets of a cowtown in hopes someone would offer him resistance" (289). The suggestion here is that the level of heroism surrounding Hickok has led him to a situation in which he must maintain an inescapable facade of bravado, a state which causes him to experience "[a] suspiciousness which warps the mind" (72).

While it endeavors to debunk much of the mythology surrounding traditional depictions of the West, *Little Big Man* also acknowledges the problems that are inherent in attempt to write about such a subject without simultaneously romanticizing it. At one point in the novel, Crabb states his intention to try to avoid glorifying the West and the characters therein, by consciously refusing to recount his experiences to anyone he might meet later on:

> He tried one more thing to pry from me an admission that I was fascinated by him. He says: "I guess you can go about now saying how you put a head on Wild Bill Hickok."
>
> I says: "I'll never mention it." And I have kept my word from that day to this. I wasn't going to give him no free advertisements of any kind. That was the trouble with them long-haired darlings like him and Custer: people talked about them too much. (299)

The irony here is obvious. In spite of Crab's protestations to the contrary, in the very act of telling of his vow not to communicate his meeting with Hickok, Crabb risks romanticizing it. The novel's sly recognition of the inherent inescapability of this process suggests that any attempt to demythologize the West, through fictional means, can only ever be a partial process at best.

In the novel's deconstruction of the mythology surrounding figures such as Wild Bill Hickok or George Armstrong Custer, the anti-heroic form is a suitable means through which a writer can question notions of the heroic. For the presence of the anti-hero implies an authorial rejection of selected standards, inherent within the heroic. While the hero figure serves to strengthen the ideological status quo, by encouraging our support for an ideal, the anti-hero induces the reader to question the ideology behind the heroic model by virtue of its radical stance toward the 'normal' order of things. By undermining the heroic superiority of the cowboy with the anti-heroic form, writers of the 1960s present the figure as being no different from the 'ordinary man on the street'. This repositioning

of the cowboy decreases its validity as a moral exemplar, as Crabb notes of Hickok:

> This was a typical opinion about Hickok: that he enjoyed sending people under. So many of them who admired him liked this idea, for in any white population there is a vast number of individuals who have murder in their hearts but consider themselves too weak to take up its practice themselves, so they substitute a man like Hickok. A Cheyenne enjoyed killing, but not Wild Bill: he was indifferent to it. He had barely looked at the corpse of Strawhan's brother except to check whether it would draw on him again. In fact, I don't think Hickok enjoyed anything. Life to him consisted of doing what was necessary, endlessly measuring his performance against that single perfect shot for each occasion. (294)

The deconstructionist process, applied to Wild Bill Hickok in *Little Big Man*, is just one example of a wider-scale destabilization of the cowboy's traditional form taking place during the 1960s. Novels, such as *Little Big Man* and David Markson's *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* in addition to films like George Roy Hill's *Butch Cassidy and The Sundance Kid* and Mel Brook's *Blazing Saddles*, set about reducing the cowboy. Changing the figure from a paragon of heroism, to something often crude and unattractive in nature: "taking [it] into the terrain of the scatological."[44]

Markson's *The Ballad of Dingus Magee*[45] is, perhaps, the most obvious example of an author presenting us with a 'lowbrow' version of the cowboy figure. The novel follows the unheroic cowboy, Dingus Magee, as he evades capture by the corrupt sheriff, C.L. Hoke Birdsill, in the aptly named town of Yerkey's Hole: "a turd heap and a abomination in the eye of the Lord."[46] Magee is aided and abetted in his adventures by Madam Belle Nops, the sexually promiscuous Native American Anna-hot-water and the spinsterish schoolteacher, Horseface Agnes. In an online interview, Markson notes how he could not help "turning the entire myth [of the West] upside down—everybody a coward or an incompetent, all the women unappetizing, that sort of thing."[47] Like Berger with *Little Big Man*, Markson infuses *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* with a revisionist rhetoric that serves to undermine the conventionally grandiloquent rhetoric surrounding the West:

> So now the doctor began to mumble as if for his own conviction only. "Wild Bill were sitting at a poker table with'n his back turned when they shot him in it. Billy Bonney were on his way to carve hisself a slice

> of eating beef when Pat Garrett kilt him in a dark room without no word of previous notice neither. Bill Longley got strung up by the neck, and Clay Allison fell out'n a mule wagon and broke his'n. That feller Ford snuck up to the ass-end of Jesse James, and John Ringo blowed out his own personal brains, and John Wesley Hardin is doing twenty-five years in the Huntsville Penitentiary." (*DM*, 124)

Markson imbues *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* with a staunch pragmatism, reserving the romanticized aspects of the cowboy figure for the newspaper cuttings of an idealistic young woman who meets and attempts to woo Dingus. Indeed, this satirical acknowledgment of the cowboy figure's traditional heroism as little more than a fictional construct leads to the following humorous rebuttal of affection, as Dingus' admirer realizes that Dingus possesses few of the heroic qualities the cowboy is meant to have:

> She finally hit him with an adze. "You stink of cow," she informed him.
>
> "What's wrong with that? It's what I been riding behind the backsides of, is all."
>
> He took a bath nonetheless, but that did not help either.
>
> "Because there just isn't anything romantic about you," she said.
>
> He still did not understand, so she finally showed him the cuttings. She had a hatbox full of them, newspaper accounts and artist's sketches of General George Armstrong Custer, Captain W.J. Fetterman, Buffalo Bill Cody. "But that's loco," Dingus insisted. "All they done, they shot Injuns and the true fact is, most of 'em ot kilt theirselves in the process. (97–98)

In *The Ballad of Dingus Magee*, Markson takes the burlesque objective of many 1960s anti-Westerns to their very limits. He replaces the grandiloquence of the heroic with the anti-heroic in order to present us with characters who indulge in a variety of transgressive activities including thievery, lying, prostitution, cross-dressing, cuckoldry, and public urinating: "Hoke urinated on his boot" (28). Markson employs the scatological to expose the chivalric notion of 'the code of the West' as a falsehood, recommending instead, that frontier life should be regarded in a decidedly more carnivalesque manner. The author uses humor to 'explode' the conventions of the traditional Western in a Bataillean fashion, adhering to the suggestion that "laughter has the ability to suspend a very closed logic."[48] By employing the carnivalesque, Markson creates a kind of Western version of Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749), one that embodies Fiedler's assertion,

"There is scarcely a New Western . . . which does not in some way flirt with the notion of madness as essential to the New World."[49]

In *The Return of the Vanishing American*, Fiedler proposes that "the New West [is] the West of Madness"[50] (quite literally in the case of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, which is set in a psychiatric hospital). By deconstructing the, supposedly historical, 'truth' of the Western, what one is left with is a state of chaos caused by the omission of the ordering of conventional historicizing: "Two kinds of truth come immediately into conflict . . . the truth of history, which is the truth of reason; and the truth of myth, which is the truth of madness."[51]

Markson's novel also depicts authority as innately corrupt, holding it responsible for the debasement of the cowboy figure. It is telling that when Magee seeks to deceive the naive Miss Agnes Pfeffer, he decides the best way to achieve this is by adopting the methods commonly employed by the corrupt sheriff C.L. Hoke Birdsill: "So now how are we gonter manipulate this in the most guaranteed and sure fire way? Why nacherly, we'll jest take a lesson from Hoke hisself" (56). Authority is also shown to be corrupt when the sheriff lets Magee go free, from prison, and encourages him to commit further offences: "Rob one. Give me your sworn word of honour you'll rob a train" (42). Birdill's plan is to blame Magee for a series of crimes he has not committed, in order to increase the bounty that he can collect when he recaptures the errant cowboy:

> You know, Doc, I'm hanged if'n I don't hear the same thing. But it's right peculiar, too. Because to speak the Lord's truth, I've been sort of behaving myself most currently. Oh, I done a few harmless little pranks here and there, but they never added up to more'n four thousand and five hundred dollars in bounty on me, and that's a true fact. But then last month I find there's a whole five thousand more dollars on top of that, and durned if'n I weren't all the way down to Old Mex when them last ones happened. Looks like if a feller gets a mite of a reputation they'll hold him in account fer everything, even if'n he's tending to his own business somewheres else. (54)

While authority is depicted as corrupt, it is noticeable that Markson presents the cowboy Magee as possessing an integrity that is noticeably absent from the other characters in the novel. Though Dingus engages in range of transgressive activities, his actions are never malicious or harmful. This is evident in the following exchange between Dingus and Birdsill in which Markson imbues the rebellion of Dingus

with the carnivalesque power of disruption, rather than any seriously destructive force:

> "I heard tell you'd gone bad," Hoke said. "What do want to perpetrate things that ain't lawful for, now?"
>
> Dingus removed his sombrero, fanning air across his merry face. "Hot, ain't she?" he said. "Tell you the truth, Hoke, I don't rightly approve on it much neither, but a feller's got to live, and that's the all of it." (27)

Alongside a desire to undermine the typically grandiloquent mythology of the cowboy, many 1960s writers attempt to reposition the figure in a decidedly more collectivist and compassionate manner. For, though many in the counterculture believed in a particular type of inclusive humanitarianism called Personalism,[52] conventional incarnations of the cowboy figure tended to embody a quite different set of values. Indeed, rather than possessing a countercultural inclination toward ideals such as altruism, philanthropy, and compassion, Sardar and Davies note that "In the Western it is the hero . . . alone [who] evokes poignant reflection, while the vanquished are unmourned; they do not require the reflex of regret, for as agents of evil they are by definition of less human worth."[53] This reading of the Western as monolithic suggests the cowboy exemplifies a clandestine elitism toward the white, Anglo-protestant male. Such exclusivity did not sit well with the more liberal elements of the counterculture.[54]

Instead, many in the counterculture began to perceive the cowboy as analogous to "[the] lead-bottomed ballast of the status quo,"[55] representing yet another conformist tool of the hegemony, which needed to be overturned in order to invoke an opportunity for the emergence of new, more humane ideological standpoints. This concept of the cowboy is evident in two main instances during the 1960s. First, the cowboy figures in the rhetoric of President John F. Kennedy. Kennedy's acceptance speech evoked a specifically heroic permutation of the cowboy in the notion of the 'new frontier' of 'unfulfilled hopes and threats, "We stand today on the edge of a new frontier . . . a frontier of unknown opportunities and perils . . . I am asking each of you to be pioneers on that frontier."[56] The identification of the Kennedy administration with the frontier myth was particularly classical in nature,[57] configuring the Western in the tradition of Arthurian myth and legend; what Fiedler derogatorily classified as the 'Sir Walter Scottification of the West'."[58] Such an approximation is ironic considering that the narratives of Camelot and The Round Table were

originally the product of a European feudal tradition that American market-centered ideology had tried to distance itself from since the 1600s. Indeed, while Kennedy's adoption of the cowboy might suggest an empowerment of the individual through an invocation of the 'traditional' Western's crusading and questing themes, the truth is that it tended to reflect an attempt to limit the possibility of any true dialectic. Something Richard Slotkin touches upon when he suggests, "The paradox of the New Frontier was that it aimed at achieving democratic goals through structures and methods that were elite-dominated and command-orientated."[59]

If we move beyond the specificities of the Kennedy administration's appropriation of Western iconography, then we can see that the 'established reality' of the cowboy has often been used as a powerful tool for garnering widespread political support. Ironically, given the superficially dissident nature of the cowboy, there has always been a long-standing association between politics and the figure in American life.[60] Successive presidents have utilized a romanticized image of the cowboy, derived largely from its more conservative Dime Novel configuration, as a means to endear themselves to large sectors of the public. This political appropriation relies upon an image of the figure as an unshakeable bastion of moral values thought to be both intelligible and favorable to a mass audience. In *The Return of the Vanishing American,* Fiedler notes the suitability of the traditional cowboy's 'safe' rebellion for political requisition: "[cowboys] rebelled no more than they conformed, neither coming into their inheritances and settling down nor killing their fathers and challenging the power of the State."[61] Fiedler's reading suggests that the cowboy is easily co-opted by the establishment as a tool for what Marcusians might term 'repressive desublimation';[62] acting as a kind of release valve or aesthetic gesture for radical feeling.

During the latter half of the 1960s, a specific version of the cowboy is also utilized as a means of validating the horrifying events of the Vietnam War. The myth of the West is employed to transfigure proceedings in Vietnam into a more palatable "game of "Cowboys and Indians."[63] As Slotkin notes, "Kennedy's ambassador to Vietnam would justify a massive military escalation by citing the necessity of moving the "Indians" away from the "fort" so that the "settlers" could plant "corn."[64] The reasons for this appropriation of cowboy iconography undoubtedly lie in its ability to rationalize the conflict in a reassuringly mythic tradition. In the same way that allusions to Arthurian iconography supplied a medieval English audience with a justification for the Crusades, so, the cowboy provided America with

a framework through which to present their actions as possessing a moral and spiritual worth, as Mary Sheila McMahon suggests, "[the government] co-opted the rhetoric and imagery of American history to justify policy."[65]

It is important to note that, though potentially distasteful, the political deployment of the Western as a kind of real life 'morality play'[66] was largely well received by mainstream sectors of the population. Middle America welcomed the opportunity to combine "as a whole to undertake a *heroic* engagement in the 'long twilight struggle' against Communism and the social and economic injustices that foster it."[67] However, while Middle America lapped up the portrayal of Vietnam as a contemporary Western, such a simplistic depiction proved increasingly problematic for those within the counterculture. A sentiment that is shared by the bohemian character of Charlie Stavros in John Updike's novel *Rabbit Redux* (1971), when he tells us that "I just can't get too turned on about cops bopping hippies on the head and the Pentagon playing cowboys and Indians all over the globe."[68]

Because of this uncertainty, in many 1960s anti-Westerns, the cowboy figure's machismo is shown to exert a kind of repression of feeling upon the individual. Indeed, a substantial number of those within the counterculture viewed the cowboy's lack of emotional sensitivity as a negative attribute; at odds with their own professed desire for a greater sense of communication with the 'inner being'. Many felt that the cowboy's masculine callousness and stoicism belied an aggressive and outdated mindset that they hoped to overcome, as Roszak notes,

> One of the most remarkable aspects of the counterculture is its cultivation of a feminine softness among its males. It is the occasion of endless satire on the part of critics, but the style is clearly a deliberate effort on the part of the young to undercut the crude and compulsive he-manliness of American political life.[69]

Contemporary dissatisfaction with the 'he-manliness' of the cowboy figure is explored further in Charles Portis' *True Grit* (1968). The novel tells the story of an orphaned girl, Mattie Ross, as she sets out to avenge the death of her father. To find retribution Mattie must locate the murderer, a cowboy named Tom Chaney, who is thought to be hiding out in Choctaw country. However, due to her age (fourteen, gender (female), and relative inexperience, Mattie is forced to hire the 'washed up' deputy marshal 'Rooster' Cogburn and the

Texas Ranger LaBoeuf to accompany her on the trip. As they journey into the wild, Cogburn's antiquated attitudes and proclivity toward violence cause a great deal of friction between him and Mattie. The two characters are decidedly uncomfortable with one another throughout the majority of their time together, sharing an unease that is visible in the following exchange:

> "I hope you don't think I am going to keep you in whiskey."
>
> "I don't have to buy that, I confiscate it. You might try a little touch of it for your cold."
>
> "No thank you."
>
> "This is the real article. It is double-rectified bust-head from Madison County, aged in the keg. A little spoonful would do you a power of good."
>
> "I would not put a thief in my mouth to steal my brains."
>
> "Oh, you wouldn't, would you?"
>
> "No, I wouldn't."[70]

It is possible to interpret the ongoing tension that exists between Mattie and Cogburn as a metaphor for the relationship between the counterculture and the more conservative parts of the establishment. Mattie, a fourteen-year-old girl with 'spunk', embodies the counterculture. Mattie, like those in the counterculture, seeks to reposition the individual in a more peaceable relationship with his fellow man: "When the conductor came through he said, 'Get that trunk out of the aisle, nigger!' I replied to him in this way: 'We will move the trunk but there is no reason for you to be so hateful about it'" (*TG*, 11). In contrast to Mattie, the character of Rooster Cogburn represents the more traditional, reactionary element of society. Cogburn possesses a particularly American belief in the use of violence as a valid method by which to achieve justice. When we first meet Cogburn he is involved in a court case concerning the killing of a character named Aaron Wharton. During the case, we learn that Cogburn is responsible for the deaths of "Twenty-three dead men in four years . . . that comes to about six men a year" (33). However, while the novel implies that Cogburn is skilled in taking lives, as the story proceeds, Cogburn is depicted as an increasingly tired and dilapidated individual: "He dropped things and got them all askew and did not do a good job" (44). Cogburn realizes he is unable to cope with the demands of society because the knowledge and skills that he possesses have now become redundant: "It is the devil's own work and Potter is not here to help me. If you don't have no schooling you are up against it in this country, sis. That is the way of it. No sir, that man has no chance anymore" (56).

Cogburn's antiquated attitudes and tendency toward violence mean that he is no longer an admirable figure for someone like Mattie, who prizes consideration and compassion for others above overt displays of brutish masculinity:

> Who was to blame? *Deputy Marshal Rooster Cogburn!* The gabbing drunken fool had made a mistake of four miles and led us directly into the robbers' lair. A keen detective! Yes, and in an earlier state of drunkenness he had placed faulty caps in my revolver, causing it to fail me in a time of need. That was not enough; now he had abandoned me in this howling wilderness to a gang of cutthroats who cared not a rap for the blood of their own companions, and how much less for that of a helpless and unwanted youngster! Was this what they called grit in Fort Smith? We called it something else in Yell country! (130)

Cogburn's unmediated behavior is initially shown to be completely redundant. The novel implies that because Cogburn's individualism stops at the point of expressing vital needs, it, therefore, achieves nothing of any worth, in the process indicating a Marcusian inclination in the text toward collectivist rebellion. However, as the story progresses, the simplicities of such a reading are challenged as the novel begins to suggest that what is needed for the characters to succeed is, in fact, a greater level of understanding and cooperation. This sentiment is evident in Mattie's changing attitude toward Cogburn when he comes to rescue her: "It was some daring on the part of the deputy marshal whose manliness and grit I had doubted" (139). Mattie, Cogburn, and LeBoeuf realize that they are unable to achieve their aims individually, and must cooperate in order to capture Tom Chaney. The novel's endorsement of interdependency is further epitomized when all of the characters are caught off guard, and must work together to survive:

> Rooster said, "Do you think you can climb the rope?"
>
> "My arm is broken," said I. "And I am bit on the hand."
>
> He looked at the hand and pulled his dirk knife and cut the place to scarify it. He squeezed blood from it and took some smoking tobacco and hurriedly chewed it into a cud and rubbed it over the wound to draw the poison.
>
> Then he harnessed the rope tightly under my arms. He shouted up to the Texan, saying, "Take the rope, LaBoeuf! Mattie is hurt! I want you to pull her up in easy stages! Can you hear me?"
>
> LaBoeuf replied, "I will do what I can!" (148)

True Grit exemplifies a contemporary reevaluation of the validity of the lone maverick and 'free spirit' motifs, conventionally associated

with the cowboy figure. At the climax of the novel, the characters find themselves in a position in which the rugged individualism of the cowboy is insufficient on its own.

A desire to undermine notions of masculine stoicism is also evident in Ken Kesey's novel *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. The cowboy-like Randle P. McMurphy is compared to the Lone Ranger at one point, "that'er masked man,"[71] and espouses a similar message of individual liberty. This note of freedom stands in opposition to the oppression of society, represented by the character of Big Nurse.

Initially, the novel depicts McMurphy as the personification of a particular version of machismo: "ruddy of face and abloom with physical health" (199). However, we soon learn that McMurphy's physical appearance belie his sentiments. For, as the novel progresses, McMurphy reveals himself as a strong proponent of Personalist ideology, which prizes individuality above everything else: "'I'm different,' McMurphy said" (*CN*, 242). Such is the force of McMurphy's belief in the necessity of personal freedom that it ultimately leads to his death at the end of the novel. When McMurphy receives a frontal lobotomy at the discretion of the Big Nurse, his friend, Chief Bromden, decides:

> I was only sure of one thing: he [McMurphy] wouldn't have left something like that sit there in the day room with his name tacked on it for twenty or thirty years so the Big Nurse could use it as an example of what can happen if you buck the system. I was sure of that. (253)

During his time in the hospital, McMurphy helps the other patients by asserting the importance of a pluralistic definition of masculinity, in the face of a system that no longer prizes individuality in any form. Bromden notes the homogeneity of the urban landscape (and its inhabitants) on a temporary excursion organized by McMurphy, commenting that he saw "a train stopping at a station and laying a string of full-grown men in mirrored suits . . . like a hatch of identical insects" (185–186). In opposition to the increasing homogeneity of postwar society, McMurphy champions the patients' right to determine their own identity, bringing them together in a spirit of camaraderie, rather than attempting to separate and turn them against each other in the way that those in authority do.

Importantly, and unlike the traditional cowboy figure, the novel reveals that McMurphy is as vulnerable as the other patients on the ward are. Indeed, he is only able to maintain his macho facade for a limited period, then his "magnificent . . . psychopathic suntan . . . fades"

and the "dreadfully tired and strained and *frantic*" (199) reality behind it appears. This display of emotion, on the part of McMurphy, marks a significant change in depictions of the cowboy's masculinity. In presenting emotionally self-aware anti-heroic cowboy characters, such as McMurphy, the contemporary anti-Western subverts the stoic, he-manliness of the traditional figure in favor of a more fallible incarnation.

As part of their Marcusian rejection of the 'spontaneous' rebellion of the traditional cowboy, the 1960s anti-Western also examines the figure's legitimization of violence as a valid means of achieving one's goals. Writers of the 1960s frequently negate the moral worth of violence, questioning its effectiveness as a force for good:

> Distinction must be made between violence and revolutionary force. In the counterrevolutionary situation of today, violence is the weapon of the Establishment; it operates everywhere, in the institutions and organisations, in work and fun, on the streets and highways, and in the air.[72]

An overt reliance on violence and violent symbolism has formed a crucial part of both the historical, and the mythical, development of the Frontier, as the character of Crabb notes in *Little Big Man,* "I found that…I had carried a revolver for years and had used it upon occasion" (*LBM*, 288–289). Traditionally, the cowboy liberates himself from either, the savagery of the wilderness, or the corrupt authoritarian politics and ideological conformity of civilization, through the redemptive use of violence. In *Gunfighter Nation* (1992), Slotkin notes how the Western genre establishes a model of "regeneration through violence,"[73] in which the aggression of the cowboy is seen as a necessary element of a larger process of redemptive purification.

In contrast to this emphasis on violence, the 1960s anti-Western employs a specifically pacifist form of the anti-heroic. This serves to emphasize the negative elements of the violence of the traditional model. Texts, such as Berger's *Little Big Man*, present didactic figures that refuse to believe in a logical rationale for violence. Crabb, the central character of the novel, questions the ideology behind such action, exclaiming that "gunfighting was all idea when you got down to it, devoted to testing the proposition: *I'm a better man than you*…But the question was, what did you establish when you found the better man?"[74]

Contemporary writers appear to share sociologist Paul Goodman's (particularly Marcusian) view that active nonviolence is preferable to

violent rebellion, as it is "both tactical and educative."[75] In *Little Big Man*, Crabb has a negative attitude toward the use of violence. He questions the extent to which Wild Bill's teachings on how to use a gun effectively have truly empowered him: "So what did Hickok actually do for me? Show me how to save my life? No, rather he give me a new means by which to risk it" (293). Similarly, in Ishmael Reed's *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down*, Drag Gibson, a corrupt authority figure, is the only character to take human life. Significantly, the protagonist of Reed's novel, the Loop Garoo Kid, chooses to use magic, rather than firepower, to achieve his ends.

Reed's *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* disrupts the artificial 'ordering' of the West, upsetting both literal and ideological hierarchal frameworks in a distinctly Marcusian fashion:[76]

> The result is the creation of an object world other than and yet derived from the existing one, but this transformation does not do violence to the objects (man and things)—it rather speaks for them, gives word and tone and image to that which is silent, distorted, suppressed in the established reality.[77]

The Loop Garoo Kid is a decidedly unorthodox version of the traditional cowboy, as one character puts it, "A desperado so ornery he made the Pope cry."[78] The Kid embodies the oppositional stance of the counterculture, "Loop seems to have some gripe against society" (*YB*, 61). Assisted in his quest by a white python and a 'patarealist', helicopter-flying Native American Indian, the Kid battles the combined forces of realistic mimesis and political corruption. His occultism challenges the traditional characteristics of the cowboy, personified within his villainous opponent Drag Gibson, a degenerate cattle baron given to murdering his wives. Gibson is asked by the citizens of Yellow Back Radio to crush their rebellious children's efforts "to create [their] own fiction" (16). The Kid stumbles into this tumultuous situation, and quickly discovers that Drag has drugged the town's drinking water in order to trick the adult population into signing their land over to him. When Drag's army of adults kill the children, and the traveling circus the Kid belongs to, he takes up the "revenge motif" (48), and sets out to find Drag and avenge his friends.

Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down's rejection of absolutes is evident within its postmodernist, self-reflexive structure and deconstruction of genre conventions. The novel creates a space in which exclusive definitions can be questioned, echoing the Kid's assertion that a novel

"can be anything it wants to be, a vaudeville show, the six o'clock news, the mumblings of wild men saddled by demons" (36). Reed's novel suggests that while the heroic conventions of the traditional cowboy lend it a certain rigidity, if it is dispossessed of this specific demarcation, then the figure can be opened up to incorporate more radical values, such as those held by the counterculture.

The Kid's outsider status, as the neorealist character of Bo Schmo puts it, "a deliberate attempt to be obscure" (34), suggests an endorsement of personal freedom, be it social, spiritual, or artistic. Indeed, the introduction of a figure such as The Loop Garoo Kid into the 1960s anti-Western reflects the counterculture's rejection of empirical reasoning and subsequent espousal of the emotional. Reed's transformation of the 'stock' cowboy figure into the unorthodox, eccentric Loop Garoo Kid also mirrors a move from a belief in an objective consciousness to a belief in the concept of an 'irrational rationality'. The Enlightenment concept that knowledge stands apart and above other worldviews, because it "does not re-mythologize life; it *de*-mythologizes it,"[79] is refuted in Reed's text. Instead, *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* denounces the 'real', deconstructing the genre's grand narratives so that the reader is never able to forget that the text is anything but a fiction. Indeed, the novel suggests that while the dogmatic literalism that empiricism forces upon us may, indeed, lead to an "indisputable truth [taking] the place of make believe,"[80] such a change does not result in a more fulfilling existence for the individual.

Interestingly, the 1960s anti-Western's refutation of the traditional cowboy figure's exclusivity never seems to have extended to a reevaluation of the genre's negative depiction of women. While the 1960s anti-heroic cowboy may dismiss the machismo of the traditional figure, he stops short of releasing the female from its more negative associations with civilization, as Locke sarcastically remarks to Joe Buck in *Midnight Cowboy*, "every day we reap the harvest in this garden spot of the world. And it's these women who planted the seeds, yes, we owe it all to them, this entire wonderful civilization of ours, every scrap of it is their making."[81] In his sexist outlook, the anti-1960s cowboy can be seen as the latest example of a long tradition of American literary characters who reject the supposedly feminizing notion of becoming civilized in favor of an oppositional lifestyle choice, deemed more masculine, and thus more appealing. It would not be until the 1970s, with the publication of Tom Robbins' *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* (1976), that this negative connection would be challenged. The authoritarian Countess of Robbins' novel suggests that "women shouldn't be relegated to menial and effete cosmetic

tasks while men got to perform all the exciting outdoor work . . . I'm a cowgirl. And there's gonna be cowgirls riding this range or there ain't gonna be a range to ride."[82]

James Leo Herlihy's *Midnight Cowboy* demonstrates the centrality of the masculine condition to 1960s reinventions of the cowboy figure. The novel follows the character of Joe Buck, as he travels from Texas to New York City to become a male hustler—a 'midnight cowboy'. Once in New York, he meets the homeless bum 'Ratso' Rizzo, and together they attempt to earn a meager living in the alienating urban environment.

At the beginning of the novel, Joe experiences a personal crisis. This condition is borne out of a fear that he no longer fits into a society that increasingly alienates anyone who is different: "There was an awareness entering him too momentous to acknowledge: he was a nothing person, a person of no time and no place and no worth to anyone at all" (*MC*, 111). Joe's response to his crisis of confidence is to cling to an individualist image of the cowboy as a bastion of security in a world otherwise gone mad. Indeed, when Joe is at his lowest ebb, following his encounter with the grotesque Native American Indians Perry, Tombaby and Juanita, it is his indefatigable belief in the authenticity of the cowboy that aids him on the road to spiritual recovery. As the narrator tells us, "Even in this sorry shape he was able with no effort at all to hold a certain new idea in his head: that there was in this world only one person who had his and only his interests at heart. "Cowboy," he said to his image" (66).

Joe initially formulates his rebellion against society in the "spontaneous"[83] and individualist fashion of the traditional cowboy; however, this ultimately proves to be unsuccessful. Emotionally immature, and unable to realize that violence is not the answer, Joe's hostile, confrontational reactions in the first part of the novel are depicted in a decidedly parodic manner. "Joe's hand moved to his crotch, and under his breath he said, "I'm gonna take hold o' this thing and I'm gonna swing it like a lasso and I'm gonna rope in this whole fuckin' island" (76). The depiction of Joe's belief in the relevance of the cowboy as naive allows the reader a degree of critical distance from which to reconsider the effectiveness of such an emotionally charged form of rebellion. Joe believes he can make a living hustling people in the big city; however, upon reaching New York he becomes the hustled, and must join forces with the equally victimized Ratso in order to stand any chance of resisting the corrupting pull of the city and its more nefarious inhabitants.

As Joe spends more time in New York, he grows to recognize that his earlier reactionary behavior will only cause him further trouble. Subsequently, he decides to relinquish the role of aggressor, and embraces his need for friendship, even though a reliance on others has the potential to leave him emotionally vulnerable and "scared to death" (191).

Joe's friendship with the character of Ratso Rizzo, a destitute conman, provides him with the only element in his life that remains constant during his time in New York. Joe draws strength from this relationship: "Nowadays he had, in the person of Ratso Rizzo, someone who needed his presence in an urgent, almost frantic way that was a balm to something in him that had long been exposed and enflamed and itching to be soothed" (123). The bond between Joe and Ratso suggests that it is not enough for the individual to oppose society in isolation; rather there is always a need for human contact in even the most individualist characters. Indeed, by the end of the novel, Joe arrives at the conclusion that true fulfillment is to be found within a communal experience.

It is through the acceptance of this concept that Joe is able to experience a true sense of identification with others. Through his closeness with Ratso, Joe feels more at ease with his self, and is able to overcome the feelings of alienation that had previously troubled him:

> It was a curious kind of burden under which he felt lighter instead of heavier, and warm. The seat became exceptionally comfortable and his head fit the pillow better. He felt joined to everything that touched him, and pretty soon he fell asleep, dreaming his golden-people dream.
>
> But there was a startling difference in it. They were marching to rodeo music, a wild march beat. And the rope of light that bound the people in their trip around the earth was on this night of a special brilliance and clarity so that Joe was able to see the actual features on the face of the marchers. The one that caught his interest was the face of a cowboy swinging a lariat, a lariat made of the same golden stuff that bound all the marchers. He looked hard, very hard at the face of the cowboy, longing to get his attention and disturbed more and more by an ever increasing sense of familiarity with what he saw, and lo and behold! There came a moment in which he knew the face of the cowboy to be none other than his own. (183)

The reassurance that Joe feels, because of his relationship with Ratso, provides one possible answer to the existentialist crisis discussed by Colin Wilson in *The Outsider* (1956)[84] under the title "The

Question of Identity."[85] Wilson proposes, "'The outsider is not sure who he is.' He has found an 'I', but it is not his true 'I'." His main business is to find his way back to himself."[86] In *Midnight Cowboy*, Herlihy suggests that the individual's journey of self-discovery is to be found in a return to loving contact with others. Joe and Ratso's friendship does not represent a desire for the kind of structured community inherent within a city such as New York. Instead, Herlihy implies that true personal fulfillment is only possible through the forging of communal bonds that stand outside urbanized society. Indeed, the notion that the city environment corrupts personal relationships causes Joe and Ratso to try to relocate to the more rural idyll of Florida at the end of the novel:

> I been figuring main thing we break our ass for here is keep warm. Right? What're you're doing now, you're shivering, see? Second main thing is food. Right again, right? Well, in Florida it's a matter of coconuts and sunshine and all that, and you don't break your ass at all. (156)

Interestingly, Joe and Ratso's journey to the supposedly more 'innocent', rural expanses of Florida has obvious similarities with the back-to-nature ideology, which lay behind the communes set up by members of the counterculture. These cooperative communities reflected a rejection of the technocratic city "[i]n [which] everything aspires to become purely technical."[87] Commune inhabitants believed that "[i]ncreasingly…disciplined urban environments"[88] deprived them of the "juice and passion"[89] that was necessary for a healthy life.

The anti-Western seems to reflect the environmentalism of the counterculture in its continued adherence to a romanticized depiction of the pastoral. For, though 1960s texts deconstruct many of the conventional elements of the cowboy, writers frequently transfer a Rousseauistic oversimplification of the figure into that of the Native American Indian. This relocation belies a countercultural affection for the Indian as a signifier of many ideologies analogous to those of the counterculture. Fiedler discusses this return of a perception of the Native American as the 'original' noble outsider in *The Return of the Vanishing American*, stating that in the climate of the 1960s, "everyone who thinks of himself as being in some sense an American feels the stirrings in him of a second soul, the soul of the Red Man."[90]

Fiedler goes on to note the recurrent role of the mythic Indian in the counterculture's construction of identity. Suggesting the hippie has consciously moulded himself into a spiritual successor to the Native American, "as he…becomes fully hippie, the…Westerner

ceases to be White at all and turns back into the Indian, his boots becoming moccasins, his hair bound in an Indian headband, and a string of beads around his neck."[91] While the counterculture's appropriation of the Native American Indian as an exemplary model for a simpler, more spiritually fulfilling way of living is understandable, it is also problematic. Indeed, such a monolithic conceptualization of the Indian as Other risks ignoring many of the generalizations that are involved in such an idealized representation.[92]

An overly romanticized image of the Native American Indian undoubtedly permeates many 1960s novels. It is evident in the character of Chief Bromden and his 'lost peoples' in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, the wise Chief Showcase in *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down*, and it reaches its apex in *Little Big Man*'s portrayal of the Cheyenne Indians as pastoral martyr figures. Although the narrator of Berger's novel is hesitant to confess an all out desire for the Indian way of life, on several occasions he chooses to retreat to the plains when white culture treats him badly. Like many in the counterculture, Crabb believes that the Indians[93] enjoy an alternative lifestyle that is often preferable to that of the white hegemony: "I was predisposed in their favour" (*LBM*, 144). He also thinks that the Native Americans possess an honor that is noticeably missing from the workings of mainstream society. Thus, when a gentleman-thief by the name of Allardyce suggests that Crabb should remain in the city in order to pursue a career in crime, Crabb refuses the offer, and implicitly the corrupt environment of the city: "That might well be," I says. "But I believe my real calling lays outdoors" (309–310).

The end of the novel further reinforces the character's favorable predisposition toward the Native American Indian. *Little Big Man* culminates in a scene of, almost, religious ascension in which Crabb follows the dying chief of the Indian tribe to the top of a mountain range. Once at the peak, Crabb experiences a distinctly Emersonian epiphany. Crabb awakens to the profundity of an original, prelapsarian existence that is marked out as being the preserve of the Native American Indian:

> Looking at the great universal circle, my dizziness grew still. I wasn't wobbling no more. I was there, in movement, yet at the center of the world, where all is self-explanatory merely because it *is*. Being at the Greasy Grass or not, and on whichever side, and having survived or perished, never made no difference.
>
> We had all been men. Up there, on the mountain, there was no separations. (418)

Though an idealized depiction of the Native American Indian undoubtedly exists within Berger's text, there is evidence that other 1960s novels take a slightly more critical approach to the figure. Both *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* and E.L. Doctorow's *Welcome to Hard Times* present the reader with 'professional', Native American Indians, as one of the Caucasian characters states of the Native American doctor in Doctorow's novel: "John Bear was the best doctor I ever saw, white or red; he had a true talent for healing and it must be owned him."[94] While it is possible to read the depiction of Native American Indian characters who possess medical ability as a stereotypical example of the mystical powers of the 'witch' doctor, such a portrayal might equally be part of an concerted attempt to suggest that Native Americans can be more than the 'noble savages' of Berger's text.

Doctorow's *Welcome to Hard Times* tells the story of the residents of a small town in the Dakota Territory as they attempt to rebuild their settlement following its violent destruction at the hands of a sadistic cowboy, known as the 'Man from Bodie'. Instead of depicting the conventional relationship between the cowboy and society, Doctorow portrays the cowboy as a villain and his attack upon civilization as "a plague" (*HT*, 78). The novel presents the Man from Bodie's misanthropic lifestyle as evidence of his amoral nature: "Bad Men from Bodie weren't ordinary scoundrels, they came with the land, and you could no more cope with them than you could with dust or hailstones" (7).

Following the destruction of the settlement, *Welcome to Hard Times* charts the differing opinions that Mayor Blue and the other residents have concerning the reconstruction of their town. Some of the residents see the task of rebuilding as pointless: "Truth is, if the drought don't get you and the blizzard's don't get you, that's when some devil with liquor in his soul and a gun in his claw will ride you down and clean you out" (29). However, Blue maintains a desire to reestablish the town and tries to convince others of the benefits of doing so:

> I told him there were mountains one way and deserts another, high enough and wide enough for armies to lose themselves in. I told him a man could use up all his money and most of his life looking for something in the West. But, I said, if he were to stake out in one place, make his name in the country, the word would travel surer than any letter that Isaac Maple was keeping a store in Hard Times. (82–83)

In its depiction of the oppositional relationship between the Man from Bodie and the town's residents, *Welcome to Hard Times* explores

the incompatibility of the cowboy figure's individualism with the concept of community. This is perhaps most evident in the fight over the future of the orphan Jimmy Fee that takes place between the spurned prostitute Molly Riordan and Mayor Blue. Molly is ruled by her emotions, and seeks vengeance on the Man from Bodie by fashioning the young and impressionable Jimmy into an outlaw who will be capable of killing him. While Molly tries to turn Jimmy into a tempestuous cowboy, Blue tries to prevent Jimmy from succumbing to the lure of this individualist, macho lifestyle:

> Listen to me I said the day is coming when no Man from Bodie will ride in but he'll wither and dry up to dust. You hear me? I'm going to see you grow up with your own mind, I'm going to see you settled just like this town, you're going to be a proper man and not some saddle fool wandering around with his grudge. (166)

Blue's attempts to educate Jimmy are reminiscent of the Marcusian desire to "'translate' spontaneous protest into organized action which has the chance to develop and transcend immediate needs and aspirations toward the radical reconstruction of society."[95]

In a more general sense, Blue seems conscious of the Marcusian suggestion that "Awareness of the brute fact that, in an unfree society, no particular individual and no particular group can be free must be present in every effort to create conditions of effective refusal."[96] As such, Blue tries to imbue the town's residents with the idea that it is only by organizing themselves that they can hope to succeed in the future. Blue believes that this concerted organization will exclude the possibility of more Men from Bodie being created, indicating the inherent conflict between the cowboy's lifestyle and that of a fully functioning, harmonious community:

> I've seen enough, I've seen them ride into a town, a bunch of them, feeling out the place, prodding for the right welcome. And when they get it you'd might as well turn your gun on yourself as try to turn them away. But a settled town drives them away. When the business is good and the life is working they can't do a thing, they're destroyed. (149–150)

Blue does not deny the possibility of Marcuse's 'infecting agents', rather he chooses to confront them, and encourages others to do the same, telling Molly that

> Sure as winter brings summer we'll draw our Man from Bodie. I suppose I know it as well as you. But you see this time we'll be too good

> for him. Listen to what I say: I don't mean I'll stand up to his gun, I mean I won't have to. When he came last time, the minute Flo walked over to him we were lost… You fight them, you just look at them, and they have you. (149)

In spite of his espousal of such a collectivist sentiment, toward the end of the novel, Blue appears to go back on his assertion that organization is better than spontaneity as a means of effective rebellion. Following the Man from Bodie's return, Blue shoots his nemesis, setting off a chain of events that sends Jimmy down the path of becoming a cowboy. While it appears that all has been lost, on a group level, there is evidence to suggest that Blue has given the other residents of the town the courage to combat figures like the Man from Bodie in the future. By the climax of the story, Blue has imbued the other characters with a collectivist spirit, even if he does not realize it:

> Now what I wonder is why they didn't leave. I saw by the looks on their faces they knew I was telling them right. They had the chance to get out and I can't account that they stayed, that they ran out of my door and went back, each to his selling counter, putting on a face and coddling the customer right past the time it became too late to leave. (190)

Like the characters of Joe Buck and McMurphy, Blue's actions represent a modification of the cowboy's typically individualist stance; one that transfigures its immature radicality into something more inclusive and communally dependent. This alteration of the cowboy brings the figure closer to the Personalist ideology of the 1960s counterculture.

In *The Making of a Counterculture,* Roszak discusses the counterculture's desire to find a utopian "life sustaining receptacle that can nourish and protect good citizenship."[97] Roszak suggests that the counterculture considered there to be a noticeable absence of reliable examples for this kind of Personalist redirection of society: "The old radicals are no help: they talked about socializing whole economies, or launching third parties, or strengthening the unions, but not about building communities."[98] Perhaps, in their transformation of the traditional cowboy figure, writers of the 1960s present us with a model for such revolution, one whose indication of the direction change should take is concurrent with Roszak's notion that "you make up a community of those you love and respect, where there can be enduring friendships, children, and, by mutual aid, three meals a day scraped together by honourable and enjoyable labour."[99]

In conclusion, Furst and Wilson's assertion that the anti-hero is a 'reduced' version of the heroic figure finds great resonance in depictions of the cowboy found in the 1960s anti-Western. In *The Return of the Vanishing American*, Fiedler notes how such texts demote the heroic elements of the cowboy, "[causing them to] shrink in size until they move through the vastness of the West more like the dwarfed Julius Rodman of Edgar Allen Poe than any movie version of the Cowboy Hero."[100] While this shrinking implies a process of invalidation, it is important to note that writers recurrently present this reduced figure in a favorable manner: "Thomas Berger's Little Big Man is precisely what his name declares: a shrimp with sharp wits and an enormous spirit."[101] As such, the anti-heroic cowboy represents a humanist rebuttal to the suggestion that modern man is of less metaphysical worth than his mythological ancestors may have been.

The shift toward the human that occurs in the 1960s anti-Western appears particularly Marcusian in nature, as Reitz suggests, "[Marcuse] believes that art may assist in what Wilhelm Dilthey called *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*—or in other words the construction of a (second) historical world *in the humanities*."[102] To achieve this more human historical world, Marcuse proposes that history must be reconceptualized, in a fashion that is "explicitly opposed to Engel's historical materialist elaborations of the historical philosophy of Hegel . . . rooted in the sensuousness and historicity of human beings themselves."[103] Such a desire for the reassertion of the human permeates the approach the 1960s anti-Western takes in transforming the cowboy. Authors like Doctorow and Berger humanize the figure, and, in the process, introduce a subsequent humanizing into their historicizing of the American West.

In the 1960s anti-Western, the cowboy's traditional separation from the rest of society is increasingly complicated as writers reevaluate the effectiveness of criticizing the system from an exterior position. For example, in *Little Big Man,* Crabb's 'on-off' membership with both white frontier and Native American Indian society enables him to see the positive and negative elements of both of these cultures. Indeed, Berger's protagonist refuses to generalize, or simplify, either set of peoples for the reader. Instead, Crabb's objectivity invites a dialectic in which the reader is able to form their own opinion about the information presented to them, as the character suggests, "For every question there are ten answers, pro and con on every detail" (*LBM*, 413).

While the anti-Western employs a form of satire aimed at disrupting genre conventions it also frequently displays a certain degree of

admiration for these clichés, as the sympathetic marshal of *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* notes, "what's a Western without tall tales and gaudy romance?" (*YB*, 101) For, while a 'progressive' impulse is important to the anti-Western, this radicalism could not exist without a set of archetypal images to draw upon. Consequently, this contemporary engagement with the conventions of the genre results in a process of resignification for the cowboy, rather than replacement, as the 1960s version operates fully aware of the symbolic potential of his more traditional predecessor.

The writers, under discussion in this chapter, disorder the previously established ideological connotations of the cowboy as a deliberate and systematic attempt to analyze and revise its intellectual and moral content. However, just as the earlier symbolism surrounding the cowboy was the result of subjective historicism and aesthetic abstraction, so contemporary modifications of the figure incorporate their own mythological elements.[104]

In particular, by presenting the reader with a set of ideological problems that only a demythologized, anti-heroic version of the cowboy figure can contend with, writers, such as Ishmael Reed and James Leo Herlihy, reaffirm the importance of the postwar individual. This reconstitution transcends the conventional mythological boundaries of the cowboy in order to move the figure toward a position of, ironically. more relevant 'concrete' possibilities, providing one possible answer to Fiedler's enquiry: "Can [we] re-establish the West anywhere?"[105] By repositioning the cowboy on the frontier of the mind, rather than any anachronistic geographical boundary, 1960s writers contribute to a necessary renewal of the figure, as Fussell notes, "The West exerted serious imaginative impact in the United States only so long as it remained a living idea, which was only so long as it survived in real potentiality."[106]

The contemporary anti-Western contributes to the continuing relevance of the cowboy in a period of, otherwise negatively viewed, political appropriation. By subverting the conventions of the traditional cowboy, 1960s writers prevent the figure from becoming entirely redundant to a great deal of the population; a situation that was in danger of realization in the postwar age, as Fiedler notes,

> Everything else which belongs to the Western scene has long since been assimilated: the prairies subdivided and landscaped; the mountains staked off as hunting preserves and national parks; fabulous beasts, like the grizzlies and the buffalo, killed or fenced in as tourist attractions; even the mythological season of the Western, that

non-existent interval between summer and fall called "Indian summer," becomes just another part of the white year.[107]

The 1960s anti-Western's creation of a distinctly metaphysical version of the cowboy instils the figure with a new philosophical validity. Furthermore, by introducing a deeper, more organized element to the rebellion of the cowboy, the figure assumes a Marcusian credibility, reinstating its relevance to a new generation of countercultural readers.

The infusion of a distinctly Marcusian, pro-communal ideology indicates a reexploration of the relationship between the subject and the world. The presentation of cowboy figures who prosper through the rejection of emotional individualism echo the Personalist suggestion that the individual must seek to combine his rebellion with like-minded peoples in order to maximize his potential to change the world around him.

In attempting to incorporate an overtly ethical element into the cowboy, one could suggest that writers, such as Reed, Markson, and Herlihy, produce a modern iteration of the 'social bandit'. Indeed, in some respects, the socially informed motives of the 1960s cowboy seem to parallel those of the Reconstruction Outlaws of the dime novel in the period between 1865 and 1880, "whose outlawry was a response to injustices perpetrated by corrupt officials acting at the behest of powerful moneyed interests."[108]

Undoubtedly, both these sets of figures are anti-heroes who stand in opposition to a society that perceived to have lost its moral, social, and political integrity. They ride into the corrupt township of American 'civilization' in order to flush out the dishonest members of officialdom, and leave the landscape in a decidedly more humanitarian fashion. However, by the time we get to the 1960s 'version' of the social bandit, the Dime Store cowboy's oppositional form of rebellion is presented as useless in the face of the all-consuming pervasiveness of the modern technocratic state. Instead, to combat the ubiquitous nature of the contemporary hegemony, the 1960s anti-Western imbues the cowboy with elements that appear specifically Marcusian in sentiment. The cowboy moves away from the individualist rebellion of his predecessors, to a position in which he seems to fulfill the Marcusian desire for a figure with the ability to liberate others "to something that the Establishment is increasingly incapable of tolerating, namely, independent thinking and feeling."[109]

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 4

Sinner or Saint? The Anti-Hero as Christ Figure in the American Novel of the 1960s

The previous two chapters have examined how the counterculture's 'Great Refusal' manifested itself within anti-heroic subversions of the capitalist and cowboy figures in selected novels of the 1960s. While these two archetypes occupy an important place in American culture, the Christ or Christlike figure is both more central and significant. This chapter, therefore, attempts to explore key fictions that undermine a puritanical, exclusive concept of the biblical Christ through the construction and utilization of a 'new' anti-heroic Christlike figure that is radical and inclusive. This original fictional creation is bereft of the 'exhausted' mythological overtones of the Christian prototype, replacing them with its own, uniquely humanist reconstruction.

Before proceeding any further, it is perhaps pertinent to state the switch in this chapter from a Marcusian to a Camusian framework. It is not the case that I now abandon Marcuse entirely but rather that the work of Camus provides a more apposite philosophy for examining the characters under consideration. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, Camus discusses the subject of a secular Christlike rebel figure in *The Rebel*, and is therefore especially relevant to any discussion of the contemporary Christlike anti-hero. Second, the majority of Marcuse's more significant work almost entirely avoids the subject of religion. While a return to the Camusian theory mentioned in the first chapter might seem inconsistent, the shift from Marcuse to Camus is not as large as it first appears. Indeed, in an essay entitled "Sartre's Existentialism," Marcuse writes of his admiration for the work of the French existentialist. Marcuse approves of the manner in which Camus "rejects [the nihilism] of existential philosophy," and

instead presents a life affirming ideology: "To him, the only adequate expression is the absurd life, and the artistic creation."[1] Like much of Marcuse's work, Camus' positivistic ideology asserts the need for rebellion if the individual is to reach a state of self-actualization: "This life is nothing but 'consciousness and revolt', defiance is its only truth."[2]

The notion of the church as an orthodox institution is crucial to understanding the reasons behind the counterculture's rejection of it. During the 1960s, the NCC (National Council of Churches) represented the idea of the church as a hegemonic body most prominently.[3] The NCC was the biggest establishment state-church organization in postwar America, and was comprised of a conglomeration of Protestant (comprising Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists), Roman Catholic, and Jewish factions: "the famous Protestant-Catholic-Jew troika."[4] While the NCC proposed that it spoke for a sufficiently diverse sector of the population, in reality it was predominantly geared toward maintaining the status quo for those in power, as Ellwood suggests,

> The leaders of the mainstream, NCC denominations were characteristically persons with North European names, educated in recognized universities and divinity schools, and possessed of a certain savoir faire that marked them as serious, moderate, world-class ecclesiastical statesmen.[5]

As such, the prevailing, often conservative, attitudes of the NCC were found increasingly wanting during the 1960s as a new attitude to the theological arose. The NCC was attacked and undermined by those more liberal members of society who ostensibly rejected the 'organization' of religion and by "fundamentalists [who] seized the initiative and tried to redirect [the church] in a conservative direction."[6]

Such contradictory arguments arose because of a number of factors that led to a larger-scale questioning of organized religion in the 1960s. Among the reasons for this reassessment of church systems were a general questioning of the relevance of religion borne of the appointment of a Roman Catholic (Kennedy) as president and the civil rights crusade. Whose appropriation of religion in a more spiritual and 'open' manner highlighted the dogmatic elements of the mainstream church organization. The NCC also came under pressure from a range of extreme Right movements such as the John Birch Society, the Christian Anti-Communism crusade, and the Methodist Circuit Riders. These extremists accused the NCC of being too closely in alignment with communism, and sought to transform the

church into a more conservative force for the causes of "conformity, solidarity . . . and a purifying purge of society."[7]

Opposed to the NCC, and the very concept of orthodox Christianity, many in the counterculture sought a reconfiguration of organized religion into a system of atheistic faith that would reaffirm the relevance of spirituality while attacking the establishment's role as a corrupting influence. As Norman Mailer notes of the 1960s counterculture, "Today in America the generation that respected the code of the myth was Beat, a horde of half-begotten Christs with scraggly beards, heroes none, saints all."[8] Indeed, while the counterculture's rebellion against American hegemony might suggest an equal denunciation of the church as an exemplar of the state, many historians have noted the close parallels that existed between the ideology of the counterculture and that of more traditional, religious bodies. In *The 60s Spiritual Awakening*, Robert S. Ellwood suggests that

> Even at their scruffiest the sixties seemed to be taking place in an invisible cathedral. For all the talk of secularity, the Sixties still belonged to the Age of Faith, which lingered long in America. The Sixties did not so much secularise the sacred as sacrilize the secular, turning its causes into crusades and its activism into liturgies, with their initiatory ordeals and their benedictions at the end. Its dropouts were monks and nuns, complete with habit and reverse tonsure (though it may be, friars as much of the flesh as the spirit), and they knew no dearth of sacraments and sacramentals.[9]

This new anti-organization yet still pro-spiritual, theological sentiment is shared by a number of 1960s novelists who begin to subject the Christ figure to a process of ideological revision in which its 'outdated' religious imagery is 'reinvigorated' in more dissident forms. In this manner, writers engage with the central tenets of Americanism itself, exploring, challenging, and often refashioning the puritan tropes that had come to dominate American literature both explicitly and implicitly.

Of course, the deployment of the anti-heroic as an effective means by which to subvert the 'classical' image of Christ has a long precedent in the American novel. Specific examples include Captain Ahab in *Moby Dick* and the titular character in *Miss Lonelyhearts* (1933) along with postwar characters such as Randle P. McMurphy in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Lloyd Jackson in *Cool Hand Luke*. More recently, Andy Dufresne in Stephen King's *Different Seasons* (1982), the Batman of Frank Miller's revisionist comic series *The Dark Knight Returns* (1997), and the character of Neo in the blockbuster *Matrix*

trilogy (1999–2003) all demonstrate a continuing fascination with the Christlike anti-heroic figure. Many of these characters discard the overtly mythic elements of the Christ figure while retaining much of the ideological intention behind them, reflecting the Marcusian suggestion that "Art must break with . . . reification."[10] In *Reason and Revolution* (1941), Marcuse proposes that by breaking from the divine, art possesses the ability to create a secular model that resonates with a more humanitarian theory:

> The aesthetic morality is the opposite of Puritanism. It does not insist on a daily bath or shower for people whose cleaning practices involve systematic torture, slaughtering, poisoning; nor does it insist on clean clothes for men who are professionally engaged in dirty deals. But it does insist on cleaning the earth from the very material garbage produced by the spirit of capitalism, and from this spirit itself. And it insists on freedom as a biological necessity: being physically incapable of tolerating any repression other than that required for the protection and amelioration of life.[11]

Characters such as Dean Moriarty in Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* and Holden Caulfield in J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* reflect the manner in which postwar writers chose to remove the classical, epic elements from the Christlike figure. Holden Caulfield, a sixteen-year-old boarding school pupil, narrates Salinger's novel. Confined to a mental hospital, Caulfield recounts the three days he spent running away from the 'phoniness' of school and society at large. Caulfield's actions in the novel suggest that he possesses a redemptive quality analogous to the Christ figure. This parallel is especially noticeable within Caulfield's savior-like desire to protect the innocent from the corruptions of society:

> [To] catch everybody if they start to go over the cliff—I mean if they're running and they don't look where they're going I have to come out from somewhere and catch them. That's all I'd do all day. I'd just be the catcher in the rye and all.[12]

Holden's compassion for others anticipates the influence of the Camusian rebel in the construction of the humanitarian Christlike anti-hero of 1960s texts such as Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Pearce's *Cool Hand Luke*, and Kurt Vonnegut's *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*.

The compassionate Christlike anti-heroic figure is also evident in *On the Road*. The novel tells the story of narrator Sal Paradise and the

"holy conman"[13] Dean Moriarty as they travel across America searching for a means to overcome their spiritual disillusionment with society. The character of Moriarty embodies the Christlike qualities of charm and personal magnetism drawn from a reading of the biblical Christ as a charismatic healer and exorcist in the synoptic Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. Indeed, in many ways Moriarty can be seen as the starting point for a new 1960s transfiguration of the Christ figure, as a transmutation that attempts to refresh the prototype by emphasizing the ability that each of us has to be a savior, positing the messianic within the form of the anti-heroic in order to create a new Personalist mythology.[14]

The transferral of an anti-heroic sentiment into the biblical Christ figure results in the creation of a new secular entity during the 1960s. This Christlike figure is ostensibly crude, offensive, unchivalric, and mercenary while simultaneously being responsible for the eventual salvation of those around him. This dichotomous element appositely reflects the paradoxical feelings of those within the counterculture who saw themselves as following a system of agnostic "Christian atheism."[15] The notion of an 'unreligious' Christianity arises as an inevitable result of divorcing the possibility for rebellion from organized forms of Christianity, following in the footsteps of philosophers such as Søren Kierkegaard and G.W.F. Hegel:

> Hegel looked upon hereditary monarchy as the Christian state *par excellence,* or, more strictly, as the Christian state that came into being with the German Reformation. To him this state was the embodiment of the principle of Christian liberty, which proclaimed the freedom of man's inner conscience and his equality before God. Hegel thought that without this inner freedom the outer freedom democracy was supposed to institute and protect was of no avail…Protestantism had established this self-consciousness, and shown that Christian liberty implied, in the sphere of the social reality, submission and obedience to the divine hierarchy of the state.[16]

The counterculture's radical modification of the qualities that constitute the heroism of the Christlike figure serve as a criticism of the conservative ideal found within Puritan depictions of Christ. If the 'hero' was an archetype thought to embody a level of perfection humanly impossible—an unachievable ideal fostered by the state in order to maintain a structure of oppressive hierarchy—many in the counterculture thought that Christ should no longer be classified as a 'hero' in the established definition of the term. Indeed, in his essay "The Antihero in Modern British and American Fiction" (1959), Hassan proposes

that the concept of Christ as a hero is incompatible with postwar ideology: "The term *Antichrist*, meaningful and precise in another age, is succeeded by coinages multiplying out of denial—antimatter, antiplay, anti-utopia, anti-Americanism, and finally antihero, a concept, as it happens, far closer to Christ than to his enemy."[17]

It is important to note the degree to which the divinity of the Christ figure has been interpreted in a variety of ways, not least within the Bible itself. For example, the miracles that the Johannine figure of Christ performs are presented very much as 'signs' that are executed with the purpose of proving the divine origin, and the superior nature of Christ in comparison to mortal men. It is through the ability of the Johannine Christ to display such symbols of extraordinary power that he is depicted as being closer to God. The Johannine Gospel relies heavily upon the presence of such miraculous acts to manifest the notion of Christ's glory.

While the Johannine Christ has the ability to perform 'magical' acts that place him apart from other men, the 1960s Christlike antihero is positioned as distinctly human in ability. As such, this figure bears a closer resemblance to the representations of Christ found in the other synoptic Gospels. These portray Christ as someone who deliberately shies away from overtly magical displays of power, consciously shunning the use of so-called miraculous signs intended to emphasize the divine superiority of their executor. Indeed, the depiction of Christ in the Gospels of (particularly) Matthew and Luke goes so far as to suggest that those who desire miraculous signs belong to an evil and false group of people. As the Gospel of Matthew notes, "But he answered and said unto him, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."[18]

The move away from a belief in the notion of transcendence during the twentieth century means that any miraculous basis for Christ's heroism immediately becomes problematic. Indeed, by the postwar period the idea that Christ's heroism as founded primarily upon his ability to perform acts that mortal men could not was increasingly subject to the same deconstructionist processes being applied to the wider heroic archetype in the American consciousness. More specifically, the positioning of Christ at the top of a hierarchy jarred with the Personalist ideology of the counterculture, which proposed there should be no societal barriers based on elements of an individual's background, wealth, color, or creed.

The postwar rejection of the divine elements of the Christ figure is explored further in Walter Tevis' *The Man Who Fell to Earth.* In Tevis'

novel, Christ is figuratively transformed into an alien: Thomas Jerome Newton. Newton travels to earth on a scientific exploration in order to prevent humanity from self-annihilation: "to save you from destroying yourselves."[19] Newton's race has already destroyed their own planet with scientifically advanced weapons of mass destruction but in an act of selfless compassion they hope to stop humanity from suffering the same fate. While Newton brings a message of empathy, human society has lost its sense of compassion to the extent that when Newton is exposed as an alien, he is imprisoned and tortured by the very people he seeks to help. The parallels between Christ and Newton are further emphasized when Newton is accidentally blinded in an act that resembles the Crucifixion of Christ.

Tevis' repositioning of the Christlike in the form of a (literal) alien can be read as an attempt to reflect the counterculture's desire to transform the Christ prototype into a more accessible, pluralist form. Indeed, the novel's attempt to suggest the need for a more liberal reconceptualizing of the figure is evident when the Anthean Newton recognizes his uncanny similarity to the biblical Christ:

> Two of the walls were covered with bookshelves, and on the third was a large painting of a religious figure whom Newton recognised as Jesus, nailed to a wooden cross. The face in the picture startled him for a moment—with its thinness and large piercing eyes it could have been the face of an Anthean. (*MW*, 15)

Though sharing much in common with the Christ figure, upon returning to earth Newton discovers that humanity has twisted their experiences of the Anthean's previous visits into a system of conformist mass deception they now call religion:

> He was not at all certain that these people had been entirely wise in their development of that strange manifestation of theirs, a thing Anthea was totally without—and yet which the Antheans, in their ancient visits to the planet, were probably to blame for—this peculiar set of premises and promises called religion. (52)

Newton is bewildered by the religiosity of the masses, and the 'organized' systems that humanity have created in order to enforce its illogical practices. The working-class character of Betty Jo specifically represents the human belief in organized religion. Newton is critical of Betty Jo's confidence in structured, religious 'faith' that he perceives to be little more than the last vestiges of an antiquated system.

> She was the sort of irregular and sentimental churchgoer whom television interviewers would call deeply religious—she claimed that her religion was a great source of strength. It consisted largely of attending Sunday afternoon lectures about personal magnetism and Wednesday evening lectures about men who became successful in business through prayer. Its faith was based on a belief that whatever happened, all would be well; its morality was that each must decide for himself what was right for him. Betty Jo had decided on gin and relief, as had a great many others. (50)

While Betty Jo is ostensibly still a Christian, the manner in which she follows Christianity is shown to hinder, rather than help, her well-being. Indeed, despite her protestations to the contrary, Betty Jo experiences little personal fulfillment from her churchgoing, and instead finds greater relief in the un-Christian vices of alcohol and sloth.

The Anthean's covert strategy for saving the earth requires that Newton does not disclose his identity to anyone; instead, he must remain "something of a recluse" (109). This decision leads to a situation in which Newton must attempt to save humanity from annihilation but is unable to acknowledge this fact publicly. However, when Newton is arrested and exposed as an extraterrestrial at the conclusion of the novel, one particularly astute CIA officer suggests that such levels of covertness were unnecessary as the general public's rejection of the extraordinary is such that "no one would believe [Newton's stories] anyway" (170).

This refutation of the divine or 'superhuman' has important implications for the configuration of the Christlike figure's heroism. While Newton's powers initially seem attributable to a superior scientific knowledge that enables him to quickly and efficiently amass a personal fortune worth hundreds of millions of dollars, over the course of the novel this extraordinary element is denied the character: "There were stranger-looking men than this one in the world, and there had been brilliant inventors before" (64). Instead, the novel presents the reader with a quite different set of reasons for believing in Newton based upon his selfless compassion for others. By the dénouement of the novel we are able to conceive of Newton as possessing 'miraculous' powers through the immense personal and humanitarian sacrifice he has made in trying to save humankind from destroying itself. Newton's sacrifice is made all the more poignant when we learn that it is humanity's actions that cause him to lose faith and abandon his mission, stating dejectedly at the end of the novel: "I've decided that the project was over-ambitious" (172).

While Newton descends into a state of apathy at the end of Tevis' novel, many of those within the counterculture decide to take a much more confrontational approach in achieving 'salvation'. Indeed, as the 1960s progressed, more and more people came to see the mainline ecclesiastical system as too conservative, too oppressive, and too out of touch with the rest of society. For many, the NCC had become too analogous with Kierkegaard's concept of the 'church *triumphant*',[20] and not enough like the 'church *militant*'[21] that they desired. The counterculture's perception of organized religion as conservative meant that they felt that the figure of Christ needed liberating from the corrupting grip of a religious system, which was itself, in dire need of fundamental restructuring along considerably more altruistic and activist lines.

The desire for religion to inform a more radical direction for society became a recurring theme in the work of many 1960s writers such as Kurt Vonnegut. Vonnegut's work explores the disparity that many perceived existed between the ideological and ethical teachings of Judaeo-Christianity and the practices of organized religious bodies, as Peter Scholl notes,

> Vonnegut has lost the Faith, has repudiated Christianity, its creeds and assorted institutions, but he has retained all the ethical reflexes which sometimes embellish that religion . . . He retains belief in the worth of man as an article of faith, though it is a faith he cannot justify intellectually, and which he sometimes only half-heartedly maintains.[22]

Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse 5* recounts the story of a lowly optometrist by the name of Billy Pilgrim.[23] Billy, who "resembled . . . Christ" (*S*, 144) and has "a meek faith in a loving Jesus which most soldiers found putrid,"[24] is presented as a potential savior figure following his contact with the alien Tralfamadorians during the Second World War, as Marguerite Alexander notes, "[Billy] is, as his name suggests, representative of suffering humanity."[25]

As the story develops, Billy recounts his abduction by the alien Tralfamadorians who have the capacity to view any moment in time whenever they choose: "they can look at all the different moments just the way we can look at a stretch of the Rocky Mountains" (19). The Tralfamadorians take Billy back to their planet and force him to mate with "a former Earthling movie star named Montana Wildhack" (19). Billy is then returned to earth, and with the knowledge he has gained sets out on a personal crusade to comfort the rest of humanity: "The cockles of Billy's heart, at any rate, were glowing coals. What

made them so hot was Billy's belief that he was going to comfort so many people with the truth about time" (20).

In *Slaughterhouse 5* the Christ figure is imbued with a sense of pathos, as the crucifix Billy has on the wall of his childhood bedroom illustrates,

> Billy had an extremely gruesome crucifix hanging on the wall of his little bedroom in Illium. A military surgeon would have admired the clinical fidelity of the artist's rendition of all Christ's wounds—the spear wound, the thorn wounds, the holes that were made by the iron spikes. Billy's Christ died horribly. He was pitiful. (28)

Central to the novel is the suggestion that Christ's suffering to redeem humanity has been rendered pointless by a world in which humans create and allow atrocities, such as the bombing of Dresden, to take place. Indeed, *Slaughterhouse 5* depicts a situation in which, as Peter J. Reed's suggests, "people [are] doubting their own worth because of a denigration of the worth of people generally."[26] The bombing of Dresden—a city that Billy initially describes as "like a Sunday school picture of Heaven" (108)—exemplifies the senseless violence of the war. If the city in its prebombed state represents a 'picture of Heaven' then its destruction can be read as an attempt to question a Christian belief in the laws of cause and effect, specifically "the futility and absurdity of traditional Christian views of death and free will."[27]

The novel also criticizes the Christian image of war as heroic, as Conrad Festa suggests, "*Slaughterhouse—Five* attacks the notion of war as glorious, noble, or just."[28] Vonnegut condemns the idea of war as righteous through the character of Roland Weary, a jingoistic and unlikeable soldier (he violently attacks Billy). Weary talks of the inherently Christian service he and his band of comrades, nicknamed "The Three Musketeers," are performing by killing Germans in the war. He tells Billy that

> [The] Piety and heroism of "The Three Musketeers," portrayed, in the most glowing and impassioned hues, their virtue and magnanimity, the imperishable honor they acquired for themselves, and the great services they rendered to Christianity. (37)

Weary's heroic rhetoric is undermined by his sadistic behavior, and like Billy the reader cannot help nervously laughing at the character. For Weary's misguided comments highlight an ironic incongruity between the ostensibly benign role of religion, and the numerous

ways in which it has been used to support, or justify, gross acts of violence, as the narrator of *Slaughterhouse 5* notes when reading an evangelical copy of the Bible:

> I looked through the Gideon Bible in my motel room for tales of great destruction. The sun was risen upon the Earth when Lot entered into Zo-ar, I read. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of Heaven; and He overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. (*S*, 16)

Though he is conscripted into the army, and sent to fight in Germany, Billy remains a self-confessed pacifist. In fact, Billy resolutely avoids joining in with the conflict in any way, even going so far as to refuse to carry a weapon throughout the entire course of the war. Such is the character's aversion to violence that when an anti-tank gunner asks him "what he thought the worst form of execution was Billy [has] no opinion" (26). Billy is shown to be incapable of causing harm to anyone, be they friend or foe. In this respect, he is akin to the figure of Christ, who is unwilling to hurt even the slaves of those who will ultimately crucify him: "Then said Jesus unto him, put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."[29]

In the character of Billy we observe the anti-heroic figure refusing the rules of an unjust society; in this case refusing to fight just because society orders him to. Billy's is not a petulant rebellion but a conscious and compassionate stance against the war. Indeed, the novel suggests that it is Billy's continued innocence, in a time of otherwise widespread madness,[30] which enables him to retain his sanity. Billy's strong humanitarian stance causes him to respect life rather than to attempt to destroy it. Billy's spiritual beliefs will not allow him to kill others even if many believe that the church sanctions such actions, instead *Slaughterhouse 5* "point[s] toward a new Christianity in which Christ is far more human."[31]

Biblical depictions of Christ often present the figure as having a democratic ability to engage with all peoples, from the privileged and the wealthy, to the sick, the outcast, and the underprivileged. Such egalitarianism is evident in Christ's friendship with the prostitute Mary Magdalene: "he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons."[32] In a similar display of forbearance, Billy is also shown to embrace those deemed undesirable through his acceptance of the pornographic actress, Montana

Wildhack. Furthermore, Wildhack's conversion from promiscuous adult star to Tralfamadorian believer, with Billy's help, has echoes of early representations of Mary Magdalene's own conversion.

While Billy spends his time in the war as a kind of suffering, passive Christlike figure, after the conflict has ended he consciously adopts a prophetic role: "a calling much higher than mere business" (21). Billy decides to try and save everyone on earth from their own 'short-sightedness' by teaching them what he has learnt from the Tralfamadorians about the relative insignificance of the human race: "He was doing nothing less now, he thought, than prescribing corrective lenses for Earthling souls. So many of those souls were lost and wretched" (21). However, like the character of Newton in *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, Billy finds that communicating this reassuring message is harder than it might first appear. Human pessimism is so great that Billy is unable to persuade even his own daughter of the truth of the Tralfamadorian's communication. Instead, she thinks he has gone mad and tries to put him into residential care: "Billy, meanwhile was trying to hang onto his dignity, to persuade Barbara and everybody else that he was far from senile" (21).

Slaughterhouse 5 asks the reader to reevaluate the practices of organized Christianity. In particular, the novel questions the manner in which those in the religious hegemony invoke the supposed wishes of a higher power as a moral justification for violence or combat, and use fiction as a means of romanticizing this dubious appropriation:

> *History in her solemn page informs us that the crusaders were but ignorant and savage men, that their motives were those of bigotry unmitigated, and that their pathway was one of blood and tears. Romance, on the other hand, dilates upon their piety and heroism, and portrays, in her most glowing and impassioned hues, their virtue and magnanimity, the imperishable honour they acquired for themselves, and the great services they rendered to Christianity.* (12)

Like Billy Pilgrim, many 1960s Christlike figures have an inclination toward a policy of Gandhian non-violent action. This pacifist leaning is ideologically concurrent with Camusian notions of the rebel, configuring the anti-hero as a figure who acts in order to improve the situation of all men, even those who might initially oppose him. The anti-hero's rebellion therefore extols the notion that everyone is of an equal worth, and rejects the concept of 'justifiable violence' as this would intrinsically assert the type of hierarchal framework that those within the counterculture hoped to replace.

Interestingly, *Slaughterhouse 5* suggests that the biblical story of Christ is, in fact, open to an interpretation that sees the text as implicitly supporting the notion of 'justifiable violence':

> The flaw in the Christ stories, said the visitor from outer space, was that Christ, who didn't look like much, was actually the Son of the Most Powerful Being in the Universe. Readers understood that, so, when they came to the crucifixion, they naturally thought, and Rosewater read out loud again:
>
> *Oh, boy—they sure picked the wrong guy to lynch that time!*
>
> And that thought had a brother: "*There are* right people *to lynch.*" Who? People not well connected. (79)

Through the comments of a bemused alien, the novel makes the radical assertion that a great number of people may have misread the meaning of the Christ narrative. Instead of appreciating the seditiousness of the humanitarian Christ figure, these mistaken readers have constructed Jesus' innocence based on a system of hierarchy, which serves to enforce, rather than reject, the ideology behind crucifying and torturing human beings. As if to further this suggestion, while staying in a wartime hospital Billy encounters a book written by the fictional novelist Kilgore Trout entitled *The Gospel from Outer Space*. Trout's novel tells the story of a visitor from outer space who instigates "a serious study of Christianity, to learn, if he could, why Christians found it to be so easy to be cruel" (78). After some in depth investigation, the visitor creates his own revised version of the Christ narrative. This revision has a decidedly more pluralistic bent, and seeks to redress the possibility for misinterpretation:

> In it, Jesus really *was* a nobody, and a pain in the neck to a lot of people with better connections than he had. He still got to say all the lovely and puzzling things he said in the other Gospels.
>
> So the people amused themselves one day by nailing him to a cross and planting the cross in the ground. There couldn't possibly be any repercussions, the lynchers thought…And then, just before the nobody died, the heavens opened up, and there was thunder and lightning. The voice of God came crashing down. He told the people he was adopting the bum as his son…God said this: *From this moment on, He will punish horribly anybody who torments a bum who has no connections!* (79)

The inherently hierarchal nature of the church hegemony meant that it was not until the middle of the twentieth century, and with a degree of reluctance, that its members were willing to instigate a

tentative liberalization of some of its policies. While activist religious groups, such as the Catholic Workers, advocated "personalist action to solve social problems,"[33] there remained a predominantly traditionalist sector that wished to maintain the status quo of doctrinal and conformist rule despite much of the general population's growing aversion to such practices.

These more conservative parts of the church received the turbulent and radical events of the 1960s with a sense of incredulous shock. Ironically, such 'radical' activity played straight into the hands of right-wing factions who were able to use the fear of these events to force tentative liberals into reassessing their policies, or face contributing to the creation of a 'godless' state. This shift toward the right meant that the hegemony of the church was, in many cases, pushed toward a more puritanical condemnation of those 'radicals' within society perceived to be disrupting the status quo, as Mark Noll elucidates,

> The legacy of these contentious times was a pervasive division between liberal and conservative approaches to both public issues and the life of faith . . . Most visible was the rise of a political movement known as the "New Religious Right." . . . events seem to have stimulated the renewal of the kind of evangelical political action that was standard in the nineteenth century but that had largely diminished after the 1930s.[34]

The renewed conservativeness of the church placed them in marked opposition to the growing counterculture, whose desire was for a more radical reading of Christianity and the Christ figure therein. This longing for a more radical Christ figure can be interpreted as signifying the end of a long-held sense of widespread and indiscriminate faith in the state's ability to rule ethically as a result of its professed pantheistic symbiosis with 'morally correct' Christian values. Instead of believing that such moral standards exist in bodies of authority, the counterculture transports them over to its own loosely formulated ideology of Political Personalism,[35] which becomes a kind of secular deism opposed to the state. This transferral then gives rise to the existence of two Christ figures in the postwar era. First, the 'right wing', Puritanical and conservative Christ of the church, which retains the conventional, sanctified relationship between the figure and the state. Second, there is the 'radical' Christ of the counterculture, a figure that breaks the 'sanctified' relationship with the state and chooses instead to emphasize a dissident humanistic concept of Christ that stretches back to theologians such as David Strauss[36] and Ernest Renan.[37]

The character of Lionel Boyd Johnson,[38] in Vonnegut's *Cat's Cradle*, appears to realize the validity of such an anti-heroic reading of the Christ figure when he suggests that his friend, the dictator Edward McCabe, "[should] outlaw him and his religion, too, in order to give the religious life of the people more zest, more tang."[39] Vonnegut's novel tells the tale of Johnson and McCabe, two travelers who land on the small tropical island of San Lorenzo and attempt to set up their own religious system. They call their religion Bokononism. Bokononism is constructed upon a scheme of consciously telling comforting lies to the island's residents in order to reassure them that everything will be all right in the future, even if it isn't in the present:

> When Lionel Boyd Johnson and Corporal Earl McCabe were washed up naked onto the shore of San Lorenzo, I read, they were greeted by persons far worse off than they. The people of San Lorenzo had nothing but diseases, which they were at a loss to treat or even name. By contrast, Johnson and McCabe had the glittering treasures of literacy, ambition, curiosity, gall, irreverence, health, humour and considerable information about the outside world. (*CC*, 80)

Though they are never entirely sure that their plan will work, when Johnson and McCabe realize that their attempt at mass deception will not fully dispel the islanders' worries concerning their terrible conditions, Johnson suggests that McCabe should outlaw him and his religion, in an effort to increase their following and maintain the status quo:

> I understood that a millennium would have to offer something more than a holy man in a position of power, that there would have to be plenty of good things for all to eat, too, and nice places to live for all, and good schools and good health and good times for all, and work for all who wanted it—things Bokonon and I were in no position to provide. So good and evil had to remain separate; good in the jungle and evil in the palace. Whatever entertainment there was in that was about all we had to give to the people. (142)

Of central importance to the ideology of Bokononism is an exploration of the essential tensions that exist between religious concepts of good and evil, as the narrator of the novel explains, "McCabe was always sane enough to realize that without the holy man to war against, he himself would become meaningless" (111). While Johnson elects to have himself outlawed in order to increase support for Bokononism, a critical observer, such as the character of Julian Castle,

might note that such a move only functions on a superficial level, and does nothing to improve the actual plight of the islanders:

> "McCabe and Bokonon did not succeed in raising what is generally thought of as the standard of living," said Castle. "The truth was that life was as short and brutish as ever."
>
> "But people didn't have to pay as much attention to the awful truth. As the living legend of the cruel tyrant in the city and the gentle holy man in the jungle grew, so, too, did the happiness of the people grow. They were all employed full time as actors in a play they understood, that any human being anywhere could understand and applaud." (110)

By foregrounding the superficiality of Johnson's particular brand of rebellion, *Cat's Cradle* represents a Marcusian understanding of the potential of the Christ figure as a deceptive exemplar. In such a reading, Christ is seen as a primarily aesthetic and, therefore, passive symbol of dissent, which must be transformed into an activist guise capable of mobilizing others if any form of true rebellion is to be achieved, as "The Books of Bokonon" indicate,

> The words were a paraphrase of the suggestion by Jesus: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's."
>
> Bokonon's paraphrase was this:
>
> "Pay no attention to Caesar. Caesar doesn't have the slightest idea what's *really* going on." (66)

While the counterculture's opposition to the establishment inevitably caused a, at least partial, refutation of belief in more traditional, state approved systems of organized, hierarchal 'religion' in the style of Bokonon, this does not mean that the movement wanted to divorce the Christ figure from religion completely. Perhaps because of the counterculture's continued faith in decidedly less doctrinal versions of religion than the traditional church system seemed to offer, the 1960s Christlike anti-hero becomes less overtly 'Christian', rather than 'un-Christian' in nature. Relying upon an unclassified belief in notions such as altruism, philanthropy, and compassion. These more humane qualities were thought to be lacking in the ideology of organized religion, as Ellwood notes, "As early as 1960, a survey of college students showed that, while a majority felt a need for religion, almost half of these meant by religion nothing more than 'some sincere working philosophy or code of ethics, not necessarily a religious belief.'"[40]

Like *Slaughterhouse 5*, *Cat's Cradle* also explores the power religion has to deceive, as the narrator of the novel notes, "Nothing in this book is true" (6). The reader is told how successive generations of San Lorenzo leaders, culminating in the dictator 'Papa' Monzano, elected to maintain the archaic system of Bokononism in order to foster a climate of submissiveness in which it is easier to control the population: "the belief that God was running my life and that He had work for me to do. And inwardly, I *sarooned*, which is to say that I acquiesced to the seeming demands of my *vin-dit*" (127). While *Cat's Cradle* critiques religion, and the manner in which those in authority use it as a tool to deceive the masses, the novel seems to imply that science has an even greater potential for misuse. To this end, Vonnegut's story establishes an obvious moral distinction between the originators of Bokononism, and the seemingly, innocent scientist Felix Hoenikker. While it is suggested that Johnson and McCabe are responsible for misleading many generations of San Lorenzo residents it is made clear that they do not physically harm anyone. In contrast to the relatively harmless exploits of Johnson and McCabe, the experiments carried out by Hoenikker and his three children succeed in freezing all of the earth's water, and killing the vast majority of the population.

Cat's Cradle depicts the present, inhumane direction of scientific development as having immensely negative repercussions for the well-being of the human race, reminding us of the Marcusian suggestion that "science and technology . . . have to change their present direction and goals; they . . . have to be reconstructed in accord with a new sensibility—the demands of the life instincts" (19). Felix, in particular, exemplifies a system that seeks ever increasing technological progress without considering the moral and ethical repercussions. Felix is intelligent enough to be "one of the chief creators of the [atomic] bomb" (10) yet does not remember anything about his deceased wife: "I remember one time, about a year before he died, I tried to get him to tell me something about my mother. He couldn't remember anything about her" (14).

Alongside ecclesiastical depictions of Christ, there has long existed a philosophical concept of the figure as one of first instances of the anti-heroic archetype in Western literature. On a conceptual level, the character of Christ has many elements that tie it to that of the rebel; as a figure who is able to fulfill the existentialist gap in the troubled psyche of a disillusioned population. The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche describes Christ as a "holy anarchist" and "a political criminal"[41]—terms that connect the figure to the rebel, and

distance it from notions of sovereignty. Such discussion points to the existence of a distinctly unorthodox mythopoeism to Christ that locates the figure's 'heroism' in his more radical actions such as "selling food without a license, disturbing the peace of the temple, associating with street people and radicals, and undermining authority."[42]

This rebellious concept of the biblical Christ inevitably appealed to the counterculture much more than the traditional Puritan depiction ever would, as Albert Schweitzer suggests, "Jesus was not found in 'sacred space' amid gilt and between candlesticks, but in the suffering."[43] Many in the counterculture thought that if it was possible that such a recognizable figure as Christ could be accepted as having supported the act of rebellion, then mainstream America might be better able to understand their own seemingly, radical ideologies. Subsequently, sectors of the counterculture begin to appropriate Christ as a kind of unofficial 'poster boy', placing a distinct emphasis upon the figure's more rebellious qualities:

> Jesus often appeared on posters: "Wanted" they said. "Jesus Christ. Alias: The Messiah, The Son of God, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, Prince of Peace, etc. Notorious leader of underground liberation movement." Wanted for selling food without a license, disturbing the peace of the temple, associating with street people and radicals, and undermining authority.[44]

During the 1960s, Christ is reconfigured in terms of a new set of secular symbols that attempt to reclaim qualities perceived to have been inherent in the figure's original, biblical incarnation. In particular, the humanitarian qualities of altruism and philanthropy, thought to reside in the 'original' teachings of Christ, are filtered through a lens that relocates such virtues in the act of rebellion.

The influence of Camus is tangible here. The counterculture's shift from a theological, to a more human, interpretation of Christ shared much in common with the writings of Camus, whose work explored the experience of the individual in the modern world, authenticating the human in the absence of the divine:

> "The mystery of God is only the mystery of the love of man for himself." The accents of a strange new prophecy ring out: "Individuality has replaced faith, reason the Bible, politics, religion, and the State, the earth, heaven, work prayer, poverty, hell, and man has replaced Christ." Thus there is only one hell and it is on this earth: and it is against this that the struggle must be waged.[45]

In *The Rebel*, Camus proposes a new secular substitute for the divine. This replacement incorporates some of the positively perceived humanist aspects of the 'old' theological systems: "To conquer God, to make Him a slave, amounts to abolishing the transcendence which kept the former masters in power and to preparing, with the ascension of the new tyrants, the advent of the man-king."[46]

Camus proposes an intrinsic and causal link between the renunciation of religion and the rebel figure, locating the origins of all rebellion within an original rejection of the idea of unmitigated religious belief: "Is it possible to find a rule of conduct outside the realm of religion and of absolute values? That is the question raised by revolt."[47] Indeed, if, as Camus suggests, "only two possible worlds can exist for the human mind, the sacrosanct (or, to speak in Christian terms, the world of Grace) or the rebel world,"[48] then the rebel brings into question religious notions of the sacrosanct in order to deconstruct the idea of divine superiority and validate the importance of man. "The rebel is a man who is on the point of accepting or rejecting the sacrosanct and determined on creating a human situation where all the answers are human."[49]

As part of a Camusian emphasizing of the importance of the human, the 1960s Christlike anti-hero is depicted as an imperfect, rather than perfect, individual. This fallible element of the figure is apparent in the character of McMurphy in Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.* McMurphy embodies a set of distinctly unheroic, Personalist and 'Beatific' qualities as he openly defies authority whenever possible. He encourages gambling on a psychiatric ward, smuggles in wine and women, and refuses to abide by the Big Nurse's strict scheduling of the patient's lives. Yet, while such 'anti-heroic' activity places McMurphy in opposition to traditional, Puritanical depictions of a 'heroic' Christ, he nevertheless retains an undeniably Christlike aura for the other patients.

Indeed, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* portrays McMurphy in a manner that lacks many of the stereotypically heroic traits normally associated with religious depictions of the Christ figure; instead suggesting a link between Mcmurphy's rebellious actions and his Christlike aura, he says, "but you know how society persecutes a dedicated man. Ever since I found my callin' I done time in so many small town jails I could write a brochure."[50] In McMurphy, the divine qualities of the Christ figure are demoted to the point where "[w]hat amazes one . . . is the deceptiveness with which such heroism is displayed. There is no real trace . . . of the grandiloquence with which a Walter Scott portrays an Ivanhoe."[51]

The ambiguous nature of McMurphy is explored further in the rest of the novel. Chief Bromden, a Native American Indian whose dealings with the rest of society have left him in a state of self-imposed muteness, refuses to provide a definitive judgment of McMurphy. Instead, he asks the reader to formulate their own conclusions based upon what they read: "You can't tell if he's really this friendly or if he's got some gambler's reason for getting acquainted with (the) guys" (*CN*, 23).

Interestingly, the Big Nurse questions the perception of McMurphy as a Christlike figure. She attempts to force the patients to articulate their respect for McMurphy in order to try and undermine them: "'And yet', she went on, 'he seems to do things without thinking of himself at all, as if he were a martyr or a saint. Would anyone venture that Mr. McMurphy was a saint?'" (207). This ridiculing of the notion of McMurphy as a savior figure leads to a crisis of faith among the patients who are forced to decide, once and for all, between the oppressive yet familiar oppression of the Big Nurse, and the more radical freedom offered by McMurphy. In spite of the Big Nurse's attack on McMurphy's credentials, the patients finally resolve to retain their belief in the new inmate. For though McMurphy may indeed be more of a sinner than a saint, in the traditional sense of the term, his anti-establishment stance offers the patients a means of personal and spiritual fulfillment otherwise unattainable from the oppressive behavioral codes of a society that has worked to ostracize and depersonalize them.

As well as exploring the interrelated connections between rebellion and saintliness, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* reassesses the role of the miraculous in the construction of the Christlike figure. Upon first meeting McMurphy, Bromden notes incredulously that he

> [l]ives under the same laws, gotta eat, bumps up against the same troubles; these things make him just as vulnerable to the combine as anybody else, don't they?
>
> But the new guy is different and the acutes can see it, different from anybody been coming on this ward for the past ten years, different from anybody they ever met outside. He's just as vulnerable, maybe, but the combine didn't get him. (175)

While the chief's initial description of McMurphy implies that the character is extraordinary in some manner, through the course of the novel this interpretation is deconstructed. It is substituted with a more human conceptualization of the character that continually works to reinforce the fact that McMurphy possesses no superhuman abilities. This repositioning is most obvious when McMurphy tries,

and fails to lift a heavy control panel off the ground. At this point, the novel makes it clear that McMurphy is only human, by reinforcing the character's inability to reproduce the miraculous actions or 'signs' of the Johannine Christ figure:

> His whole body shakes with the strain as he tries to lift something he *knows* he can't lift, something *everybody* knows he can't lift... his breath explodes out of him, and he falls back limp against the wall. There's blood on the levers where he tore his hands. He pants for a minute with his eyes shut. (100–101)

Though the novel depicts McMurphy as a more human, Christlike figure, it does not dispense with the (chief's) belief that McMurphy is miraculous in some, albeit unconventional, manner. Indeed, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* attempts to redefine what constitutes the 'miraculous' by relocating it in a more psychological sphere.

The character of Harding proposes that McMurphy possesses a kind of 'miraculous' power to heal, "Yes, with your talent, my friend, you could work subconscious miracles, soothe the aching id and heal the wounded superego. You could probably bring about a cure for the whole ward" (51). McMurphy is able to help the other patients on the ward by teaching them the importance of self-confidence and self-belief. McMurphy's 'miracle' is, indeed, to bring a cure of sorts to the other hospital patients before the Big Nurse lobotomises him. Harding notes the positive effect McMurphy has had on the other patients, saying: "They're still sick men in lots of ways. But at least... they are sick *men* now. No more rabbits" (241).

McMurphy's restorative ability is most evident in the case of the 'deaf and dumb' Bromden. As the story progresses, McMurphy is able to restore Chief Bromden's ability to speak by rebuilding his confidence and self-esteem. It is important to note that McMurphy 'cures' people by altering the way in which they see both themselves, and the world around them. In this manner, McMurphy's 'powers' reflect the Gandhian notion, shared by many within the counterculture, that "as human beings, our greatness lies not so much in being able to remake the world... as in being able to remake ourselves."[52] While McMurphy physically lays his hands upon the chief, in an act that is analogous to Christ's miraculous healing of a deaf mute in the region of Decapolis, it is by altering the chief's psyche that he is able to work his true 'miracle'.

McMurphy is only able to perform 'miracles' because the other patients are initially unaware of their innate ability for positive action.

Therefore, McMurphy can be seen as a specifically Personalist prophet whose true power lies in his ability to reawaken the individual's capacity for self-actualization. The novel seems to embody the Kierkegaardian notion that "The miracle can demonstrate nothing, for if you do not believe . . . then you deny the miracle,"[53] suggesting the need for a humane solidarity that is able to challenge and reverse the effects of hegemonic depersonalization. As a means of propagating this message, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* dispels the notion that McMurphy is extraordinary in order to encourage the Personalist belief that anyone is capable of achieving freedom from the system (or the 'combine' as Bromden calls it). Terry Sherwood states of McMurphy's democratizing powers: "[McMurphy's] power of miracle is transmitting his traits to others."[54] This sentiment is palpable at the end of the novel when it is made clear that McMurphy has empowered, at least one of, his disciples to do something they would have, previously, been incapable of. After McMurphy receives a frontal lobotomy and the Big Nurse wheels him back onto the ward in a vegetative state. Bromden smothers him in an act of kindness, and then proceeds to hurl a heavy limestone fixture through the window, finally escaping both the literal and metaphysical confines of the hospital.

In keeping with a Personalist mantra, McMurphy is unable to access a more divine role once his earthly one has ended. This leads to a situation in which the tables are turned and Bromden must take the initiative in choosing to 'free' McMurphy.

Bromden's decisive act of rebellion at the end of the novel reinforces the duality of McMurphy's 'miraculous' powers. In this manner, McMurphy's kindness represents a kind of Kierkegaardian miracle of compassion: "being the extraordinary meant to be more concerned than anybody else."[55] It also incites others to rebel against the forces that have made McMurphy's compassion so unusual. Indeed, McMurphy's revolt suggests an intrinsic link between the act of dissension and a universal humanitarianism, which reflects the Camusian concept that all rebellion is an innately selfless act:

> Two observations will support this argument. First, we can see that an act of rebellion is not, essentially, an egoistic act. Undoubtedly it can have egoistic aims. But you can rebel equally well against a lie as against oppression. Furthermore, the rebel—at the moment of his greatest impetus and no matter what his aims—keeps nothing in reserve and commits himself completely. Undoubtedly he demands respect for himself, but only in so far as he identifies himself with humanity in general.[56]

In many ways, McMurphy can be read as a Camusian hero whose revolt against the oppression of the Big Nurse "is the means by which [he] protests against his condition."[57] McMurphy becomes an activist role model whose rebellion is a form of social and moral critique: "All of this—he sweeps his hand around him again—Why do you stand for it?" (150). Interestingly, the novel recalls a historical viability for such activism. This is evident when Hardy, the most overtly intellectual character, elucidates his reasons for continuing to support McMurphy following the Big Nurse's attempts to persuade the patients to doubt him:

> His down right bullheaded gall and the American flag. bless it. and the Lincoln Memorial and the whole bit. Remember the Maine, P.T. Barnum and the Fourth of July. I feel *compelled* to defend my friend's honour as a good old red, white and blue hundred percent American. (209)

Hardy's belief in McMurphy evokes a traditional American love for the primitivistic aspects of the anti-heroic, which favors the anti-hero's separation and opposition to the state. This element of the anti-hero is evident in McMurphy's strong opposition to the technologizing and alienating practices of a society that Bromden loosely terms 'The Combine'. McMurphy becomes emblematic of a countercultural desire to reverse modernity "and return to traditions which enriched the lives of persons."[58] Standing against this return to a more 'fulfilling' lifestyle is the character of the Big Nurse, who personifies the technocratic vision. The sense of community that McMurphy encourages among the other patients threatens the Big Nurse. This kinship would destroy the Big Nurse's control over the patients, as this relies upon processes of personal alienation and humiliation.

In addition to the activist interpretation of Christ, represented by McMurphy, the 1960s novel incorporates humanist and altruistic aspects drawn from depictions of the Christ figure in the Gospel of Luke and the letters of Paul. These two elements combine to provide a contemporary interpretation of the figure that prioritizes the radical, while reducing the divine. Such a reading echoes the work of Christologians such as Albert Schweitzer, whose 1906 writings on the subject of the historical Jesus enabled believers, of a more radical persuasion, to reinterpret the 'Christ of faith' as a concrete figure within history: the so-called Jesus of history. This secularized version of Christ, as a 'religionless' man who lived for the good of others, seems appropriate for a counterculture that yearned for a spirituality

located within the suffering of the Personalist cause rather than the 'sacred space' of the ecclesiastical domain.

The counterculture's resistance to traditional concepts of the sacred and the profane is reflected in Donn Pearce's *Cool Hand Luke*. The novel, which has distinct echoes of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, tells the story of former soldier Lloyd Jackson[59] and his incarceration on an unforgiving Florida chain gang. While imprisoned, Luke metaphysically liberates his fellow inmates through acts of rebellion against the prison wardens, eventually dying at their hands to become a martyr figure for the other convicts.

Luke is initially seen as 'supernaturally' empowered. Sailor, the narrator of the novel, introduces us to Luke using religious rhetoric (reminiscent of John the Baptist): "I was really the one who first became aware of Luke's existence. I recognised his heroic aspects long before he even arrived at our camp. I sensed his poetry. And I knew that he was coming to save us all."[60] The other prisoners on the chain gang also believe that there is "something magical in everything Luke did" (*CHL*, 142) and, upon one of Luke's early escape attempts, are convinced "that in some miraculous way he was going to make it" (192).

However, Luke, like McMurphy, consciously exposes his superhuman image as fraudulent when he admits that a photo he sent to the men during a successful escape attempt was 'faked'. The photo shows Luke in a New Orleans nightclub surrounded by women, champagne, and money. Luke suggests that he created the photo in order to stop the other prisoners from losing faith in themselves:

> Oh, that. I thought you boys might be havin' the Black Ass back here. And maybe you'd miss your old buddy Cool Hand. So I thought I'd send you this little old snapshot to kind of cheer you all up. All together that damn thing cost me about a week's pay. (213)

While the photo prevents the other prisoners from thinking that Luke is infallible, by recognizing that he has brought them together as a unit, they are able to reconceptualize Luke's worth along more humanitarian lines. Indeed, Luke transforms the previously disparate prisoners into a community that serves to make them stronger as individuals, as Sailor notes, "This was the Family, our true family" with "Luke . . . as the master of the family" (103–104).

Cool Hand Luke reevaluates what constitutes the extraordinary in a manner that does not deny the spiritual, only the dogmatic. This is apparent at the end of the novel when the prisoners reach the piece of

land where Luke was killed. On this patch of 'hallowed' ground they choose to reflect in a spiritual, yet distinctly un-Christian, manner:

> And as we each bent over for our rations we knelt in a kind of pagan genuflection. This was sacred ground to us and making us eat here was a deliberate act of heresy. For this was the very spot where they finally caught up with Dragline and with his buddy Cool Hand Luke. (25–26)

The prisoner's 'pagan genuflection' suggests a rejection of traditional, organized religiosity, and a switch to a spiritual, less ecclesiastical alternative. This refutation reflects a similar process in the counterculture. For many members of the movement belief in alternative philosophies, such as the Acid Church of Timothy Leary, Gnosticism, or Zen Buddhism, grew to rival, or take the place of, traditional Christianity, as Ellwood recounts,

> A counter culturalist once told me, ecstatically, that the Gospel of Thomas made Jesus sound like a Zen master, full of mysterious and enlightening koans—the "secret gospels" of those ancient outsiders, the Gnostics, clearly made Christianity more attractive to him than anything preached in church.[61]

Though *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Cool Hand Luke* share similarities in the presentation of their central, Christlike characters, Pearce's novel diverges from Kesey's in several important ways. For example, we are told that McMurphy's opposition to the state has been a constant part of his life since childhood: "Maybe he growed up so wild all over the country . . . so a school never got much a hold on him . . . free enough to be a good con man" (*CN*, 76). In contrast to this, in Pearce's novel, the relationship Luke has toward American hegemony is less clearly defined:

> Two photographs were printed side by side; the one a formal military portrait, the kind we all sent home during the war, face scrubbed, tanned and shiny, uniform correct, hat squared, chest out and bedecked with bits of colored ribbon and metal badges—the other the picture of a drunk peering through the bars, hair dishevelled, shirt open and dirty. But instead of sticking to his role of the Scowling Criminal, the ex-soldier was smiling directly into the camera, one eye closed in a sly wink. (*CHL*, 36)

Indeed, Luke's military service is one of the central ways in which we learn more about his character. *Cool Hand Luke* explicitly

foregrounds the incongruity between Luke's success as a soldier and his apparent hatred of such a profession:

> He was a holder of two Purple Hearts, a Bronze Star and a Silver Star. But he had no Good Conduct Medals. He had been given company punishment on a number of occasions and had served sixty days in a disciplinary battalion for going AWOL. (37)

Luke's sense of internal conflict becomes more intense as the story progresses. Luke becomes increasingly critical of his actions during the war, resenting the manner in which his family, the church, and the army, all conspired to convince him that killing the enemy was a valid cause: "Course I had to kill a couple fellas here and there. Killin' was my job. And my daddy always used to tell me to do a real good job. Him bein' a preacher and all, carryin' the Word, I always did what my daddy said" (125). Throughout the novel, Luke seems unable to reconcile a sense of religious faith with the violence he experienced during combat:

> The girl lay curled up in a heap on the floor, burying her face in her arms, refusing to look at the bewhiskered, muddy enemy soldier who stood in the doorway playing his fiendish instrument.
>
> Then Luke stopped. High on the wall was a huge crucifix, the figure of Christ carved in the crude, macabre style of the Middle Ages, the wood dark and stained and splintered by the years, the face gaunt and tormented.
>
> Luke stood there and looked at it. He looked down at the girl. He waited for a long time, hanging his head and thinking and quietly slung his banjo over his shoulder and left the room. (132–133)

Luke is continually critical of a divinity that supposedly supports bloodshed. This particularly American concept suggests that God is moral yet able to sanction the death of innocent men, women, and children, even going so far as to seemingly 'reward' those who carry out such inhumane actions:

> Ah done killed people. Well, maybe not *exactly* people. But there was fourteen of 'em. Before ah was even a man. Before ah could even vote. In cold blood. Men ah didn't even know. And one of 'em even had a Bible in his pocket. What did You tell *him* about love, God? Or don't You really speak that heathen tongue o' his'n after all? And what about all them starvin' heathen kids and women folk? And them ah wasn't allowed to feed or even talk to cause they was enemies? And how come after ah had to do all this burnin' and killin' they made *me*

> out somethin' special? Music, speeches, flags, medals? Hell, ah was Good Guy Number One. And how come everywhere ah went ah could always see some man of the cloth hangin' around? Smilin' and grinnin' and salutin'? Wearin' war ribbons and officer's marks and all like that there? (237–238)

In its rejection of a religious or nationalistic validation for war, Pearce's text mirrors the moral questioning of those within the counterculture over issues such as America's nuclear armament and the conflict in Vietnam. Luke rejects America's glorification of violence in the name of a higher power, be it the 'righteous' power of the state or that of God. He also refutes what he perceives to be the church's hypocritical brand of humanity, echoing the Marcusian sentiment that

> Obscene is not the picture of a naked woman who exposes her pubic hair but that of a fully clad general who exposes his medals rewarded in a war of aggression; obscene is not the ritual of the Hippies but the declaration of a high dignitary of the Church that war is necessary for peace.[62]

The counterculture's perception of the church as hypocritical is most conspicuous in attitudes concerning its behavior toward the Vietnam War. As one 1965 *Newsweek* article suggests, "One of the more obvious ironies of religious history is the ease with which most Christian churches, despite their theoretical commitment to peace and universal brotherhood, have repeatedly baptized the aims of their own national governments in time of war."[63] The church's delay in pledging its support for the anti-Vietnam movement led many to question the true humanity of an ecclesiastical body that would sanction the war because it could "be a moral means of insuring peace."[64] Luke's attitudes toward religion and war echo those within the counterculture who were disgusted at eminent members of the mainline churches proposing that Vietnam should be seen as a "war for civilisation [and its combatants as] soldiers of Christ."[65]

In *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Joseph Campbell proposes that a desire for a reaffirmation of the human, in the light of the perceived redundancy of 'organized' Christianity, is an inevitable result of secularism:

> The universal triumph of the secular state has thrown all religious organizations into such a definitely secondary, and finally ineffectual, position that religious pantomime is hardly more today than a sanctimonious exercise for Sunday morning, whereas business ethics and patriotism stand for the remainder of the week. Such a monkey-holiness

> is not what the functioning world requires; rather, a transmutation of the whole social order is necessary, so that through every detail and act of secular life the vitalising image of the secular god-man who is actually immanent and effective in all of us may be somehow made known to consciousness.[66]

Campbell's notion of a secular god-man that is known to human consciousness through a 'transmutation of the whole social order' resonates with Christlike characters such as Luke and McMurphy. Indeed, the fictional elucidation of the 'secular god-man' may be one of the contemporary anti-hero's most pertinent functions. For this figure transcends a position of mere anti-religiosity to reflect the nature of the changing relationship between religion and the individual in American society, as Luke puts it, "Dyin'? Ha! It's livin' I'm scared of. Livin' this nice pretty life you say the Old Man up there can take back whenever He wants. Well. He's welcome to it. Come on God! Show your stuff, Old Timer! Make me know it!" (145). Luke's aggressive rejection of organized religion embodies the Camusian notion that the rebel seeks to assert the significance of man by attacking conventional religious hierarchies:

> The metaphysical rebel, is, therefore, certainly not an atheist, as one might think him, but inevitably he is a blasphemer. He simply blasphemes, primarily in the name of order, by denouncing God as the origin of death and as the supreme disillusionment.[67]

The presentation of Luke as a sacrilegious figure, a Camusian blaspheming anti-hero: "givin' the whole fuckin' world a hell-fire sermon" (235), indicates the extent to which 1960s writers were reflecting wider changes regarding the relationship between the countercultural individual and what had previously been revered as sacrosanct. The struggle to authenticate the individual devoid of the church (and organized religion) led many within the counterculture to the Camusian belief that "Every Church is a stone rolled on to the tomb of the man-god; it [has] tried to prevent the resurrection, by force."[68] Such radical rhetoric was considered increasingly frightening and disrespectful by those with more conservative attitudes, as one of the characters in Pearce's novel suggests, "Ah don't like this kind of talk . . . it's blasphemy! Anybody knows better than that. You're gonna bring down the wrath of God on yoreself. On you and me both" (237).

The antagonism between Luke and the church is evident in the character's continued invective against God throughout the novel, culminating in Luke's blaspheming "straight to *God*" (235) within

the confines of an empty church: "Ah'm practically beggin' him to shut up…And Luke, he's arguin' and cussin' and mad all at once" (236).

Both *Cool Hand Luke* and *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* encourage the reader to question their own notions of the heroic by suggesting that heroism can be found in those who have been classified as 'criminals', if society is, itself, corrupt. This inherent critique of contemporary hegemony means that the 1960s Christlike figure often rejects state-instigated systems of social ranking, the narrator of Pearce's novel noting that Luke, "[gave] a hard look at Carr, probably incensed at the idea of a convict giving orders to other convicts" (54).

Indeed, many of those in the counterculture believed that the church employed Christ as a means of maintaining a hierarchy. It did this by emphasizing that the figure was closer to God than man was: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you."[69] In contrast to this approach, many of the novelists in this chapter make the Personalist proposal that Christ is an authentication of (secular) man and consequently validates the importance of every individual within society.

As part of its relocation of Christ into a more ordinary form, 1960s writers often reinvoke the primitivism inherent in images of the biblical figure as a lowly carpenter. For example, Billy Pilgrim is an optometrist; Cool Hand Luke's family has "coal miners, timber cutters and livestock raisers who had always struggled without much luck to make a living" (120) while we learn that McMurphy has previously been both a wanderer and a logging bum. This transmutation of the Christ figure reflects the counterculture's belief that in order to best help people, everyone in society should be made equal because "if not, the contrast makes the difference all the greater."[70]

The anti-heroic figure that seems in some way analogous to Christ also supports the Personalist notion that Christ is to be found in people, and not in buildings and statues (be they deemed religious or otherwise). Hence Luke's actions when he enters the dilapidated church at the end of Pearce's novel:

> He's pickin' up prayer books. He picks up one of these here fans layin' on a chair. They're made outta cardboard. Some funeral parlor outfit hands 'em out. Some picture of a saint or a apostle or somethin' on one side and the name of the funeral parlor is printed on the other side. So this fan belongs to some nigger what lives around here. But he's got his name printed on the handle in pencil. But ole Luke, he

> ain't satisfied. Oh, hell no. He's gotta *read* this here name. Like maybe he might know the guy. (234)

Luke's rebellion is both anti-religious and humanist in nature, echoing the Camusian suggestion that the rebel inherently identifies himself with a larger collective body of people in order to maximize his potential for moral and ethical good. Indeed, it is the socially motivated reasoning behind the rebellion of the Christlike anti-hero that makes it a relevant model for religious faith for those in the counterculture, providing a set of humanitarian guidelines to aid them in achieving a Personalist ideal.[71]

Under the umbrella of Personalism, many in the counterculture reinvoked the humanitarian message behind Christ's words in order to formulate and promulgate their own beliefs. In particular, the contemporary Christlike figure adopts 'Brightman's Law of Altruism'. Formulated by Edgar Brightman, who studied at Boston University alongside Martin Luther King Jr., 'Brightman's Law of Altruism' argued for the distinctly Christlike notion that "each person ought to respect all other persons as ends in themselves, and, as far as possible, to cooperate with others in the production and enjoyment of shared values."[72]

The ideological tenets of Brightman's Law of Altruism are apparent in the oratory of Martin Luther King Jr., who drew upon concepts of Personalism and Gandhian nonviolence in his crusade for greater civil rights. The civil rights movement brought the compassionate side of Christianity to the fore. King and his followers used the language and symbolism of Christian worship to aid in their own Personalist plight in a manner that echoes the Christlike figure's own appropriation of Christ. Evidently, King was not alone in his utilization as many others in the counterculture, operating on a multitude of different levels, drew upon the humanity of Christ's earthly incarnation in their own Personalist quests. Regardless of religious faith, Christ's rebellion was perceived to have sought the destruction of unfair and unjust hierarchal systems, and the establishment of a society founded upon principles of altruistic egalitarianism.

Vonnegut's *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* explores this Personalist interpretation of Christ's teachings. The protagonist of the novel, Eliot Rosewater, is an almost communist reinterpretation of the Christ figure. Eliot espouses the belief that "the government ought to divide up the wealth of the country equally, instead of some people having more than they could ever use, and others having nothing."[73] Though a wealthy son of an American senator, in the novel, Eliot is introduced as "a drunkard, a Utopian dreamer, a tinhorn saint, an

aimless fool" (*GBY*, 49). Yet, over the course of the novel, Eliot removes himself from the rat race of corporate America. Instead, he chooses to utilize his family's immense wealth in order to fight the social inequalities in American society: "Rosewater dollars fought cancer and mental illness and race prejudice and police brutality and countless other miseries, encouraged college professors to look for truth, bought beauty at any price" (10). Eliot's inclination toward increasingly humanitarian causes leads him to Rosewater County, where he sets out on a crusade to care for its resident population: "to love these discarded Americans" (27). The selfless reasoning behind Eliot's relocation is reminiscent of the Kierkegaardian notion that in order to successfully, emulate Christ's practices:

> One must oneself live in the very same manner, poor as the poorest, poorly regarded as the lowly man among the people, experienced in life's sorrow and anguish, sharing the very same condition as those one invites to come to one, those who labor and are burdened. If someone wants to invite the sufferer to come to him, he must either alter his condition and make it identical with the sufferer's or make the sufferer's condition identical with his own.[74]

Although seemingly beneficial to all, Eliot's actions polarize opinion into two camps. The first camp is comprised of those who possess the power of the state such as lawyers, businessmen, and Eliot's father, Senator Rosewater. This group think that Eliot's philanthropic actions are tantamount to insanity, and hire a lawyer to try to prove this. The second camp includes people who occupy a decidedly more liminal role within society such as the inhabitants of Rosewater county and Eliot's ex-wife. In contrast to those in the first group, these 'outsiders' think, "Eliot is right to do what he's doing. It's beautiful what he's doing" (43).

Exemplifying the conservative elements within society, Eliot's senator father rejects the radical humanitarianism that Eliot espouses. While Eliot wants people to reassess the ideological value of money, his father believes that it is right that people should 'worship' the dollar over everything else. Indeed, the senator warns his son that he is wasting his time trying to help those less fortunate than him. The senator believes that these down and outs will only take advantage of Eliot's goodwill: "don't play God to people, or they will slobber all over you, take you for everything they can get, break commandments just for the fun of being forgiven and revile you when you are gone" (163).

Despite his father's protestations, Eliot leaves privileged society and begins his quest to care for Rosewater County's disadvantaged

population. In so doing, Eliot's actions clearly embody a Personalist ideology that seeks to validate the importance of every individual in contrast to hegemonic and hierarchical systems that advantage a minority at the top, as Eliot explains, "every grotesquely rich American represents property, privileges, and pleasures that have been denied the many" (6).

As the residents of Rosewater County spend more time with Eliot they come to believe that the bungling millionaire has indeed helped them: "You've cured more hopeless diseases than all the doctors in Indiana put together" (49). For, while Eliot has no officially recognized medical abilities, the novel suggests that what the residents need, and duly receive, from Eliot, is an intangible humanitarian treatment. As one happy patient tells Eliot, "You gave up everything a man is supposed to want, just to help the little people, and the little people know it" (49).

Eliot's rebellion, like that of McMurphy and Cool Hand Luke, prioritizes the human: "The secret is that they're human" (43). Eliot formulates an answer to a problem that capitalist America is unaware it even has. Eliot notes of the Doctor he goes to see: "It's a cure he doesn't understand, so he refuses to admit it's a cure" (20). Through his kindness, selflessness, and compassion, Eliot creates a Personalist utopia for the residents of Rosewater County, based on an image of the Christ figure as a socialist exemplar:

> It's news that a man was able to *give* that kind of love over a long period of time. If one man can do it, perhaps others can do it, too. It means that our hatred of useless human beings and the cruelties we inflict upon them for their own good need not be parts of human nature. Thanks to the example of Eliot Rosewater, millions upon millions of people may learn to love and help whomever they see. (164)

Instead of merely representing the humanist love of the Christian God for his people, the Christlike figure of the 1960s novel seeks to reposition and authenticate man as the ultimate source for good in the world. As the fictional writer Kilgore Trout notes of Eliot's actions in Rosewater County, "Trout spread his hands. 'There we have people treasuring people as people. It's extremely rare. So from this we must learn'" (162).

Characters such as Eliot present the 'common man' as valid, Personalist replacements for the divine, reminding us of Camus' proposal (noted by Thomas Merton) that people should try to become "Saints without God."[75]

It is possible to interpret 1960s writer's attempts to reclaim and utilize the prominence of the biblical Christ figure as a means of enlightening and recruiting more people to the counterculture's own causes. Following the pattern established with fictional subversions of the capitalist and the cowboy, writers exploit the notoriety of the Christ figure, inverting its reputation as a heroic figurehead through the deployment of the anti-heroic form, in order to bring into question the values of both the state and its systems of organized religion.

An important part of this anti-heroic subversion of Christ is a reassertion of the figure's more humanitarian and radical aspects as a means of incorporating those values that the counterculture sought to promote within their own Personalist ideology. This contemporary renovation of the biblical 'original' reflects a larger-scale move toward secularism, taking place in postwar society. Thus, the synthesis of the Christlike figure's humanistic affirmation in the more attainable form of the anti-heroic serves as a comforting antidote to the ideological worries caused by existentialism. The 1960s Christlike anti-hero authenticates the individual, and, in the process, creates a mythology for the figure that has remained one of the most important to the present day.

This page intentionally left blank

Conclusion

This book has analyzed a selection of anti-heroic figures from 1960s novels in order to achieve a range of objectives. By starting with an introductory chapter that sets out the reasons and theoretical framework behind the study, then dedicating one chapter apiece to examining incarnations of the capitalist, the cowboy, and the Christlike figure, I hope to have proved that the anti-heroic can be seen as an integral part of the rebellion of the 1960s counterculture. Such a wealth of evidence supports the notion that the anti-hero should be ranked in importance alongside other developments in literature such as metafiction and surfiction, and cultural events such as the Hippies and the anti-Vietnam movement.

On a more theoretical level, what has become evident throughout the course of this study is that while it may be popular to assume that the counterculture of the 1960s represented a radical break from what preceded it, it is perhaps more accurate to suggest that its members often worked within established frameworks. That is to say that those in the counterculture consciously utilized the power of widely understood, traditional narratives in order to gain support for their own ideological struggles, as Farrell suggests,

> Personalist anarchism offered political and popular advantages because personalists spoke the common languages of religion and civic republicanism. Deleon suggests that "any radical movement, to be popular in the United States, must draw upon the biblical language of rebirth, liberation, purification, and dignity"...it was such appeals to conscience that explained much of the power of King, the anti-war movement of the 1960s, various battles for civil rights, the aura of Robert Kennedy, and support for Cesar Chavez of the United Farm Workers.[1]

Even the more anarchistic elements of the counterculture—"the dropout school of hippies and back-to-the-landers"[2]—interact with the mainstream of society on some level. Though anarchy may not achieve its professed goals, it is still valuable as "a general critique of

the failures and myths of official liberal society, providing, in some cases, workable alterations, though not alternatives."[3]

Rather than simply opposing the mainstream, those within the counterculture sought to interact with its ideologies, past and present, to convey their message to others. Miles Baxter suggests that the contemporary movement "didn't start something incredibly revolutionary and new; deep down [they] knew that what they were hitting on was very old. They were handing something on, they weren't starting anything."[4]

There is an essential tone of retrieval evident within the counterculture that believes that an 'original' positive American-ness has been lost through the (predominantly capitalist) 'civilization' of society. As Theodore Roszak suggests, "They [the counterculture] give us back the image of the palaeolithic band, where the community during its rituals stood in the presence of the sacred in a rude equality that predated class, state, status. It is a strange brand of radicalism we have here that turns to prehistoric precedent for its inspiration."[5]

Those writing during the 1960s reflect this often-radical appropriation of the traditional with the counterculture's proclivity for dialecticism permeating the anti-heroic figure of the 1960s novel. Indeed, the contemporary anti-hero gains much of its power by reconfiguring the mainstream as radical. Many of the writers this book has examined take the most orthodox figures it is possible to find in American culture: its heroic exemplars, and imbue them with a radical signification more favorable to the counterculture. This process of reappropriating the heroic is central to human thought, as Harold Lubin suggests in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*,

> The study of man's heroes is one way to make the past usable. By thinking about heroes, by searching out the values they represent and testing these against our own values, by reflecting on our heroes and their significance to us, we can make the past more usable and the future more manageable.[6]

By reinvoking the archetypal, heroic figures of American culture, then subverting, parodying and reconfiguring them as anti-heroic, writers of the 1960s expose the gulf between the heroic ideal and its reality. The novels discussed in chapters 2, 3, and 4 attempt to reveal a significant incongruity between a national heroic ideal and its reality in contemporary postwar America. Those in chapter 2 consider the capitalist ideal against the reality of life for the individual within a capitalist society. The novels in chapter 3 examine the individualist

and chivalric image of the traditional cowboy figure, and contrast this with the mundane and dangerous 'reality' of life on the frontier during the nineteenth century. Those in chapter 4 explore the divinely heroic, ecclesiastical Christ of the puritanical, church system, and provide a nonreligious yet spiritual reading of the figure, drawn from his 'original' teachings.

The 1960s anti-hero often seems to look backward in order to reveal a forgotten truth or experience that may suggest viable alternatives for the positive development of society. It is as though—conscious of the Marcusian suggestion that "a whole body of distinctions . . . is removed into the realm of fiction or mythology"[7]—writers of the 1960s seek to reinvoke such forgotten or ignored values as an effective means to break through to a less 'rational' and therefore more 'human' truth.

Because of their incorporation of an ideology that rejects the rationality of the mainstream coupled with a subversion of its heroic figures, the anti-heroic novel of the 1960s often contains a deconstructive or metafictional element. By presenting us with anti-heroes that dialogize with specific heroic exemplars, writers expose the artificiality of these heroes effectively foregrounding them as fictions. However, while metafiction can often seem increasingly nihilistic, demoting the importance of the individual, the anti-heroic novel can achieve the same ends while retaining a strongly humanitarian aspect, as Mark Currie suggests, "the form . . . once thought introspective and self-referential [can] in fact [be] outward looking."[8] By encouraging the reader to identify with the characters in the text, the 1960s novel and the anti-hero figures therein reflect Marcuse's suggestion that art has the ability to challenge the monopoly (or reality principle) of established reality. It does this by creating fictitious worlds and characters, in which the viewer is able to see the complete range of human emotion and experience hidden from them in the present reality.

At the beginning of *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction*, David Galloway offers the following summation of the task facing writers in the twentieth century:

> The decay of traditional Christianity as a unifying force in the life of Western man, whether it be mourned, celebrated, or merely acquiesced to, cannot be ignored. Since the death of the Genteel Tradition the theme of the exiled individual in a meaningless universe . . . has challenged the imagination of American writers with an almost overwhelming urgency.[9]

Such a loss of meaning—"the dark, fragmented, absurd night of despair which colors so much of the modern imagination"[10]—is

challenged by the anti-hero of the 1960s. As we have seen, the rebellion of this figure often assumes a distinctly anti-nihilistic character, answering the question Saul Bellow asks, "How can one resist the controls of this vast society *without* turning into a nihilist, avoiding the absurdity of empty rebellion? . . . Are there other, more good-natured forms of resistance and free choice?"[11]

Some of these 'good natured forms of resistance' are undoubtedly embodied within the 1960s anti-hero who seeks to negate the nihilistic, and instead presents us with "the life-enhancing alternatives which man may adopt"[12] in order to improve conditions for both the individual and society. This expository aim is particularly Marcusian in nature. Indeed, the contemporary anti-hero closely embodies Marcuse's attitudes concerning the interventionist purpose of art: "Art cannot change the world, but it can contribute to changing the consciousness and drives of the men and women who could change the world."[13] Charles Reitz notes of Marcuse:

> His approach proposed that artistic activity and the aesthetic imagination inherently possess disalienating cognitive, affective, and creative powers that can help bring into being, that is, draw out or cultivate, the finest sociocultural visions of which the human genius is capable.[14]

It is possible to see further ideological connections between Marcuse and the anti-hero of the 1960s based upon their shared positivity. Jürgen Habermas notes how Marcuse goes beyond his fellow critical theorists Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer in being the most affirmative of the Frankfurt School: "He did not hesitate to advocate, in an affirmative mood, the fulfillment of human needs, of the need for underserved happiness, of the need for beauty, of the need for peace, calm and privacy."[15] Similarly, and crucially, the anti-hero of the 1960s goes beyond the negative by affirming the positive elements of life (such as love, friendship, and understanding) thought to be truly spiritually and emotionally fulfilling by thinkers such as Marcuse.

The most prominent alternative to nihilism that novels of the 1960s present us with is that of love or compassion. Significantly, these qualities require the protagonist to interact with fellow human beings, and to benefit from such interaction. Subsequently, the positive effects of human interaction find a voice in the 1960s anti-hero who frequently experiences a kind of (Marcusian) transcendence because of his active engagement with others. As Galloway notes, "These heroes all begin their quests with a vision of the apparent lack of meaning in the world, of the mendacity and failure of ideals, but

they conclude with gestures of affirmation derived explicitly from their realization of the significance of love."[16]

The writers and novels I examine in chapter 2 denounce the capitalist system as an ideal. These texts present us with characters (including Eugene Henderson, Eliot Rosewater, or Benjamin Braddock) that choose to leave the isolating confines of this system in favor of more spiritually fulfilling alternatives. This motif continues in the novels I examine in chapter 3. In this chapter, I explore anti-heroic figures that demythologize aspects of the traditional cowboy figure, specifically its position as an exemplary model for individualist rebellion. Novels such as *Little Big Man*, *Midnight Cowboy,* and *Welcome to Hard Times* seek to replace the 'outsider' motif of the cowboy with something collective. They suggest a need for an organized rebellion that is reliant upon the forging of communal bonds that work to empower the individual beyond the limits he would have been able to reach on his own. Finally, in chapter 4 I examine subversions of the Christ figure in the guise of the Christlike 1960s anti-hero (like Cool Hand Luke or Randle P. McMurphy). I suggest that these anti-heroic characters attempt to reclaim the biblical Christ's humanitarian teachings, refocusing the worth of the figure away from the divine and more toward the human.

There is therefore a clear ideological correlation between the figures in all three chapters; one that is linked to a Marcusian theory of collective, human rebellion. The anti-capitalists of chapter 2 represent an awakening to the benefits of the pleasure principle over the reality principle of society; the cowboy figures of chapter 3 reject one specific aspect of the American reality principle; that of individualism, in order to suggest the need for a type of Marcusian 'collective' rebellion. The Christlike figures of chapter 4 extend this concept further, transfiguring the collective rebellion of the 'Great Refusal' into an act of humanitarianism that embodies a strong set of human goals.

It is evident that the 1960s anti-heroic figures I examine in the course of this book follow a definite pattern—one in which the purpose of rebellion is to affirm the importance of a community that has the capacity to nourish the individual on both an ideological and spiritual level. The realization of this purpose often comes through the establishment of loving relationships between previously individualist characters, reflecting a belief that is central to the rebellion of the counterculture; as Farrell suggests:

> The anarchism of political personalism was communitarian anarchism. It was not anarcho-syndicalism, which looks to labor for leadership. It

> was not libertarian anarchism, which seeks to maximize the freedom of individuals, and which is consonant with the so-called "free enterprise" system. Instead, it was an interpersonal anarchism that hoped to maximize the freedom of people-in-community. Sixties personalists envisioned a society of human scale, characterized by participatory democracy, by economic sufficiency, by egalitarianism, by good work and good play, by personal intimacy, and human growth. They envisioned institutions that would make it easier to be good. Since they did not think that Congress was likely to pass either legislation or a Constitutional amendment to enact this program, they often decided to constitute "the beloved-community" themselves.[17]

The Marcusian process of the individual joining other like-minded individuals in order to construct a 'beloved community' that operates away from the mainstream of society is central to the anti-hero of the 1960s. This more compassionate community is evident in the relationships that exist between characters such as Joe Buck and Ratso Rizzo in *Midnight Cowboy*, McMurphy and the other patients on the ward in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, and Mattie Ross, Rooster Cogburn, and LeBoeuf in *True Grit*. These relations stand apart from the mainstream of society and can instead be seen to represent countercultural communities (of sorts) founded upon Personalist notions such as egalitarianism, good work and good play, personal intimacy, and human emotional and intellectual growth.

It is in his humanitarian leanings that the anti-heroic figure of the 1960s is analogous to Hassan's "unheroic hero,"[18] encouraging the reader to a more humanist way of thinking. The sense of hope in the human that is evident within the 1960s anti-hero, and the manner in which this hope is born out of the possibilities of rebellion lend the figure a particularly Marcusian nature, as John Bokina proposes of the enduring quality of the philosopher:

> In the fifteen years after his death [Marcuse] begins to take on a symbolic quality. Subjected to the unwarranted charge of pessimism during his lifetime, Marcuse now represents revolutionary optimism.[19]

The revolutionary optimism that pervades the 1960s novel manifests itself in the repeated depiction of humane characters whose 'anti-heroic' nature reaffirms a belief in the individual. Indeed, as Roger B. Rollin suggests "[such] Literature may not be able to transform us into heroes, but it may help us to become more human. And there may, in the last analysis, be something heroic in that."[20]

Notes

Chapter 1 The Rebel with a Cause? The Anti-Heroic Figure in American Fiction of the 1960s

1. Ihab Hassan, "The Anti-Hero in Modern British and American Fiction," in *Rumors of Change* (1959; repr., Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995), 55–67, p. 55.
2. David Galloway, *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas Printing, 1970), 9.
3. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, "Histories and Textuality," in *Modern Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, rev. ed. (1989; repr., London: Arnold, 2001), 252–256, p. 253.
4. Helen Weinberg, *The New Novel in America: The Kafka Mode in Contemporary Fiction* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), 11.
5. Ibid., 55.
6. Tony Tanner, *City of Words* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1971), 146.
7. There are of course important novels written in the 1960s that can be classified as metafiction or surfiction such as Thomas Pynchon's *V* (1963), *The Crying of Lot 49* (1967), and Richard Brautigan's *Trout Fishing in America* (1967). However, the majority of significant novels written during the 1960s still maintain an (at least ostensible) adherence to a more naturalist form and structure.
8. Thomas Berger, *Little Big Man*, rev. ed. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965; London: Harvill Press, 1999), 312. Citations are to the Harvill Press edition.
9. John Barth, "The Literature of Exhaustion," in *The Friday Book: Essays and Other Nonfiction* (1984; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997), 62–76, p. 62.
10. Louis D. Rubin Jr., "The Great American Joke," in *What's So Funny? Humor in American Culture*, ed. Nancy A. Walker (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1998), 107–119. (Hereafter cited in text as *WSF*.)
11. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948; London: Paladin, 1988; London: Harper Collins, 1993), 387. Citations are to the Harper Collins edition.

12. Lilian R. Furst and James D. Wilson, "Editor's Comments," in *Studies in The Literary Imagination,* ed. Lilian R. Furst and James D. Wilson (Special Journal Issue), 9 (Spring 1976): 5–9, 6.
13. Ibid.
14. Campbell, 389.
15. Contempt toward the traditional heroic archetypes of American culture is evident within much of the rhetoric of the counterculture; one of the more infamous examples being John Lennon's 1966 proclamation that the Beatles were more popular than Jesus Christ. See John Lennon cited in Chia Evers (2003). *John Lennon Proclaims Beatles "More Popular than Jesus" (March 4, 1966)* [online.]. Available: http://www.newsoftheodd.com/article1012.html [2006, March 26].
16. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*, rev. ed. (1968; repr., London: Faber, 1969), 12.
17. Lillian R. Furst, "The Romantic Hero, or Is He an Anti-Hero?" in *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, ed. Lilian R. Furst and James D. Wilson (Special Journal Issue), 9 (Spring 1976): 53–69, 53.
18. Leslie Fiedler, *Love and Death in the American Novel*, rev. ed. (New York: Criterion, 1960; London: Granada, 1970), 33. Citations are to the Granada edition.
19. Furst, *Romantic Hero*, 55.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., 57–58.
22. Ibid., 56.
23. Campbell, 391.
24. Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, rev. ed. (1884; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2003), 51.
25. Albert Camus, *The Rebel*, trans. Anthony Bower, rev. ed. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1953; London; Peregrine Books, 1962; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 20. Citations are to the Penguin edition.
26. Ibid.
27. Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, trans. Justin O' Brien (1942; London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971), 7.
28. S. Beynon John, "Albert Camus: A British View," in *Camus: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Germaine Brée (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965), 85–91, p. 90.
29. Albert Camus, *Selected Essays and Notebooks*, trans. Philip Thody (1962–1965; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970), 36.
30. Albert Camus, *Resistance, Rebellion and Death*, trans. Justin O' Brien, rev. ed. (1961; repr., London: Hamish Hamilton, 1964), 191.
31. Serge Doubrovsky, "The Ethics of Albert Camus," in *Camus: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Germaine Brée (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965), 71–84, p. 74.
32. Ibid., 76.

33. Richard Lehan, "Existentialism in Recent American Fiction: The Demonic Quest," in *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 1 (1959): 181–201, pp. 200–201.
34. Doubrovsky, 16.
35. Furst and Wilson, 7.
36. Ibid.
37. Hassan, *Rumors*, 55.
38. Ken Kesey, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, rev. ed. (London: Methuen & Co: 1962; London: Calder & Boyars: 1972; London: Picador, 1973; London: Marion Boyars, 1979), 243. Citations are to the Picador edition.
39. Ibid., 77.
40. Ibid., 101.
41. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., "The Decline of Heroes," in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*, ed. Harold Lubin (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968), 341–350, p. 342.
42. Harold Lubin, "From Anti-Hero to Non-Hero," in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*, ed. Harold Lubin (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968), 310–318, p. 310.
43. Daniel Boorstin, *The Image, or What Happened to the American Dream* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961), 59–60.
44. Stan Smith, *A Sadly Contracted Hero—The Comic Self in Post-War American Fiction* (London: British Association for American Studies, 1981), 5.
45. Often with the setting in a past war acting as a convenient metaphor for critiquing the contemporary war in Vietnam.
46. Lubin, "From Anti-Hero to Non-Hero," 312.
47. Ibid., 313.
48. Donn Pearce, *Cool Hand Luke* (1966; repr., London: Prion Books, 1999), 37. Citations are to the Prion edition. (Hereafter cited in the text as *CHL*.)
49. Lyndon Johnson, The University of Kansas, *Lyndon Baines Johnson Inaugural Address Wednesday, January 20, 1965* (1995) [online]. Available: http://www.ku.edu/carrie/docs/texts/45john1.htm [2005, February 18].
50. Winston Churchill, C.N.N Interactive, *Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech* (1999) [online]. Available: http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/02/documents/churchill/ [2005. February 18].
51. Walter Lippman cited in the Indiana University School of Honors–Bloomington. (2002). *Honors | American Century Lives H204 | 0012 | N. Cullather* [online]. Available: http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/blfal02/hon/hon_h204_0012.html [2005. February 18].
52. In 1950 America pledged military and economic aid to the Republic of Korea in order to protect them from any 'communist attack' by North Korea.

53. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 marked the culmination of an ongoing conflict between America and Cuba's Fidel Castro, one that had seen President Eisenhower attempt to remove the communist leader in the Bay of Pigs fiasco the previous year.
54. See Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1990).
55. See Larry May, *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
56. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, "Introduction: Historicizing the American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 5–14, p. 9.
57. Anon., The University of Indiana, *The Declaration of Independence of the Thirteen Colonies, In Congress, July 4th, 1776* (1995) [online]. Available: www.law.indiana.edu/uslawdocs/declaration.html [2006, February 16].
58. While the House Committee on Un-American Activities was created with the intention of investigating anti-American propaganda, it was condemned for persecuting people on account of their personal or political beliefs. Most notably, accusations were made against film star Charlie Chaplin, resulting in his relocation to Switzerland. See Peter Braunstein, "Forever Young: Insurgent Youth and the Sixties Culture of Rejuvenation," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. by Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 243–273, p. 269.
59. Schlesinger Jr., 343.
60. This was a rising area of concern for many academics and social theorists. Indeed Vance Packard discusses the increasing alienation felt by the individual within society, detailing a fellow study by academic Peter M. Blau in which Blau discovers that "A large and increasing proportion of the American people spend their working lives as small cogs in the complex mechanisms of bureaucratic organizations." See Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers,* rev. ed. (New York: David McKay, 1959; London: Longmans, 1960; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961), 31. Citations are to the Penguin edition.
61. Schlesinger Jr., 344.
62. While it is never possible to fully isolate time periods as being entirely distinct from each other, I have chosen to focus upon novels published within the 1960s as this period seems to mark a highpoint in the utilization of the anti-heroic figure within American fiction. Certainly there are significant examples in novels produced during the 1950s and 1970s: J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951), Ralph Ellison's *The Invisible Man* (1952), Saul Bellow's *The Adventures of Augie March* (1953), Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*

(1957), Tom Robbins' *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* (1976), and John Irving's *The World According to Garp* (1978). However, the fact remains that novels published within the 1960s appear to epitomize the culmination of a modernist preoccupation with character, before the postmodernist radicalization instigated by authors such as Donald Bartheleme in *Snow White* (1967), Thomas Pynchon in *V* (1963), and *Gravity's Rainbow* (1973) occurs. This temporarily sidelines the importance of the anti-heroic figure until it reemerges in the 1990s in novels such as Bret Easton Ellis' *American Psycho* (1991) and Chuck Palahniuk's *Fight Club* (1996).

63. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), 13–14.
64. Lewis Mumford, *The Myth of the Machine* (New York: Brace & World, 1967), 62–63.
65. Edward J. Rielly, *The 1960s* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003), 145.
66. *The Town & the City* (1950) *The Subterraneans* (1958), *The Dharma Bums* (1958), *The Floating World* (1959), *Mexico City Blues* (1959), *Maggie Cassidy* (1959).
67. This template establishes the following features of the 1960s anti-heroic novel: a likeable figure that refuses to fit into the confines of mainstream society, a plot that involves an escape or movement away from the more negative aspects of this society, a group of friends who help out and in the process are helped by the anti-heroic character either literally, spiritually, or both, an overtly masculine cast of characters, with few or no female characters of any stature, an endorsement of an alternative lifestyle and marginal peoples and an ambiguous ending in which the welfare of the central anti-heroic figure is left uncertain.
68. Carlo Marx is Allen Ginsberg. William Burroughs is Old Bull Lee, and Neal Cassady is the anti-heroic character Dean Moriarty.
69. Paul Goodman writes a series of books (both fiction and nonfiction) throughout the 1950s and 1960s castigating the American people for losing sight of the country's original libertarian ideology. See *Empire City* (1959), *Growing Up Absurd* (1960), *The Society I Live in Is Mine* (1963), *People or Personnel: Decentralizing and the Mixed System* (1965), and *Like a Conquered Province: The Moral Ambiguity of America* (1967).
70. Ann Charters "Introduction," ed. Ann Charters (1957; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2000), p. 27.
71. Ibid., 21.
72. Ibid.
73. Joseph E. Brewer, "The Anti-Hero in Contemporary Literature," *Iowa English Yearbook*, 12 (1967): 55–60, p. 56.
74. Ibid.
75. Robert McRuer, "Gay Gatherings: Reimagining the Counterculture," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*,

ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 215–240, p. 217.

76. Ibid.
77. James J. Farrell, *The Spirit of the Sixties* (London: Routledge, 1997), 69.
78. Perhaps the most noticeable exception to this rule is the three central characters of Jacqueline Susanne's novel *The Valley of the Dolls* (1966).
79. Ferlinghetti's 1958 poem entitled "Christ Climbed Down" uses the image of a crucified Christ to criticize the shortcomings of the American way of celebrating Christmas. Like the work of many later 1960s writers Ferlinghetti's poem considers the Beatnik reconfiguration of Christ to be more relevant than the socially safe version of Christ presented by the Christian church.
80. Jack Kerouac, *On the Road*, ed. Ann Charters, rev. ed. (1957; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2000), 24.
81. Gary Snyder cited in Charters, "Introduction," 28.
82. This is not to suggest that other 1950s characters have no influence upon the anti-heroic figure of the 1960s and its subversion of national, heroic archetypes. For example, the central protagonist of J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, Holden Caulfield, is a version of the 'Christlike' figure as a teenage runaway. However, while such a character subverts one of the three archetypes, Kerouac's Moriarty subverts all three.
83. Max F. Schulz suggests that each of West's novels exposes the falsity of a particularly American ideal, the Bardic ideal in *The Dream Life of Balso Snell* (1931), the Christ ideal in *Miss Lonelyhearts* (1933), the Horatio Alger ideal in *A Cool Million* (1934), and the Hollywood ideal in *The Day of the Locust* (1939). Max F. Schulz, *Radical Sophistication: Studies in Contemporary Jewish-American Novelists* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1969), 17.
84. R.K. Sharma, *Contemporary Black Humour American Novels from Nathanael West to Thomas Berger* (Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1988), 8.
85. Ibid., 171.
86. Barry Miles, *Hippie* (London: Octopus Publishing Group, 2004), 30.
87. Norman Mailer, *Conversations with Norman Mailer*, ed. J. Michael Lennon (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1988), 40.
88. Anon., Kennedy Assassination Chronicles, *The Last Side of Camelot Theodore H. White Interview with Jackie Kennedy* (2003) [online]. Available http://www.jfklancer.com/pdf/ [2005, March 19].
89. Evan Thomas, *Robert Kennedy: His Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002), 40.
90. Robert S. Ellwood, *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 155.
91. Ibid., 102.

92. Ibid., 225.
93. Douglas Kellner, *Herbert Marcuse* (original) (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell12.htm [2004, August 7].
94. Ibid.
95. Doug Rossinov, "The Revolution Is about Our Lives: The New Left's Counterculture," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 99–124, 111.
96. Farrell, 152.
97. Ibid., 148.
98. Herbert Marcuse, "The Inner Logic of American Policy in Vietnam," in *Teach-Ins: USA: Reports, Opinions, Documents*, ed. Louis Menashe and Ronald Radosh (New York: Praeger, 1967), 60–69, p. 66.
99. Douglas Kellner, *Herbert Marcuse* (original) (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell12.htm [2004, August 7].
100. See Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses* (New York: Free Press, 1998).
101. Charles Reitz, *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 15.
102. Saul Bellow, *Mr. Sammler's Planet,* 4th ed. (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978), 32. Citations are to the 1978 Penguin edition.
103. Patricia Waugh, "Postmodernism and Feminism," in *Modern Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, rev. ed. (1989: repr., London: Arnold, 2001), 344–359, p. 349.
104. Colin Wilson, *The Outsider,* rev. ed. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1956; London: Phoenix, 2001), 145. Citation is to the Phoenix edition.
105. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy: Out of the Spirit of Music*, trans. Shaun White, ed. Michael Tanner (1872; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2003), 127.
106. Marguerite Alexander, *Flights from Realism: Themes and Strategies in Postmodernist British and American Fiction* (London: Edward Arnold, 1990), 16.
107. Camus, *Sisyphus*, 10.
108. Ronald Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Modern Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, rev. ed. (1989; repr., London: Arnold, 2001), 185–189, p. 185.
109. Alexander, 146.
110. Ibid., 151.
111. Tanner, *City of Words*, 146.
112. Ibid., 191.
113. Ibid., 96.

114. Thomas L. Hanna, "Albert Camus and the Christian Faith," in *Camus: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Germaine Brée (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965), 48–58, p. 48.
115. Roszak, 13.
116. Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 13.
117. Consider the contrast between the SDS' focus upon achieving their aims through political processes and Ken Kesey and his Merry Pranksters, whose attitude to the political establishment was simply to say "Fuck it and walk away". Tom Wolfe, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (New York: Bantam Books, 1997), 191–200.
118. Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 13.
119. Nik Cohn cited in Miles, 18.
120. Braunstein, "Forever Young," 249.
121. Lehan, 198.
122. Galloway, 171.
123. Farrell, 5.
124. Ibid., 7.
125. Ibid., 252.
126. Ibid., 256.
127. Lehan, 197–198.
128. Frank L. Cioffi, *Ihab Hassan. From an Interview with Ihab Hassan 'Postmodernism, Etc.:'* (1999) [online]. Available: http://www.ihab-hassan.com/ [2004, September 26].
129. Jerzy Durczak (2000). *Ihab Hassan in Focus: an Interview with Ihab Hassan* [online]. Available: http://www.ihabhassan.com/durczak_interview_ihab_hassan.htm [2004, October 13].
130. Ihab Hassan, *Radical Innocence: The Contemporary American Novel*, rev. ed. (1961; repr., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 327. Citations are to the 1973 edition.
131. Ibid., 15.
132. Nathan A. Scott Jr., "The Broken Center: A Definition of the Crisis of Values in Modern Literature," *Chicago Review*, 13 (Summer, 1959): 190–200, p. 196.
133. Hassan, *Radical Innocence*, 19.
134. Ibid., 18.
135. Camus, *Rebel*, 20.
136. Lehan, 198.
137. While it is difficult to pinpoint the exact length of time that the 'hippie' or 'flower children' period of the counterculture lasted for, Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle's suggestion appears apposite, "this phase took off roughly when the Beatles launched their first tour in 1964, reached its zenith of visibility in 1967–68, and then gradually but inexorably returned to earth following Nixon's 1968 election to the presidency." See Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 11.
138. Ibid.

139. While countercultural members such as Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin garnered widespread media attention through actions such as burning dollar bills, it is important to note the exclusivity of such action. It could be suggested that only white middle-class Americans (from within Galbraith's "affluent society") had the ability to engage in such symbolic gestures. See Farrell, 224.
140. Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 11.
141. Lyndon B. Johnson cited in Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 11.
142. Alan Watts cited in Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 12.
143. The Youth International Party or 'yippies', an anarchist group lead by Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, encouraged radical acts of rebellion against mainstream society, such as drug taking and street violence. The group is most significant for attempting to nominate a pig named 'Pigasus' for the presidential election in 1968, and for the 'Festival of Life', a showcase for alternative lifestyles, intended to run concurrent with the 1968 Democratic Party Convention, but which ended abruptly as police clashed with attendees. See Farrell, 223.
144. Ibid.
145. Ibid., 2.
146. Ibid.
147. Nineteenth-century American author Horatio Alger wrote a series of over a hundred, immensely popular 'dime' novels (the amount of copies sold rivalling other more respected authors such as Mark Twain). These novels (ostensibly) promoted the notion that anyone, regardless of their origins, could achieve great wealth and success through qualities such as effort, determination, and hard work. While Alger detractors have since pointed out that the author's characters are more often likely to escape poverty through isolated incidents of bravery or courage, it is nevertheless novels such as the first of the *Ragged Dick* series (1867), *Luck and Pluck* (1869), and *Brave and Bold: Or, the Fortunes of a Factory Boy* (1874) that have contributed to the formation of a distinctly American, capitalist, heroic archetype. See R.A. Burchell and Eric Homberger, "The Immigrant Experience," in *Introduction to American Studies*, ed. Malcolm Bradbury and Howard Temperley, 3rd ed. (1981; repr., London: Longman, 1998), 127–150, pp. 140–141. Citations are to the 1998 edition.
148. Braunstein and Doyle, "Introduction," 11.
149. Roszak, 1.
150. Ibid., 27.
151. The SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) was formed in 1959 as a development of an older socialist organization: the League for Industrial Democracy, and held its first official meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in 1960. The movement's manifesto, entitled "The Port Huron Statement," attacked the established political system for failing to combat a range of social problems, such as racism, materialism, militarism, poverty, and exploitation. The SDS believed

that a nonviolent youth orientated movement had the ability to convert society into a decentralized 'participatory democracy', in which every individual—rather than just the social elite—would have control over the decisions that directly affected their lives and well being. See Farrell, 141–147.

152. Peter Braunstein suggests that the yippies "in one respect, represent the utopian endpoint of rejuvenation culture, an exclamatory posturing meant to conjure up a revolution in which children and rejuvenated adults seize all the power and transform the world into a giant playground." See Braunstein, "Forever Young," 266.
153. Roszak, 1.
154. J.D. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, rev. ed. (1951; repr., London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971), 179.
155. It is widely accepted that one of the major passages of the novel (the dream vision Holden Caulfield has of being a 'catcher in the rye') can be interpreted as emblematic of the character's reluctance to enter the world of adulthood. The absence of any adult figures except Caulfield himself, combined with the character's desire to stop the children from going over the edge of the cliff into the unknown, would seem to support this theory. See David Galloway, *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas, 1970), 140–141.
156. Roszak, 2.
157. Ibid.
158. Indeed, such was the Mods' rejection of anything or anyone 'outmoded' that they did not stop at attacking those older than themselves. Instead, many Mods also challenged people in their own age bracket that they considered to be too conservative; most noticeably the youth movement called the "Rockers," who embraced 1950s tastes in areas such as clothing and music.
159. See Brian Masters, *The Swinging 1960s* (London: Constable, 1985), 13.
160. On April 4, 1964 the Beatles held the top five places in the American popular music charts with "Can't Buy Me Love" being number one, "Twist and Shout" at number two, "She Loves You" at number three, "I Want to Hold Your Hand" at number four, and "Please Please Me" at number five. As a result they were awarded the opportunity to give a concert in the prestigious Carnegie Hall, an honor previously refused to Elvis Presley even though, sales wise, he had sold far more records than the Beatles had by 1964. See Masters, 164–165.
161. Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *POPism: The Warhol 1960s* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), 69.
162. Roszak, 4.
163. Marcuse first uses this term in *Eros and Civilization* and it becomes an important theme in much of his work. It appears to be used to denote the possibility of a third, activist path for the individual,

removed from both the contemplative aestheticism of high culture and the romantic poetic concept of the soul; from Enlightenment materialism and classical Marxism.

164. Charles Webb, *The Graduate*, rev. ed. (1963; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971), 12.
165. B.H. Fairchild, "'Plastics': The Graduate as Film and Novel," *Studies in American Humor*, 4.3 (1985): 133–141, p. 133.
166. Carrol L. Fry and Jared Stein, "Isolation Imagery in *The Graduate*: A Contrast in Media," *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 19 (1978): 203–214, p. 206.
167. Perhaps the highest profile advocate of such an ideology was Jerry Rubin, who claimed in his countercultural text *Do It!: Scenarios of the Revolution* (1970), "I am an orphan of Amerika." See Jerry Rubin, *Do It!: Scenarios of the Revolution* (New York: Touchstone, 1970), 20.
168. Braunstein, "Forever Young," 267.
169. This admiration of the dissident also involves rebellious sectors of society championing their leaders as heroic because of such figure's oppositional stances to the mainstream, for example, civil rights activists eulogize Martin Luther King Jr. as 'heroic' because he encourages an oppositional set of values to those of mainstream society by challenging the position of black people in America.
170. Ken Kesey cited in Miles, 36.
171. Ross Posnock, *Innocents at Home: Ross Posnock on the Legacy of Leslie Fiedler* (2003) [online]. Available: http://www.bookforum.com/archive/sum_03/posnock.html [2004, October 27].
172. As a Newark Jew whose education, oratory skills, and distrust of political insincerity could easily have gained him a place amongst the fashionable New York intelligentsia, Fiedler noticeably turned down a position to work at the prestigious Berkeley University and instead made the 'maverick' choice to teach at Montana State University (later moving to SUNY Buffalo in 1965).
173. Fiedler, 10.
174. Ibid., 12.
175. See Robert Scholes, *Fabulation and Metafiction* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1979).
176. See *Surfiction: Fiction Now and Tomorrow*, ed. Raymond Federman, rev. ed. (1975; repr., Ohio: Swallow Press, 1981).
177. Indeed, there is one well-known example of how Fiedler influenced 1960s writers in a direct way. In the early part of the decade he convinced a national fellowship committee to give an award to Ken Kesey in order that Kesey might write and publish the book he was working on at the time called *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*.
178. Leary ironically later turned against the concept of leaders, as Braunstein notes "at the landmark hippie Houseboat Summit of

early 1967 . . . Leary suggested dropping the term 'leaders' in favor of '*foci* of energy'." See Braunstein, "Forever Young," 258.

179. Ellwood, 84.
180. It is important not to underestimate the appeal of Timothy Leary and the drug culture he came to represent. In 1966 Leary created the 'League for Spiritual Discovery', a semireligious movement for raising consciousness through techniques such as taking LSD. By 1967 thousands of young people all over America were taking drugs in defiance of the mainstream. Novelist Ken Kesey was also influential in popularizing drugs. In 1964 Kesey and a group of fellow dissidents (including Kerouac's friend Neal Cassady) called themselves 'The Merry Pranksters' and traveled cross-country from California to New York. In late 1965 they began a series of 'acid tests', informal gatherings involving strobe lights, fancy dress, LSD taking and musical accompaniment from the popular rock band the Grateful Dead. By the start of 1966 these gatherings had become a fully blown festival, such was their popularity, and upward of ten thousand people came to willingly participate in them. See Timothy Miller, "The Sixties-Era Communes," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 327–351, pp. 330–331.
181. Farrell, 208–212.
182. Ibid., 209.
183. Allen Ginsberg cited in Farrell, 209.
184. Ibid., 211.
185. Miles, 372.
186. Michael William Doyle, "Staging the Revolution: Guerrilla Theater as a Countercultural Practice. 1965–1968," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 71–97, p. 89.
187. The Haight Ashbury Diggers' disliked Hoffman and fellow activist Jerry Rubin for supposedly cultivating their image as 'leaders' of the counterculture, eventually forcing them to leave and establish their own group called the yippies. See Doyle, "Staging the Revolution," 85.
188. The yippies infamously nominated a pig, called Pigasus, as a candidate in the 1968 presidential campaign.
189. Farrell, 223.
190. Jerry Rubin cited in Doyle, "Staging the Revolution," 90.
191. Ibid.
192. The war 'officially' commenced in 1964 with the passing of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. This resolution was itself of questionable integrity, suggesting that the North Vietnamese had attacked two American warships at sea, at night, and during a heavy storm.
193. Miles, 342.
194. Ibid.

195. Abbie Hoffman cited in Miles, 282.
196. It is interesting to note that before becoming a professional musician, Hendrix enlisted in the army where he served for less than a year as a trainee paratrooper, eventually being discharged for medical reasons after he broke his ankle following a parachute jump. Hendrix also volunteered for service in Vietnam, but never saw any military action. See Lauren Onkey, "Voodoo Child Jimi Hendrix and the Politics of Race in the 1960s," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 189–214, p. 208.
197. See the discussion of this topic in Herbert Marcuse, *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (London: Penguin, 1972), 47.
198. Scott C. Holstad, "The Dialectics of Getting There: Kosinski's Being There and The Existential Anti-Hero," *The Arkansas Review: A Journal of Criticism*, 4.2 (1995): 220–228, p. 220.
199. Ibid., 221.
200. Ibid., 222.
201. Miles, 9.

Chapter 2 Individualism and the Anti-Capitalist, Anti-Heroic Figure in American Fiction of the 1960s

1. Theodore Roosevelt cited in Chapultepec, *Citizenship in a Republic "The Man in the Arena" Speech at the Sorbonne Paris, France April 23, 1910* (2004) [online]. Available: http://www.theodoreroosevelt.com/ trsorbonnespeech.html [2004, August 27].
2. Herman Melville, *Moby Dick*, rev. ed. (1851; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003), 465.
3. Ibid., 183.
4. In his introduction to the 2003 Penguin Books edition of *Huckleberry Finn* Peter Coveney examines Huck's individualism as an expression of Twain's own anti-capitalist sentiments. Coveney states that "On an important level, *Huckleberry Finn* is about money." He then goes on to explore the manner in which Huck's moral actions are contrasted with the corrupting influence money is shown to have on several of the other characters in the novel (Miss Watson wanting to sell Jim to the slave trader, the King and Duke fool others solely for money and betray Jim for forty dollars). Coveney concludes by suggesting that "Twain's whole pessimistic analysis of man's social nature in the . . . middle section of the novel derives largely from the 'lust' which 'rots' and which makes men 'hard, sordid, ungentle, dishonest, oppressive'." Peter Coveney, "Introduction," in Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, rev. ed. (1851; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003), 20.

5. Ibid., 49.
6. Ibid.
7. J.K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*, rev. ed. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1958; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), 13. Citations are to the Penguin edition.
8. Kurt Vonnegut, *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, rev. ed. (1965; repr., London: Vintage, 1992), 5. (Hereafter cited in the text as *GBY*.)
9. Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry Into Freud*, rev. ed. (1955; repr., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 93.
10. Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers*, rev. ed. (New York: David McKay, 1959; London: Longmans, 1960; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961), 114.
11. Galbraith, 60.
12. Packard, 17.
13. Anti-capitalist sentiment can be traced back even earlier if we take into account works such as Stephen Crane's *Maggie: A Girl of the Streets* (1893).
14. F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, rev. ed. (1925; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 188.
15. Jack Kerouac, *On the Road*, rev. ed. (1957; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), 242.
16. Ibid., 241.
17. Ibid., 7.
18. Paul Goodman, *People or Personnel and Like a Conquered Province*, rev. ed. (1963 and 1965; repr., New York: Random House, 1968), 370.
19. *Catch-22 Modern Critical Interpretations*, ed. Harold Bloom (Broomhall: Chelsea House, 2001), 12.
20. David Galloway, *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas, 1970), 36.
21. Joseph Heller, *Catch-22* (1961; repr., London: Vintage, 1994), 498. (Hereafter cited in the text as *C*.)
22. Bloom, 82–83.
23. Anon., BBC News, *What Is Catch-22? And Why Does the Book Matter?* (2002) [online]. Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1868619.stm [2004, October 12].
24. Indeed, Milo's 'bad' capitalist individualism, and its potential for dehumanizing others, has remarkable parallels with Paul Goodman's views concerning the systemization of the individual within Vietnam: "Yet what emerges most strikingly from our thinking about and prosecution of the Vietnam war is, again, the input-output accounting, the systems development, and the purely incidental significance of the human beings involved." Goodman, 263.
25. Marcuse, *Eros*, 45.

26. This is also true of Joseph Heller's second novel *Something Happened* (1974), which examines the manner in which contemporary American business dehumanizes its workers to the point of absurdity.
27. Bloom, 65.
28. Sanford Pinsker, *The Schlemiel as Metaphor: Studies in the Yiddish and American Jewish Novel* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), 156.
29. Bloom, 46.
30. It is important to note that *Eros and Civilization* was written during Marcuse's more optimistic 'middle period'. During this period Marcuse suggests that art may act positively to destroy oppression and alienation. This is in contrast to the theorist's later work in which he seems to have reversed his thinking to a belief that art often preserves oppression and alienation. See Charles Reitz, *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 1–12.
31. In *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities* Reitz notes how *Eros and Civilization* also contains a Nietzschean element, "Like Nietzsche, Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization* propounds a militant aesthetic humanism to advance against alienation." Reitz, 128.
32. Marcuse, *Eros*, 197.
33. Ibid., 12.
34. Reitz, 185.
35. Ibid.
36. Robert M. Collins, "Growth Liberalism in the Sixties," in David Farber, *The Sixties: From Memory to History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 5–20, p. 11.
37. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 657.
38. Collins, 25.
39. Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c. 1958–c. 1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 13.
40. Anon., From the S.S. Vallejo, *The Houseboat Summit* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.vallejo.to/articles/summit_pt1.htm [2005, May 26].
41. Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, rev. ed. (1955; repr., Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 37.
42. Ibid., 71.
43. Debra Michals, "From 'Consciousness Expansion' to 'Consciousness Raising'," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 41–68, p. 49.
44. Tom Wolfe, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (New York: Bantam, 1968), 339.
45. Ibid.

46. Jason Watkins, *You're Too Hip Baby* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.bloomsburymagazine.com/ezine/articles/articles.asp?ezine%5Farticle%5Fid=616 [2004, October 13].
47. Terry Southern, *The Magic Christian*, rev. ed. (1960; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 25. (Hereafter cited in the text as *MC*.)
48. Marcuse, *Eros,* 198.
49. Lee Hill, *A Grand Guy: The Art and Life of Terry Southern* (New York: Harper Collins, 2001), 114.
50. Ibid., 88.
51. Ibid.
52. Such an appropriation is of course problematic. C. Fred Alford notes the incongruity between the presentation of Orpheus and Narcissus as ideals for the implementation of Eros in the light of their respective demises (Narcissus' death pining away at his own image after refusing the charms of Echo and Orpheus' murder at the hands of the Thracian maidens he refuses). While this might suggest an image of the erotic as negative, Marcuse appropriates these figures in order to propose that it is only when Eros is shared that it becomes a positive force. C. Fred Alford, "Marx, Marcuse, and Psychoanalysis: Do They Still Fit after All These Years?" in *Marcuse*, ed. John Bokina and Timothy J. Lukes (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1994), 40–59, p. 45.
53. Marcuse, *Eros*, 161.
54. Ibid., 164.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., 165.
57. Ibid.
58. Saul Bellow, *Henderson the Rain King*, rev. ed. (1959; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996), 24. (Hereafter cited in the text as *H*.)
59. The entrepreneurial figure dominated the economic and industrial spheres of late nineteenth-century America, with famous individuals such as Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, Carnegie, and Guggenheim all possessing an ability for success that was perceived to border on genius. These entrepreneurs were able to assemble the resources of a nation, the labor of millions, and the capital of the Western world. In the process they build American industry into the global powerhouse it was prior to the First World War. However, though such figures were often cited as being 'self-made men' whose determination and hard work had paid off under the essentially egalitarian American society of free enterprise, Many sociohistorical studies have implied that "these industrial leaders were not men who came up from the bottom," but were in fact "men who had been given rather exceptional opportunities to make the race to the top." Carl N. Degler, *Out of Our Past* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1970), 214.
60. Packard, 16.

61. Scott C. Holstad, "The Dialectics of Getting There: Kosinski's *Being There* and the Existential Anti-Hero," *The Arkansas Review: A Journal of Criticism*, 4 (1995): 220–228, p. 222.
62. Jerzy Kosinski, *Being There*, rev. ed. (1970; repr., London: Corgi, 1980), 90. (Hereafter cited in text as *BT.*)
63. Holstad, 220.
64. Welch D. Everman, *Jerzy Kosinski: The Literature of Violation* (San Bernardino: Borgo, 1991), 62.
65. Holstad, 223.
66. To all intents and purposes the 1960s politico-anarchist group, the 'Diggers' (named after a set of seventeenth-century rebels who believed in the literal common wealth of the land), shared such a philosophy. Seeing themselves as the 'worker-priests' of the counter-culture, the Diggers sought 'the death of money and the birth of the free' and attempted to establish organizations that would enable others to live outside of the conventional economy. In a similar manner to Marcuse, they considered capitalism to contain an 'invisible complexity', 'dangerous to the soul…dehumanizing', and 'hostile to freedom'. In order to combat this, the Diggers set about distributing food and clothes for free in self-created free stores, provided a free news service, put on free concerts and performances (most famously convincing the Grateful Dead to perform for free in Golden Gate Park) and generally tried to undermine the conventions of capitalist society. See David Farber, "The Intoxicated State/Illegal Nation," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 17–40, pp. 29–30.
67. Marcuse, *Liberation*,11.
68. Ibid., 5.
69. See R.D. Laing, *The Divided Self* (1960), *Self and Others* (1961), and *The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise* (1967).
70. Barbara Tepa Lupack, *Insanity as Redemption in Contemporaneous American Fiction* (Gainsville: University Press of Florida, 1995), 13.
71. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 48.
72. Marcuse, *Eros,* 48.
73. Jerome Klinkowitz, *Kurt Vonnegut* (London: Methuen, 1982), 58.
74. In *Eros and Civilization*, Marcuse defines surplus repression in the following manner,

    > (a) *Surplus-repression*: the restrictions necessitated by social domination. This is distinguished from (basic) *repression*: the "modifications" of the instincts necessary for the perpetuation of the human race in civilization. Marcuse, *Eros*, 35.

75. Ibid., 36.
76. Following the death of his wife and mother in close proximity, America's twenty-fifth President Theodore Roosevelt retired from public life and went to live in the Dakota Territory where he became

interested in conservation. Like Eliot, Roosevelt felt that a kind of original 'American-ness' was embodied within such areas of wilderness. Indeed, in relocating to rural Rosewater County in order to aid the social conditions of its inhabitants, Eliot bears an uncanny similarity to Roosevelt's crusade to improve conditions for the inhabitants of rural areas, "One of the chief difficulties . . . is the failure of country life . . . to satisfy the higher social and intellectual aspirations of country people." Degler, 326.

77. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution*, 49.
78. Marcuse, *Eros,* 50.
79. Klinkowitz, 59.
80. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*, rev. ed. (1968; repr., London: Faber, 1969), 5.
81. Ibid., 142.
82. It is no coincidence that the surname Rosewater is reminiscent of the Rockefeller family surname.
83. Harold Lubin, "The Entertainer as Hero," in *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*, ed. Harold Lubin (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968), 305–309, p. 306.
84. Weiss, 15.
85. Richard Weiss, *The American Myth of Success* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), 6.
86. Goodman, 30.
87. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 52.
88. While the anti-heroic figure was utilized as a fictional method through which to convey increasing distrust of the entrepreneurial image others were employing forms such as the extended essay and nonfiction book to critique the direction American society was perceived to be heading in. See Vance Packard's *The Status Seekers* and the work of Paul Goodman, specifically *Growing Up Absurd* (London: Gollancz, 1961).
89. Marcuse, *Eros*, 34.
90. Ibid., 45.
91. Reitz, 19.
92. The narrator of Kurt Vonnegut's *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* notes how the presidency of the Rosewater Foundation is inherited in a manner similar to that of the British Crown.
93. Packard, 16.
94. Goodman, 19.
95. Ibid., 27.
96. Farrell, 259.
97. Keith Melville, *Communes in the Counterculture: Origins, Theories, Styles of Life* (New York: William Morrow, 1972), 27.
98. Even though the original publication date of Bellow's novel falls just before the 1960s I have included it due to the text's explicit correspondence with later novels.

99. Marcuse, *Eros*, 16.
100. Ibid.
101. Roszak, 96.
102. Ibid., 35.
103. Ibid.
104. Ibid., 18.
105. Galloway, 113.
106. Ibid., 197.
107. Marcuse, *Eros*, 198.
108. Galloway, 123.
109. Marcuse, *Liberation*, 90.
110. In *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* Eliot spends the majority of the novel helping out the residents of Rosewater County in various ways, while at the end of *Henderson the Rain King* Henderson decides to fulfill his ambition to enter medical school, therefore suggesting he will also assume the symbolic role of healer.
111. *The Graduate*. Dir. Mike Nichols. Embassy Pictures Corporation. 1967.
112. Marcuse, *Eros*, 15.
113. Ibid.
114. Charles Webb, *The Graduate*, rev. ed. (1963; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971), 12. (Hereafter cited in text as *G.*)
115. Prominent activist figures in student bodies during this period include David Harris at Stanford University, David Brandt at Cornell, Dan McIntosh at Berkeley, and Robert Powell at North Carolina. These individuals were involved in the frequent and vociferous demonstrations that took place on campus during the 1960s, challenging academic arbiters and the hierarchal systems within society as a whole. See Gina Berriault, "The New Student President, David Harris of Stanford," *Esquire* (September 1967): 12–21.
116. Carrol L. Fry and Jared Stein, "Isolation Imagery in *The Graduate*: A Contrast in Media," *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 19 (1978): 203–214, p. 206.
117. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution*, 1.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid., 20.
120. Africa functions in a similar manner for Henderson in *Henderson the Rain King*.
121. Fairchild, "'Plastics': The Graduate as Film and Novel," *Studies in American Humor*, 4.3 (1985): 133–141, p. 133.
122. It is interesting to note Mr. Robinson's employment within a law firm and the connotation of a loss of morality that is often associated with such an occupation in literature of the American Left. See also *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*.
123. Marcuse, *Eros*, 103.

124. Fairchild, 135.
125. Ibid., 100.
126. Ibid., 15.
127. Fairchild notes the manner in which Benjamin escapes the church with Elaine by locking the others within it, thereby metaphorically leaving behind the corruptions of the establishment, "The Point is clear: the hypocrites are locked in their own whited sepulchure." Fairchild, 140.
128. Fry and Stein, 213.
129. Marcuse, *Liberation*, 4.
130. Farrell, 230.
131. David Rockefeller cited in Terry H. Anderson, "The New American Revolution," in *The Sixties: From Memory to History,* ed. David Farber (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 180–205, p. 187.
132. This notion is explored in further detail in chapter 3.
133. Marcuse, *Liberation*, 91.
134. Ibid.
135. Ibid.

Chapter 3 The Outlaw Returns: The Cowboy in American Fiction of the 1960s

1. Will Wright, *The Wild West: The Mythical Cowboy and Social Theory* (London: Sage, 2001), 9.
2. It is difficult to pinpoint one definitive example that inarguably produced the conventional cowboy figure as we know it today, rather it is likely to have been the result of a multitude of influences from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These include the novels of James Fenimore Cooper (*The Leatherstocking Tales*, 1823–1841), Owen Wister (*The Virginian*, 1902), numerous Dime Store writers, Zane Grey (*Riders of the Purple Sage*, 1912; *The Lone Star Ranger*, 1915), Louis L'Amour (*Hondo*, 1953; *High Lonesome*, 1962), television series, "The Lone Ranger" (1949–1957), "Cheyenne" (1955–1962), alongside the films of John Ford, (*Stagecoach*, 1939; *Fort Apache*, 1948; *The Searchers*, 1956), George Stevens (*Shane*, 1953), Fred Zinnemann (*High Noon*, 1952), and Howard Hawks (*Red River*, 1948; *Rio Bravo*, 1959).
3. Leslie Fiedler, *Love and Death in the American Novel*, rev. ed. (New York: Criterion, 1960; London: Granada, 1970), 181. Citations are to the Granada edition.
4. *The Last of the Mohicans* presents the character of Hawkeye as having consciously removed himself from an ethically defunct white civilization and as being heroic because of his close association with the natural environment.

5. Wright, 7.
6. David Farber, "The Intoxicated State/Illegal Nation Drugs in the Sixties Counterculture," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 17–40, p. 37.
7. Jane Tompkins, *West of Everything: The Inner Life of Westerns* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 10.
8. As well as Hawkeye, the character goes by the names Natty Bumppo, the scout, and La Longue Carabine (The Long Rifle).
9. James Fenimore Cooper, *The Last of the Mohicans*, rev. ed. (1826; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994), 414.
10. Anon., The Writers of the Purple Sage, *John Wayne, The Movies and the Old West: The Western Hero in the Dime Novel* (2003) [online]. Available: http://www.jcs-group.com/oldwest/writers/hero.html [2004, May 28].
11. Ibid.
12. The novels of just one publisher, Erastus Beadle, reached sales of five million in the period between 1860 and 1865.
13. The Writers of the Purple Sage.
14. Ibid.
15. Farber, 18.
16. Wright, 39.
17. In *Counterrevolution and Revolt*, Marcuse states what he believes to be the fundamental requirements for an effective 'counterrevolution' against the establishment. Most significantly, his notion of a counterrevolution is differentiated from the 'spontaneous' rebellion of the individual. While Marcuse suggests that this spontaneous rebellion is borne from a lack of vital needs (food, water, shelter) and is therefore only ever an attempt to fit back into the system, counterrevolution seeks to transform the system by being both more collective and organized. Herbert Marcuse, *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972), Chapter 1.
18. Wright, 119.
19. Stephen Eric Bronner, "Between Art and Utopia: Reconsidering the Aesthetic Theory of Herbert Marcuse," in *Marcuse: Critical Theory and the Promise of Utopia*, ed. Robert Pippin, Andrew Feenberg, and Charles P. Webel (London: Macmillan Education, 1988), 98–120, p. 116.
20. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution*, 47.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ben Agger, "Marcuse in Postmodernity," in *Marcuse*, ed. John Bokina and Timothy J. Lukes (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1994), 20–40, pp. 29–30.
24. John Sinclair cited in Jeff, A. Hale, "'The White Panthers' 'Total Assault on the Culture,'" in *Imagine Nation: The American*

Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s , ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 125–156, p. 134.

25. Oriana Fallaci, "Kissinger: An Interview with Oriana Fallaci," *New Republic*, 23 (1972): 18–25, p. 21.
26. Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies, *Why Do People Hate America?* (Cambridge: Icon Books, 2002), 183.
27. Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. Sheila Faria Glaser, rev. ed. (1981; repr., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 43.
28. Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation. The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Atheneum, 1992), 502.
29. Max Evans, *The Rounders*, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1960; New York: Bantam Books, 1965), p. 75. Citations are to the Bantam edition.
30. Ibid., 20.
31. Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers,* rev. ed. (New York: David McKay, 1959; London: Longmans, 1960; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961), 16.
32. Evans, 29.
33. Ibid., 19.
34. Marilyn B. Young "Foreword," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 1–4, p. 3.
35. Ibid.
36. William W. Savage, *The Cowboy Hero: His Image in American History and Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1986), 3.
37. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 87–88.
38. Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilisation: A Philosophical Inquiry Into Freud*, rev. ed. (1955; repr., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 106.
39. Leslie Fiedler, *The Return of the Vanishing American*, rev. ed. (London: Jonathan Cape, 1968; London: Paladin, 1972), 38–39. Citations are to the Paladin edition.
40. Alongside racism, sexism, and ecological concerns, the issue of individualism permeates such texts.
41. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*, rev. ed. (1968; repr., London: Faber, 1969), 215.
42. Thomas Berger, *Little Big Man*, rev. ed. (1964; repr., London: Harvill Press, 1999), 378. (Hereafter cited in the text as *LBM*.)
43. Joseph A. Stout Jr. and Odie B. Faulk, *A Short History of the American West* (London: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974), 247.
44. Don Graham, *Western Movies Since 1960* (1998) [online]. Available:http://www2.tcu.edu/depts/prs/amwest/html/wl1256.html [2003, October 17].
45. The title of the film adaptation was changed to *Dirty Dingus Magee* as if to exemplify the bawdy nature of the story, although in actuality

this version toned down the sexually explicit nature of Markson's text in favor of emphasizing the safer, slapstick elements.

46. David Markson, *The Ballad of Dingus Magee*, rev. ed. (1965; repr., London: Anthony Blond, 1967; London: Mayflower, 1968), 96. (Hereafter cited in text as *DM*.)
47. John Garelick, *Themes and variations David Markson Writes on* (2004) [online]. Available:http://www.portlandphoenix.com/books/other_stories/documents/04035282.asp [2005, March 1].
48. Georges Bataille, *The Unfinished System of Nonknowledge*, trans. Michelle Kendall and Stuart Kendall, ed. Stuart Kendall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 144.
49. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 185.
50. Ibid., 184.
51. Ibid., 164–165.
52. See chapter 1.
53. Sardar and Davies, 173–174.
54. There are some exceptions, most notably Calamity Jane. However, by far the majority of such figures are male. Indeed in Chapter 5 of *The Return of the Vanishing American* Fiedler accounts for the overt and strong masculinity of Western literature as a reflection of male fears that women are out to 'recapture' men, putting an end to their freedom and denying them their individuality. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 63–84.
55. Roszak, 3.
56. Daniel Snowman and Malcolm Bradbury, "The Sixties and Seventies," in *Introduction to American Studies*, ed. Malcolm Bradbury and Howard Temperley, 3rd ed. (London: Longman, 1998), 267–295, p. 272.
57. In *Gunfighter Nation. The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (1992), Richard Slotkin notes how the perception of a particularly regal aspect to John F. Kennedy's administration led to a renewal of the ideological connections between the 'myths of chivalric knighthood' and 'the heroes of the frontier myth'. This link is also likely to have informed the contemporary rejection of the absolutist mythopoeic of the traditional cowboy figure. Slotkin, 355–345.
58. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 141.
59. Slotkin, 499.
60. Politicians as far back as Andrew Jackson (1829–1837) and as recent as George W. Bush (2001–) have utilized Western-infused rhetoric in order to harness the particularly strong symbolism that the cowboy figure possesses in the American consciousness.
61. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 59.
62. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 56.
63. Slotkin, 3.
64. Ibid.

65. Mary Sheila McMahon, "The American State and the Vietnam War," in *The Sixties: From Memory to History*, ed. David Farber (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 40–65, p. 47.
66. Stout Jr. and Faulk, 9.
67. Slotkin, 3.
68. John Updike, *Rabbit Redux*, rev. ed. (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1971; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 43. Citation is to the Penguin edition.
69. Roszak, 74.
70. Charles Portis, *True Grit*, rev. ed. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 42. Citations are to the Penguin edition. (Hereafter cited in text as *TG*.)
71. Ken Kesey, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, rev. ed. (London: Methuen: 1962; London: Calder & Boyars: 1972; London: Picador, 1973; London: Marion Boyars, 1979), 242. Citations are to the Picador edition (Hereafter cited in text as *CN*.)
72. Ibid., 53.
73. Slotkin, 12.
74. Ibid., 289.
75. Paul Goodman, *People or Personnel and Like a Conquered Province*, rev. ed. (1963 and 1965; repr., New York: Random House, 1968), 394.
76. This also seems to echo notions of the carnival discussed by Mikhail Bakhtin. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: MIT Press, 1968).
77. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 96.
78. Ishmael Reed, *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down*, rev. ed. (1969; repr., London: Allison & Busby, 1995), 9 (Hereafter cited in text as *YB*.)
79. Roszak, 210.
80. Ibid.
81. James Leo Herlihy, *Midnight Cowboy*, 3rd ed. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965; London: Jonathan Cape, 1966; London: Panther, 1969), 164. Citations are to the Panther edition. (Hereafter cited in text as *MC*.)
82. Tom Robbins, *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues*, rev. ed. (1976; repr., Harpendon: No Exit Press, 2001), 98.
83. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 47.
84. Wilson's seminal text *The Outsider* (1956) is a comprehensive exploration of anti-nihilistic existentialism. Its immense popularity won Wilson many plaudits (he was hailed as Britain's answer to Albert Camus) and the book has since been translated into thirteen languages. The text explores the existentialist crisis felt by many individuals in the twentieth century by looking at a selection of noted literary and historical 'outsider' figures (such as Camus' Meursault and T.E. Lawrence). The notion of the 'outsider' figure (and the book as a whole) is important to any consideration of the 1960s anti-hero

because both share a similar ideological outlook. Indeed, both suggest the importance of a positive humanism as the answer to contemporary nihilism. Wilson went on to explore this issue further in books such as *Religion and the Rebel* (1957) and *Beyond the Outsider* (1965).

85. See Colin Wilson, *The Outsider*, rev. ed. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1956; London: Phoenix, 2001). Citations are to the Phoenix edition.
86. Ibid., 147.
87. Roszak, 7.
88. Ibid., 194.
89. Ibid.
90. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 10.
91. Ibid., 23.
92. In his essay "Counterculture Indians and the New Age" Deloria discusses the communalists' (a group of white disaffiliated counterculture members who decided to adopt a Native American Indian way of life) desire to "value Indian Otherness and its assorted meanings more than they did real native people." Phillip Deloria, "Counterculture Indians and the New Age," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 159–188, p. 164.
93. The Cheyenne Indians are calculatedly nicknamed the 'Human Beings' as if to emphasize their humanity.
94. E.L. Doctorow, *Welcome to Hard Times*, rev. ed. (1960; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996), 94. (Hereafter cited in text as *HT*.)
95. Ibid., 47.
96. Ibid., 49.
97. Roszak, 203.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid.
100. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 160–161.
101. Ibid., 161.
102. Reitz, 200.
103. Ibid., 211.
104. Indeed, this is evident within the continuation of many of the elements of the 1960s anti-Western into subsequent decades, suggesting that the ideology surrounding the genre will never stop being contested. The process of undermining genre conventions filters into film by the 1970s. It is notable in the screen adaptation of *Little Big Man* (Dir. Arthur Penn. Cinema Center 100 Productions. 1970), and in the parodic tone of Sergio Leone's *A Fistful of Dynamite* (Sergio Leone. M.G.M. 1971). The 1960s novel's rejection of the cowboy's machismo may have also led subsequent

Westerns, both textual and filmic, to a more considered approach regarding gender. For example, Tom Robbins' *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* (1976) introduces a female cowgirl as its central protagonist while more recent films such as *Open Range* (Dir. Kevin Costner. Touchstone Pictures. 2003) and *The Missing* (Dir. Ron Howard. Revolution Studios. 2003) contain central female protagonists and explore, critically, the role of violence in the genre.

105. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 25.
106. Edwin Fussell, *Frontier: American Literature and the American West* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 24.
107. Fiedler, *Vanishing American*, 22.
108. Slotkin, 127–128.
109. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution,* 129.

Chapter 4 Sinner or Saint? The Anti-Hero as Christ Figure in the American Novel of the 1960s

1. Herbert Marcuse, *Studies in Critical Philosophy*, trans. Joris De Bres (London: NLB, 1972), 160.
2. Ibid.
3. It is of course inherently problematical to propose the existence of an all encompassing 'church' body in America during the 1960s, we need only think of the controversy caused by the candidacy of Catholic John F. Kennedy to recall the divisions that existed between established religious denominations. Nevertheless, in trying to suggest something of the multifaceted approach toward spirituality that those within the counterculture adopted it is necessary to refer to the movement's generalization of the majority of the 'old' churches into a singular somewhat oversimplified categorization.
4. Ibid., 40.
5. Ibid., 38.
6. Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in America and Canada* (London: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992), 442.
7. Ibid., 59.
8. Norman Mailer, *The Presidential Papers* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 54.
9. Robert S. Ellwood, *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University press, 1994), 19.
10. Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, rev. ed. (1955; repr., Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 41.
11. Ibid., 28.
12. J.D. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, rev. ed. (1951; repr., London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971), 180.

13. Ann Charters "Introduction," Jack Kerouac, *On the Road*, ed. Ann Charters, rev. ed. (1957; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), 28.
14. For a full explanation and definition of Personalism see James J. Farrell, *The Spirit of the Sixties* (London: Routledge, 1997).
15. Carl Oglesby, "Rescuing Jesus from the Cross," *CoEvolution Quarterly*, 39 (Fall, 1983): 30–39, p. 36.
16. Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution* (1941; repr., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), 86.
17. Ihab Hassan, "The Anti-Hero in Modern British and American Fiction," in Ihab Hassan, *Rumors of Change* (1959; repr., Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995), 55–67, p. 55.
18. Matthew 12: 39.
19. Walter Tevis, *The Man Who Fell to Earth*, rev. ed. (1963; repr., London: Bloomsbury, 2000), 127. (Hereafter cited in text as *MW*.)
20. Søren Kierkegaard, *Practice in Christianity*, trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 214.
21. Ibid., 220.
22. Peter Scholl, "Vonnegut's Attack Upon Christendom," *Newsletter of the Conference on Christianity and Literature*, 22 (Fall, 1972): 10–14, p. 11.
23. Billy Pilgrim is aptly named as he goes on his own kind of spiritual journey throughout the course of the novel.
24. Kurt Vonnegut, *Slaughterhouse 5*, rev. ed. (1969; repr., London: Vintage, 2000), 22. (Hereafter cited in text as *S*.)
25. Marguerite Alexander, *Flights from Realism Themes and Strategies in Postmodernist British and American Fiction* (London: Edward Arnold, 1990), 156.
26. Peter J. Reed, "The Later Vonnegut," in *Vonnegut in America*, ed. Jerome Klinkowitz and Donald L. Lawler (New York: Delacorte Press, 1977), 160–175, p. 164.
27. Stanley Schatt, *Kurt Vonnegut, JR*. (Farmington Hills: Bobbs–Merrill Educational Publishing, 1976), 90.
28. Conrad Festa, "Vonnegut's Satire," in *Vonnegut in America*, ed. Jerome Klinkowitz and Donald L. Lawler (New York: Delacorte Press, 1977), 140–159, pp. 145–146.
29. Matthew 26: 52
30. Raymond Olderman notes how Vonnegut uses President Truman's announcement of the atom bomb being dropped on Hiroshima as a sickly apposite demonstration of man's bizarre pride concerning the destruction of anyone deemed (by those in power) to 'deserve it'. Raymond Olderman, *Beyond the Wasteland: The American Novel in the Nineteen-Sixties* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 37.

31. Schatt, 92.
32. Mark 16: 9
33. Farrell, 29.
34. Noll, 445.
35. See chapter 1, pp. 29–30 for an extended definition of this term.
36. Nineteenth-century German theologian and writer, David Strauss, is perhaps most famous for his book the *Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (1835–1836).
37. Ernest Renan, a nineteenth-century French philosopher and writer, wrote extensively on Christianity and the Christ figure, most notably in the eight-volume *Histoire des origines du christianisme* (1863–1883).
38. Of all the authors under study in this chapter, Kurt Vonnegut is perhaps the greatest explorer of religion, with texts such as *Sirens of Titan* (1959), *Cat's Cradle*, *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* and *Slaughterhouse 5*, conveying a (recurrent) desire to revaluate the role of Christianity in the contemporary age.
39. Kurt Vonnegut, *Cat's Cradle*, rev. ed. (New York: Delta, 1963; London: Gollancz, 1963; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), 109. Citations are to Penguin edition. (Hereafter cited in text as *CC*.)
40. Ellwood, 55.
41. Nietzsche, *Twilight,* 140.
42. Farrell, 209.
43. Ellwood, 127.
44. Farrell, 209.
45. Albert Camus, *The Rebel*, trans. Anthony Bower, rev. ed. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1953; London: Peregrine, 1962; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 115. Citations are to the Penguin edition.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., 27.
48. Ibid., 26–27.
49. Ibid., 26.
50. Ken Kesey, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, rev. ed. (London: Methuen, 1962; London: Calder & Boyars, 1972; London: Picador, 1973; London: Marion Boyars, 1979), 22. Citations are to the Picador edition. (Hereafter cited in text as *CN*.)
51. John A. Barsness, "Ken Kesey: The Hero in Modern Dress," in Ken Kesey, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (Viking Critical Library), ed. John Clark Pratt (New York: Viking Press, 1977), 419–435, p. 425.
52. Marian Wright Edelman, *The Measure of Our Success: A Letter to My Children and Yours* (Boston: Beacon, 1992), 71.
53. Kierkegaard, 53.
54. Terry G. Sherwood, "*One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and the Comic Strip," in Kesey, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, 380–391, pp. 386–387.

55. Kierkegaard, 42.
56. Camus, 22.
57. Ibid., 29.
58. Farrell, 50.
59. Jackson acquires the nomenclature 'Cool Hand Luke' when his fellow chain gangers note his composed, card-playing face.
60. Donn Pearce, *Cool Hand Luke* (1966; repr., London: Prion Books, 1999), 35. Citations are to the Prion edition. (Hereafter cited in the text as *CHL*.)
61. Ellwood, 91.
62. Marcuse, *Liberation*, 8.
63. "Battle of Conscience," *Newsweek*, November 15, 1965, p. 78.
64. Cardinal Spellman cited in Ellwood, 190.
65. Ibid.
66. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1948; London: Paladin, 1988; London: Harper Collins, 1993), 389. Citations are to the Harper Collins edition.
67. Camus, 30.
68. Ibid., 61.
69. Acts 2: 22.
70. Kierkegaard, 13.
71. A central element in this humanistic ideology was a desire for the creation of an egalitarian society that would be fair for all, regardless of color, creed, sex, or age; as Farrell suggests,

    > Personalism focussed especially on poor and marginal persons, using their conditions as an index of the health and justice of society. In a Personalist perspective, poor people were a sure sign of an impoverished society. (6)

72. Ibid., 83–84.
73. Kurt Vonnegut, *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater*, rev. ed. (1965; repr., London: Vintage, 1992), 23. (Hereafter cited in the text as *GBY*.)
74. Kierkegaard, 13.
75. Thomas Merton cited in Farrell, 152.

Conclusion

1. James J. Farrell, *The Spirit of the Sixties* (London: Routledge, 1997), 259.
2. Ken Kesey cited in Andrew Kirk, "Machines of Loving Grace," in *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s*, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (London: Routledge, 2002), 353–378, p. 365.
3. David Deleon cited in Farrell, 259.
4. Miles Baxter cited in Farrell, 259.
5. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*, rev. ed. (1968; repr., London: Faber, 1969), 265.

6. *Heroes and Anti-Heroes*, ed. Harold Lubin (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968), 324.
7. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), 188.
8. Mark Currie, "Introduction," in *Metafiction*, ed. Mark Currie (New York: Longman, 1995), 1–21, p. 2.
9. David D. Galloway, *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas Printing, 1970), 5.
10. Ibid., 173.
11. Saul Bellow, *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*, ed. Kay Dick (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), 226.
12. Galloway, 171.
13. Herbert Marcuse, *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978), 32.
14. Charles Reitz, *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 224.
15. Jürgen Habermas, "Psychic Thermidor and the Rebirth of Rebellious Subjectivity," in *Marcuse: Critical Theory and the Promise of Utopia*, ed. Robert Pippin, Andrew Feenberg, and Charles P. Webel (London: Macmillan Education, 1988), 3–26, p. 3.
16. Galloway, 171.
17. Farrell, 254.
18. Ihab Hassan, *Rumors of Change* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995), 56.
19. John Bokina, "Marcuse Revisited: An Introduction," in *Marcuse*, ed. John Bokina and Timothy J. Lukes (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1994), 10–25, p. 23.
20. *Hero/Anti-Hero*, ed. Roger B. Rollin (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), 21.

Bibliography

Primary Material

Alger, Horatio Jr., *Brave and Bold: Or, the Fortunes of a Factory Boy* [1874] (New York: Amereon Limited, 1976)

———, *Luck and Pluck* [1869] (Hailey: Pavilion Press, 2003)

———, *Ragged Dick* and *Struggling Upward* [1867] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985)

Barth, John, *The Floating Opera* [1957] (London: Granada, 1985)

———, *Giles Goat-Boy* [1966] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967)

Barthelme, Donald, *Snow White* [1967] (New York: Atheneum, 1972)

Bellow, Saul, *The Adventures of Augie March* (New York: Viking Press, 1953)

———, *Dangling Man* [1944] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963)

———, *Henderson the Rain King* [1959] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996)

———, *Mr. Sammler's Planet* [1970] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978)

———, *Seize the Day* [1956] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001)

Berger, Thomas, *Little Big Man* [1964] (London: Harvill Press, 1999)

———, *Reinhart in Love* [1962] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)

Bradford, Richard, *Red Sky at Morning* [1968] (New York: Harper Collins, 1999)

Brautigan, Richard, *Trout Fishing in America* [1957] (London: Vintage, 1997)

Burroughs, William S., *The Naked Lunch* [1959] (London: Calder & Boyars in Association with Olympia Press, 1964)

Camus, Albert, *The Myth of Sisyphus* [1942], trans. Justin O' Brien (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971)

———, *The Outsider* [1942] (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2000)

———, *The Rebel* [1951] (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971)

———, *Resistance, Rebellion and Death* [1961], trans. Justin O' Brien (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1964)

———, *Selected Essays and Notebooks* [1962–1965], trans. Philip Thody (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970)

Cheever, John, *Bullet Park* [1969] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983)

Cooper, James Fenimore, *The Deerslayer* [1840] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

———, *The Last of the Mohicans* [1826] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994)

———, *The Pathfinder* [1841] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Didion, Joan, *Run, River* [1963] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979)
———, *Slouching Towards Bethlehem* [1968] (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
Doctorow, E.L., *Welcome to Hard Times* [1960] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996)
Ellis, Bret Easton, *American Psycho* [1990] (London: Pan, 1991)
Ellison, Ralph, *The Invisible Man* [1952] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999)
Evans, Max, *The Rounders* [1960] (New York: Bantam, 1965)
Fitzgerald, Scott F. *The Great Gatsby* [1925] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967)
Grey, Zane, *The Lone Star Ranger* [1915] (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1919)
———, *Riders of the Purple Sage* [1912] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
Hardy, Thomas, *The Mayor of Casterbridge* [1886] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994)
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, *The Scarlet Letter* [1850] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003)
Heller, Joseph, *Catch-22* [1961] (London: Vintage, 1994)
———, *Now and Then* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1998)
———, *Something Happened* [1974] (London: Random House, 1995)
Hemingway, Ernest, *Death in the Afternoon* [1932] (London: Random House, 1994)
———, *A Farewell to Arms* [1929] (London: Random House, 1994)
———, *The Green Hills of Africa* [1935] (London: Random House, 1994)
Herlihy, James Leo, *Midnight Cowboy* [1965] (London: Panther, 1969)
Irving, John, *The World according to Garp* [1978] (London: Corgi, 1979)
Kerouac, Jack, *On the Road* [1957] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000)
Kesey, Ken, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* [1962] (London: Picador, 1973; ed. John Clark Pratt [New York: Viking Press, 1977])
———, *Sometimes a Great Notion* [1963] (London: Methuen, 1976)
King, Stephen, *Different Seasons* [1982] (London: Warner, 2003)
Kosinski, Jerzy, *Being There* [1970] (London: Corgi, 1980)
L'Amour, Louis, *High Lonesome* [1962] (London: Corgi, 1970)
———, *Hondo* [1954] (London: Corgi, 1973)
Mailer, Norman, *An American Dream* [1965] (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
———, *Barbary Shore* [1951] (London: Cape, 1952)
Malamud, Bernard, *The Fixer* [1966] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
———, *A New Life* [1961] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
Markson, David, *The Ballad of Dingus Magee* [1965] (London: Mayflower, 1968)
Melville, Herman, *Moby Dick* [1851] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003)
Palahniuk, Chuck, *Fight Club* [1996] (London: Random House, 1997)
Pearce, Donn, *Cool Hand Luke* [1966] (London: Prion, 1999)

Portis, Charles, *True Grit* [1968] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969)
Pynchon, Thomas, *The Crying of Lot 49* [1965] (London: Random House, 2000)
———, *Gravity's Rainbow* [1973] (London: Random House, 1995)
———, *V* [1961] (London: Pan, 1975)
Reed, Ishmael, *Yellow Back Radio Broke-Down* [1969] (London: Allison & Busby, 1995)
Robbins, Tom, *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* [1976] (Harpendon: No Exit Press, 2001)
Roth, Phillip, *Portnoy's Complaint* [1969] (London: Random House, 1995)
Salinger, J.D., *The Catcher in the Rye* [1951] (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971)
Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet* [1600], ed. G.R. Hibbard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
———, *Julius Caesar* [1599] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963)
Southern, Terry, *Candy* [1958] (London: Bloomsbury, 1997)
———, *The Magic Christian* [1960] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969)
———, *Red Dirt Marijuana & Other Tastes* [1967] (London: Bloomsbury, 1990)
Susanne, Jacqueline, *The Valley of the Dolls* [1966] (London: Corgi, 1968)
Tevis, Walter, *The Hustler* [1961] (London: Bloomsbury, 1998)
———, *The Man Who Fell to Earth* [1963] (London: Bloomsbury, 2000)
Twain, Mark, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* [1885] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003)
Updike, John, *Rabbit Redux* [1971] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
———, *Rabbit Run* [1960] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995)
Vonnegut, Kurt Jr., *Cat's Cradle* [1960] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965)
———, *God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater* [1965] (London: Vintage, 1992)
———, *Mother Night* [1961] (London: Random House, 2000)
———, *Slaughterhouse 5* [1969] (London: Vintage, 2000)
———, *The Sirens of Titan* [1957] (London: Gollancz, 2003)
Webb, Charles, *The Graduate* [1963] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971)
West, Nathanael, *A Cool Million* [1934] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000)
———, *The Day of the Locust* [1939] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991)
———, *The Dream Life of Balso Snell* [1931] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991)
———, *Miss Lonelyhearts* [1933] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000)
Wister, Owen, *The Virginian* [1902] (New York: Harper & Row, 1965)
Wolfe, Tom, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* [1968] (London: Black Swan, 1989)

Secondary Material

Abromeit, John, and W. Mark Cobb, *Herbert Marcuse: A Critical Reader* (London: Routledge, 2004)

Alexander, Marguerite, *Flights from Realism Themes and Strategies in Postmodernist British and American Fiction* (London: Arnold, 1990)

Anderson, Terry H., *The Movement and the Sixties* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Anon., BBC News, *What Is Catch 22? And Why Does the Book Matter?* (2002) [online]. Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1868619.stm [2004, October 12]

———, The Claremont Institute, *In Defence of Cowboy Culture* (2003) [online]. Available: http://www.claremont.org/writings/crb/summer2003/engeman.html [2003, November 25]

———, *The Declaration of Independence of the Thirteen Colonies* (2002) [online]. Available :http://www.law.indiana.edu/uslawdocs/declaration.html [2004, September 18]

———, From the S.S. Vallejo, *The Houseboat Summit* (2002) [online]. Available: http://www.vallejo.to/articles/summit_pt1.htm [2005, May 26]

——— HNN Staff, *TR: Man for All Seasons* (2002) [online]. Available: http://hnn.us/articles/850.html [2004, August 7]

———, The Indiana University School of Honors—Bloomington, *Honors | American Century Lives H204 | 0012 | N. Cullather* (2002) [online]. Available: http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/blfal02/hon/hon_h204_0012.html [2005, February 18]

———, Kennedy Assassination Chronicles, *The Last Side of Camelot Theodore H. White Interview with Jackie Kennedy* (2003) [online]. Available http://www.jfklancer.com/pdf/ [2005, March 19]

———, North American Fiction and Film, *Chapter 6: Ken Kesey's One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (revised) (1996) [online]. Available: http://www.cqu.edu.au/arts/humanities/litstud/naff/naffch6kesey.html [2003, March 31]

———, *The Psychology of Atheism* (original) (2002) [online]. Available: http://www.leaderu.com/truth/1truth12.html [2003, April 1]

———, The University of California Press, *Theodore Roszak: The Making of a Counterculture* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.ucpress.edu/books/pages/6642.html [2005, May 15]

———, The Writers of the Purple Sage, *John Wayne, The Movies and the Old West: The Western Hero in the Dime Novel* (2003) [online]. Available: http://www.jcs-group.com/oldwest/writers/hero.html [2004, May 28]

Bakhtin, Mikhail M., *Rabelais and His World* [1965], trans. Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984)

Barksdale, Richard K., "Alienation and the Anti-Hero in Recent American Fiction," *The College Language Association Journal*, 10 (September 1966): 1–10

Barth, John, *The Friday Book: Essays and Other Nonfiction* [1984] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997)

Bataille, Georges, *The Unfinished System of Nonknowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001)

Baudrillard, Jean, *America* [1986], trans. Chris Turner (London: Verso, 1988)

———, *Simulacra and Simulation* [1981], trans. Sheila Faria Glaser (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996)

Bjornson, Richard, *The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977)

Bloom, Alexander, ed., *Long Time Gone: Sixties America Then and Now* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Bloom, Harold, ed., *Catch-22 Modern Critical Interpretations* (Broomhall: Chelsea House, 2001)

Bokina, John, and Timothy J. Lukes, eds., *Marcuse* (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1994)

Bonhöffer, Dietrich, *Letters and Papers from Prison* (London: SCM Press, 1953)

Boorstin, Daniel, *The Image or What Happened to the American Dream* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961)

Bradbury, Malcolm, *The Modern American Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984)

Bradbury, Malcolm, and Howard Temperley, eds., *Introduction to American Studies*, 3rd Edition (London: Longman, 1998)

Braunstein, Peter, and Michael William Doyle, eds., *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s & '70s* (London: Routledge, 2002)

Brée, Germaine, ed., *Camus: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965)

Brewer, Joseph E., "The Anti-Hero in Contemporary Literature," *Iowa English Yearbook*, 12 (1967): 55–60

Brock, Ted, and Winnie Brock, *Hans W. Frei's. "The Identity of Jesus Christ"* (revised) (2001) [online]. Available: http://www.religion-online.org/cgi-bin/relsearchd.dll/showchapter?chapter_id=2098 [2003, April 4]

Broer, Lawrence R., *Sanity Plea: Schizophrenia in the Novels of Kurt Vonnegut* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989)

Burner, David, *Making Peace with the 60s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996)

Campbell, Joseph, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* [1948] (London: Harper Collins, 1993)

Carroll, Robert, and Stephen Prickett, eds., *The Bible: Authorized King James Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Cassirer, Ernst, *Language and Myth* [1947] (New York: Dover Publications, 1953)

———, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms, Volume 2: Mythical Thought* [1923–1929], trans. Ralph Manheim (Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1965)

Churchill, Winston, *C.N.N Interactive Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech* (1999) [online]. Available: http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/02/documents/churchill/ [2005, February 18]

Cioffi, Frank L., *Ihab Hassan. From an Interview with Ihab Hassan "Postmodernism, Etc.:"* (1999) [online]. Available: http://www.ihabhassan.com/ [2004, September 26]

Clark, John R., *The Modern Satiric Grotesque and Its Traditions* (Lexington: Kentucky University Press, 1991)

Cousins, Norman, *Dr. Schweitzer of Lamberéné* (New York: Harper, 1960)

Cox, Harvey, *The Secular City* (New York: Macmillan, 1965)

Cunliffe, Marcus, *The Literature of the United States* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978)

Currie, Mark, ed., *Metafiction* (New York: Longman, 1995)

Debord, Guy, *The Society of the Spectacle* [1967], trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (London: MIT Press, 1994)

Degler, Carl N., *Out of Our Past* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1970)

Dick, Kay, ed., *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972)

Downing, David, and Gary Herman, *Clint Eastwood: All-American Anti-Hero* (London: Omnibus Press, 1977)

Durczak, Jerzy, *Ihab Hassan in Focus: an Interview with Ihab Hassan* (2000) [online]. Available: http://www.ihabhassan.com/durczak_interview_ihab_hassan.htm [2004, October 13]

Edelman, Marian Wright, *The Measure of Our Success: A Letter to My Children and Yours* (Boston: Beacon, 1992)

Eiermann, Katharena. *The Realm of Existentialism: Albert Camus* (2003) [online]. Available: http://members.aol.com/KatharenaE/private/Philo/Camus/camus.html [2004, January 22]

Ellwood, Robert S., *The 60s Spiritual Awakening* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University press, 1994)

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Volume I: Nature, Addresses, and Lectures*, ed. E. Robert Spiller and R. Alfred Ferguson (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1971)

Everman, Welch D., *Jerzy Kosinski: The Literature of Violation* (San Bernardino: Borgo, 1991)

Evers, Chia, *John Lennon Proclaims Beatles "More Popular than Jesus" (March 4, 1966)* (2003) [online]. Available: http://www.newsoftheodd.com/article1012.html [2006, March 26]

Fairchild, B.H. "'Plastics': The Graduate as Film and Novel," *Studies in American Humor*, 4.3 (1985): 133–141

Fallaci, Oriana, "Kissinger: An Interview with Oriana Fallaci," *New Republic*, 167.23 (1972): 17–22

Farber, David, *The Sixties: From Memory to History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994)

Farrell, James J., *The Spirit of the Sixties* (London: Routledge, 1997)

Federman, Raymond, *Critifiction: Postmodern Essays* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993)

———, ed., *Surfiction* (Athens: Swallow Press, 1981)

Ferlinghetti, Lawrence, *A Coney Island of the Mind, Poems by Lawrence Ferlinghetti, A New Directions Book* (New York: New Directions, 1958)
Fiedler, Leslie, *Love and Death in the American Novel* [1960] (London: Granada, 1970)
———, *A New Fiedler Reader* (New York: Prometheus, 1999)
———, *The Return of the Vanishing American* [1968] (London: Paladin, 1972)
———, *Waiting for the End: The American Literary Scene from Hemingway to Baldwin* [1964] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967)
Fielding, Henry, *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling* [1749], ed. Tom Keymer and Alice Wakely (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005)
French, Warren, *Jack Kerouac* (Boston: Twayne, 1986)
Friedman, Bruce Jay, *Black Humour* (London: Corgi, 1965)
Fry, Carrol L., and Jared Stein, "Isolation Imagery in *The Graduate*: A Contrast in Media," *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 19 (1978): 203–214
Fry, John, *Marcuse—Dilemma and Liberation* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1974)
Frye, Northrop, *An Anatomy of Criticism* [1957] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990)
Fuchs, Christian, *On the Topicality of Selected Aspects of Herbert Marcuse's Works* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://cartoon.iguw.tuwien.ac.at/christian/marcuse/marcuseENG.html [2005, May 18]
Furst, Lilian R., and D. James Wilson, eds., *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (Special Journal Issue), 9 (Spring 1976): i–168.
Fussell, Edwin, *Frontier: American Literature and the American West* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970)
Gair, Christopher, *The American Counterculture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007)
Galbraith, J.K., *The Affluent Society* [1958] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963)
Galloway, David, *The Absurd Hero in American Fiction* (Austin: University of Texas, 1970)
Garelick, John, *Themes and Variations David Markson Writes on* (2004) [online]. Available:http://www.portlandphoenix.com/books/other_stories/documents/04035282.asp [2005, March 1]
Gedö, András, *Why Marx or Nietzsche?* [online]. Available: http://webusers.physics.umn.edu/~marquit/gedo113.htm [2005, June 30]
Gelernter, David, *Americanism—and Its Enemies* (2005) [online]. Available: http://www.mdtaxes.org/NEWS-STORIES
Gennep, Arnold Van, *Rites of Passage*, trans. B. Monika Vizedom and L. Gabrielle Caffee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960)
Glicksberg, Charles I., *The Tragic Vision in Twentieth Century Literature* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963)
Goffman, Ken, and Dan Joy, *Counterculture Through the Ages: From Abraham to Acid House* (Westminster: Villard books, 2004)

Goodman, Paul, *Empire City: A New Novel* [1959] (New York: Random House, 1977)
———, *Growing Up Absurd* [1960] (London: Gollancz, 1961)
———, *People or Personnel* and *Like a Conquered Province* (New York: Random House, 1968).
———, *The Society I Live in Is Mine* (New York: Horizon Press, 1962)
Goodman, Paul, and Percival Goodman, *Communitas: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life* [1947] (New York: Random House, 1960)
Graham, Don, *Western Movies Since 1960* (1998) [online]. Available: http://www2.tcu.edu/depts/prs/amwest/html/wl1256.html [2003, October 17]
Gunn, Giles, *The Interpretation of Otherness Literature, Religion, and the American Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
Harrison, Jane, *Themis* (London: Merlin Press, 1989)
Hartmann, Nicolai, *New Ways of Ontology* [1949], trans. C. Reinhard Kuhn (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953)
Hassan, Ihab, *Contemporary American Literature 1942–1972* (New York: Ungar Publishing Company, 1973)
———, *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971)
———, *Out of Egypt: Scenes and Arguments of an Autobiography* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986)
———, *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987)
———, *Radical Innocence: The Contemporary American Novel* [1961] (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973)
———, *Rumors of Change* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995)
Hill, Lee, *A Grand Guy: The Art and Life of Terry Southern* (New York: Harper Collins, 2001)
Holstad, Scott C., "The Dialectics of Getting There: Kosinski's *Being There* and the Existential Anti-Hero," *The Arkansas Review: A Journal of Criticism*, 4 (1995): 220–228
Hoover, Herbert, *Herbert Hoover "Rugged Individualism Speech"* (1999) [online]. Available: http://www.pinzler.com/ushistory/ruggedsupp.html [2004, September 10]
Jagger, Mick, and Keith Richards, "*Sympathy for the Devil,*" Rolling Stones, BEGGARS BANQUET (ABKCO Records 1986)
Jameson, Frederic, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981)
Johnson, Lyndon, *Lyndon Baines Johnson Inaugural Address Wednesday, January 20, 1965* (1995) [online]. Available: http://www.ku.edu/carrie/docs/texts/45john1.htm [2005, February 18]
Jung, Carl Gustav, *The Collected Works: Volume Nine, Part One: The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, ed. Sir Herbert Read, Micheal Fordham, and Gerhard Adler, trans. R.F.C. Hull (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971)

———, *Four Archetypes* [1970], trans. R.F.C. Hull (London: Routledge, 2001)
———, *Man and His Symbols* [1964] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990)
Kaufman, Walter, ed., *Existentialism from Dostoyevsky to Sartre* (New York: Meridan, 1957)
Kellner, Douglas, *Herbert Marcuse* (original) (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/Illumina%20Folder/kell12.htm [2004, August 7]
Kidd, Alex, *Are You Really an American?: A New Yorker Living in Canada* (2002) [online]. Available: http://www.acidlogic.com/anti_americanism.htm [2004, January 27]
Kierkegaard, Søren, *Practice in Christianity*, trans. V. Howard Hong and H. Edna Hong (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991)
Klein, Marcus, *After Alienation: American Novels in Mid-Century* (New York: World Publishing Company, 1970)
Klinkowitz, Jerome, *Kurt Vonnegut* (London: Methuen, 1982)
———, *Literary Subversions: New American Fiction and the Practice of Criticism* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985)
Klinkowitz, Jerome, and L. Donald Lawler, eds., *Vonnegut in America* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1977)
Kors, Alan Charles, and A. Harvey Silvergate, *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses* (New York: Free Press, 1998)
Laing, R.D., *The Divided Self* [1960] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
———, *The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise* [1967] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970)
———, *Self and Others* [1961] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971)
Lehan, Richard, "The American Novel: A Survey of 1966," *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*, 8 (1967): 437–449
———, "Existentialism in Recent American Fiction: The Demonic Quest," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 1 (1959): 181–202
Lenburg, Jeff, *Dustin Hoffman: Hollywood's Anti-Hero* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1983)
Lewis, R.W.B., *The Picaresque Saint* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1959)
Lilly, Paul R. Jr., "Vision and Violence in the Fiction of Jerzy Kosinski," *The Literary Review*, 25.3 (1982): 389–400
Lora, Ronald, ed., *America in the 60's* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974)
Lubin, Harold, ed., *Heroes and Anti-Heroes* (San Francisco: Chandler, 1968)
Lupack, Barbara Tepa, *Insanity as Redemption in Contemporary American Fiction* (Gainsville: University Press of Florida, 1995)
Lyotard, Jean-Francois, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* [1985], trans. Geoff Benington and Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992)

Mailer, Norman, *Conversations with Norman Mailer*, ed. J. Michael Lennon (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1988)
———, *The Presidential Papers* [1963] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
———, *The White Negro* [1957] (San Francisco: City Lights, 1970)
Mairowitz, David Zane, and Alain Korkos; *Introducing Camus* (New York: Totem, 1998)
Marcuse, Herbert, *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics* (Boston: Beacon, 1978)
———, *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (London: Penguin, 1972)
———, *Eros and Civilisation: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* [1955] (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987)
———, *An Essay on Liberation* [1969] (Boston: Beacon, 1971)
——— *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964)
———, *Reason and Revolution* [1941] (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968)
———, *Studies in Critical Philosophy*, trans. Joris De Bres (London: New Left Books, 1972)
Marshall, Daniel, *The Cinema Anti-Hero* (London: Athena, 2003)
Marwick, Arthur, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c. 1958–c. 1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
Masters, Brian, *The Swinging Sixties* (London: Constable, 1985)
Mattick, Paul, *Critique of Marcuse: One Dimensional Man in Class Society* (London: Merlin, 1972)
May, Larry, *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988)
McCaffrey, Larry, *Metafictional Muse: The Works of Robert Coover, Donald Barthelеme and William H. Gass* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982)
McCarron, Bill, "Catch-22, Gravity's Rainbow, and Lawlessness," *Oklahoma City University Law Review*, 24 (1999): 665–680
McElderry Jr., Bruce R., ed., *Contributions to "The Galaxy" 1868–1871, by Mark Twain* (Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1961)
McEver, Matthew, *The Messianic Figure in Film: Christology beyond the Biblical Epic* (1998) [online]. Available: http://www.unomaha.edu/jrf/McEverMessiah.htm [2005, July, 18]
Mellard, James M., *The Exploded Form: The Modernist Novel in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980)
Melville, Keith, *Communes in the Counterculture: Origins, Theories, Styles of Life* (New York: Morrow, 1972)
Menashe, Louis, and Ronald Radosh, ed., *Teach-Ins: USA: Reports, Opinions, Documents* (New York: Praeger, 1967)
Miles, Barry, *Hippie* (London: Octopus, 2004)
Miller, James, *Democracy Is in the Streets*: *From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987)
Miller, Karl Hagstrom, *That's Right, You're Not from Texas: Exploring Some Outside Influences on Texas Music* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.txstate.edu/ctmh/JTMH_2_Pdfs/ThatsRight.pdf [2004, August 8]

Mills, Wright C., *The New Men of Power: America's Labor Leaders* (New York: Kelley, 1971)
———, *The Power Elite* [1956] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
Mumford, Lewis, *The Myth of the Machine* (New York: Brace & World, 1967)
———, Murali, Ram, "The Making of an Anti-Hero: An Interview with Bret Easton Ellis," *Dartmouth Review* (April 21, 1999) [online]. Available http://dartreview.com/issues/4.21.99/bee.html [2007, December 27]
Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Beyond Good and Evil* [1886], trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979)
———, *Birth of Tragedy: Out of the Spirit of Music* [1872], trans. Shaun White (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003)
———, *Human, All Too Human* [1878], trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
———, *Thus Spake Zarathustra* [1883–1885], ed. Nicholas Davey, trans. Thomas Common (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1997)
———, *Twilight of the Idols, the Anti-Christ* [1888], trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Buckinghamshire: Hazell Watson & Viney, 1975)
Noll, Mark A., *A History of Christianity in America and Canada* (London: Eerdmans, 1992)
Oglesby, Carl, "Rescuing Jesus from the Cross," *CoEvolution Quarterly*, 39 (Fall, 1983): 30–38
Olderman, Raymond M., *Beyond the Waste Land: The American Novel in the Nineteen-Sixties* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972)
Osborne, Thomas J., and R. Fred Mabbutt, *Paths to the Present: Thoughts on the Contemporary Relevance of America's Past* (New York: Wiley, 1974)
Packard, Vance, *The Status Seekers* [1959] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961)
Pinsker, Sanford, *The Schlemiel as Metaphor: Studies in the Yiddish and American Jewish Novel* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971)
Pippin, Robert, Andrew Feenberg, and P. Charles Webel, eds., *Marcuse: Critical Theory and the Promise of Utopia* (London: Macmillan Education, 1988)
Plato, *The Republic* [390 B.C.] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
Posnock, Ross, *Innocents at Home: Ross Posnock on the Legacy of Leslie Fiedler* (2003) [online]. Available:http://www.bookforum.com/archive/sum_03/posnock.html [2004, October 27]
Raglan, Lord, *The Hero: A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama* [1936] (New York: Vintage Books, 1956)
Reed, Walter L., *Meditations on the Hero: A Study of the Romantic Hero in Nineteenth Century Fiction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974)
Reitz, Charles, *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000)
Reynolds, David S., *Faith in Fiction the Emergence of Religious Literature in America* (Cumberland: Harvard University Press, 1981)
Rielly, Edward J., *The 1960s* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003)

Rice, Phillip, and Patricia Waugh, eds. *Modern Literary Theory* [1989] (London: Arnold, 2001)

Robinson, John A.T., *Honest to God* (London: SCM Press, 1963)

Rollin, Roger B., ed., *Hero/Anti-Hero* (New York: McGraw–Hill, 1973)

Roosevelt, Theodore, Chapultepec, *Citizenship in a Republic "The Man in the Arena" Speech at the Sorbonne Paris, France April 23, 1910* (2000) [online]. Available: http://www.theodore-roosevelt.com/trsorbonnespeech.html [2004, August 27]

Roston, Murray, *The Search for Selfhood in Modern Literature* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001)

Roszak, Theodore, *The Making of a Counter Culture* [1968] (London: Faber, 1969)

Rubin, Jerry, *Do It!: Scenarios of the Revolution* (New York: Touchstone, 1970)

Ruland, Richard, and Malcolm Bradbury, *From Puritanism to Postmodernism: A History of American Literature* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992)

Russell, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy* [1945] (London: Routledge, 1991)

Sardar, Ziauddin, and Merryl Wyn Davies, *Why Do People Hate America?* (Cambridge: Icon Books, 2002)

Savage Jr. William W., *The Cowboy Hero: His Image in American History and Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986)

Schatt, Stanley, *Kurt Vonnegut, Jr.* (Farmington Hills: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1976)

———, "The Whale and the Cross: Vonnegut's Jonah and Christ Figures," *Southwest Quarterly*, 56 (Winter 1971): 29–42

Schaub, Thomas Hill, *American Fiction in the Cold War* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991)

Schlesinger Jr., Arthur M., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965)

Scholes, Robert, *Fabulation and Metafiction* (London: University of Illinois Press, 1979)

Scholl, Peter A., "Vonnegut's Attack upon Christendom," *Newsletter of the Conference on Christianity and Literature*, 22 (Fall 1972): 5–11

Schulz, Max F., *Black Humor Fiction of the Sixties: A Pluralistic Definition of Man and His World* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1973)

——— *Radical Sophistication: Studies in Contemporary Jewish-American Novelists* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1969)

Scott Jr. Nathan A., "The Broken Center: A Definition of the Crisis of Values in Modern Literature," *Chicago Review*, 13 (Summer, 1959): 183–201

Searles, George J., ed., *A Casebook on Ken Kesey's* One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992)

Sharma, R.K., *Contemporary Black Humour American Novels from Nathanael West to Thomas Berger* (Delhi: Ajanta, 1988)

Siegel, Mark, *Contemporary Trends in Western American Fiction* (1998) [online]. Available: http://www2.tcu.edu/depts/prs/amwest/html/wl1182.html [2004, May 27]

Slotkin, Richard, *Gunfighter Nation. The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Atheneum, 1992)
Smith, Stan, *A Sadly Contracted Hero—The Comic Self in Post-War American Fiction* (London: British Association for American Studies, 1981)
Stout Jr., Joseph A., and Odie B. Faulk, *A Short History of the American West* (London: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974)
Summers, Della, ed., *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* (Essex: Longman, 1992)
Suprayitno, Stefanus, *The Quest for the Self in Saul Bellow's Henderson the Rain King* [online]. Available: http://www.petra.ac.id/english/science/literature/critic1.htm [2004, August 15]
Tanner, Tony, *City of Words* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1971)
Thomas, Evan, *Robert Kennedy: His Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002)
Thoreau, Henry David, *Civil Disobedience and Other Essays* [1948] (New York: Dover Publications, 1993)
Tompkins, Jane, *West of Everything: The Inner Life of Westerns* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
Torres, Richard, *Slaughterhouse Christ* (2000) [online]. Available: http://www.bsu.edu/web/00wwnewbold/portfolio/rich/paper4port/christ.html [2003, April 12].
Tunnell, James, "Kesey and Vonnegut: Preachers of Redemption," *Christian Century*, 89 (November 22, 1972): 1180–1183
Turner, Frederick Jackson, *The Frontier in American History* [1920] (New York: Dover Publications, 1996)
Tyler May, Elaine, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1990)
Vermes, Geza, *The Changing Faces of Jesus* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000)
Waldmeir, Joseph J., *Critical Essays on John Barth* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980)
Walker, Nancy, ed., *What's So Funny? Humor in American Culture* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1998)
Warhol, Andy, and Pat Hackett, *POPism: The Warhol Sixties* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980)
Watkins, Jason, *You're Too Hip Baby* (n.d.) [online]. Available: http://www.bloomsburymagazine.com/ezine/articles/articles.asp?ezine%5Farticle%5Fid=616 [2004, October 13]
Weinberg, Helen, *The New Novel in America: The Kafka Mode in Contemporary Fiction* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970)
Weisenburger, Steven, *Fables of Subversion: Satire and the American Novel, 1930–1980* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995)
Weiss, Richard, *The American Myth of Success* (New York: Basic Books, 1969)
Wilson, Colin, *Beyond the Outsider* [1965] (London: Pan, 1965)
———, *Religion and the Rebel* [1957] (London: Gollancz, 1957)
———, *The Outsider* [1956] (London: Phoenix, 2001)

Wisse, Ruth, *The Schlemiel as Modern Hero* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971)
Wright, Will, *The Wild West: The Mythical Cowboy and Social Theory* (London: Sage, 2001)
Yinger, Milton J., "Contraculture and Subculture," *American Sociological Review*, 25 (October 1960): 625–635
Ziff, Larzer, ed., *Selected Essays: Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982)

Films and Television Programs

Anon., "Cheyenne." ABC September 1955–December 1962
Anon., "The Lone Ranger." ABC September 1949–June 1957
Brooks, Mel, Dir., *Blazing Saddles*. Warner Bros. 1974
Costner, Kevin, Dir., *Open Range*. Touchstone Pictures. 2003
Ford, John, Dir., *Fort Apache*. Argosy Pictures. 1948
———, *The Searchers*. Warner Bros. 1956
———, *Stagecoach*. Walter Wanger Productions. 1939
Forman, Milos, Dir., *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Warner Bro. 1975
Haas, Charles F., Dir., *The Beat Generation*. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. 1959
Hawks, Howard, Dir., *Red River*. Charles K. Feldman Group. 1948
———, *Rio Bravo*. Armada. 1959
Hill, George Roy, Dir., *Butch Cassidy and The Sundance Kid*. 20th Century Fox. 1969
Howard, Ron, Dir., *The Missing*. Revolution Studios. 2003
Kennedy, Burt, Dir., *Dirty Dingus Magee*. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayor. 1970
Leone, Sergio, Dir., *A Fistful of Dynamite*. M.G.M. 1971
Nichols, Mike, Dir., *The Graduate*. Embassy Pictures Corporation. 1967
Penn, Arthur, Dir., *Little Big Man*. Cinema Center 100 Productions. 1970
Rosenberg, Stuart, Dir., *Cool Hand Luke*. Warner Bros. 1967
Schlesinger, John, Dir., *Midnight Cowboy*. Warner Bros. 1969
Stevens, George, Dir., *Shane*. Paramount Pictures. 1953
Wachowski, Andy, and Larry Wachowski, Dirs., *The Matrix*. Warner Bros. 1999
———, *The Matrix Reloaded*. Warner Bros. 2003
———, *The Matrix Revolutions*. Warner Bros. 2003
Zinnemann, Fred, Dir., *High Noon*. Stanley Kramer Productions. 1952

Index