

**Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume 3:**  
**The New Left and the 1960s**  
**Edited by Douglas Kellner**

Introduction by Douglas Kellner

Preface by Angela Davis

- I. Interventions: "The Inner Logic of American Policy in Vietnam," 1967; "Reflections on the French Revolution," 1968; "Student Protest is Nonviolent Next to the Society Itself"; "Charles Reich as Revolutionary Ostrich," 1970; "Dear Angela," 1971; "Reflections on Calley," 1971; and "Marcuse: Israel strong enough to concede," 1971
  - II. "The Problem of Violence and the Radical Opposition"
  - III. "Liberation from the Affluent Society"
  - IV. "Democracy Has/Hasn't a Future...A present"
  - V. "Marcuse Defines His New Left Line"
  - VI. Testimonies: Herbert Marcuse on Czechoslovakia and Vietnam; the University of California at San Diego Department of Philosophy on Herbert Marcuse; T.W. Adorno on Herbert Marcuse.
  - VII. "On the New Left"
  - VIII. "Mr. Harold Keen: Interview with Dr. Herbert Marcuse"
  - IX. "USA: Questions of Organization and Revolutionary Subject: A Conversation with Hans-Magnus Enzensberger"
  - X. "The Movement in an Era of Repression"
  - XI. "A Conversation with Herbert Marcuse: Bill Moyers"
  - XII. "Marxism and Feminism"
  - XIII. 1970s Interventions: "Ecology and Revolution"; "Murder is Not a Political Weapon"; "Thoughts on Judaism, Israel, etc..."
  - XIV. "Failure of the New Left?"
- Afterword by George Katsiaficas, "Marcuse as an Activist: Reminiscences of his Theory and Practice"

## **Radical Politics, Marcuse, and the New Left**

Douglas Kellner

In the 1960s Herbert Marcuse was promoted to the unlikely role of Guru of the New Left. A philosopher by training, affiliated with the German exiles later known as “the Frankfurt School,” Marcuse had produced perhaps the best book on Hegel and Marx in his 1941 Reason and Revolution and an excellent philosophical interpretation of Freud in his 1955 Eros and Civilization.<sup>1</sup> Reason and Revolution introduced English-speaking readers to the critical social theory and dialectical methods of Hegel and Marx, providing for later generations of critical social theorists and New Left activists the tools of dialectical thought and theory-informed practice (or praxis, in a terminology that would become popular in the 1960s). Eros and Civilization in turn provided a splendid access to Freud’s thought and the ways that psychoanalytic ideas could be merged with critical social theory and emancipatory culture and practice. In any uncanny way, the text, with its emphasis on polymorphic sexual liberation, play, cultivation of an aesthetic ethos, and burning desire for another world and way of life, anticipated the counterculture of the 1960s which lived out many of the key ideas in Marcuse’s visionary text.

In 1964, Marcuse published a major study of advanced industrial society, One-Dimensional Man, which emerged as an important influence on the young radicals who formed the New Left. While the Old Left embraced the Soviet version Marxism and tended to give uncritical support to the Soviet Union, the New Left combined forms of critical Marxism with radical democracy and openness to a broad array of ideas and political alliances, and felt the Soviet Union to be largely irrelevant to its concerns. Whereas the Old Left was doctrinaire and puritanical, the New Left was pluralistic and engaged emergent cultural forms and social movements. While the Old Left, with some exceptions, tended to impose doctrinal conformity and cut itself off from “liberal” groups, the New Left embraced a wide range of social movements around the issues of class, gender, race, sexuality, the environment, peace, and other issues.

For Marcuse, the New Left at its best united spontaneity with organization, combining strong anti-authoritarian and liberatory tendencies with the development of new forms of political struggle and organization. The New Left sought to join change of consciousness with the change of society, the personal with socio-political liberation. The New Left, in Marcuse’s view, provided important emphases on the subjective conditions of radical social change and sought new and more humane values, institutions, and ways of life. It embodied the best features of previous socialist and anarchist traditions that it concretized in social struggles such as the antiwar, feminist, ecological communal, and countercultural movements. For Marcuse, it was the demand for total change that distinguished the New Left and its championing of freedom, social justice, and democracy in every sphere of life.

Marcuse embodied many of these defining political impulses of the New Left in his own thought and politics. Hence, a younger generation of political

activists looked up to a white-haired German refugee in his mid-60s for theoretical and political guidance. Disgusted by the excessive affluence of the advanced industrial societies and the violence of neo-imperialist interventions against developing societies in what was then called “the Third World,” the generation that would produce a New Left found theoretical and political inspiration and support in Marcuse’s writings. Marcuse in turn tirelessly criticized “advanced industrial society,” U.S. imperialism, racism, sexism, environmental destruction, and the forms of oppression and domination that he perceived as growing in intensity and scope.

Energized by the enthusiastic response of young radicals and large numbers of his academic colleagues and sympathizers on the Left, Herbert Marcuse embarked on a remarkable trajectory, becoming a major figure in the growing antiwar movement, a hero to the counterculture, and a forceful defender of the New Left. Marcuse also engaged the emerging feminist, environmental, gay and lesbian, and other oppositional social movements of the era, and his writings, lectures, and political interventions became part of the history of the times.

Fredric Jameson wrote in his 1998 book on Adorno that while Marcuse and Sartre were the key thinkers of the 1960s, Adorno was the most relevant for the 1990s,<sup>2</sup> in that the collapse of the Soviet Union and its empire marked the ascendency of global capitalism into a system of domination whereby growing prosperity in the overdeveloped countries absorbed individuals into conforming to the system, while the global economy as such produced tremendous inequalities and much suffering. In this conjuncture, Jameson argued that Adorno’s critique of a totalizing system of domination and stance of critique and negation, without positing alternatives, may have been appropriate and justified. Yet I would argue that in the present conjuncture of global economic crisis, terrorism and a resurgence of U.S. militarism, and growing global movements against corporate capitalism and war, Marcuse’s political and activist version of critical theory is highly relevant to the challenges of the contemporary moment. Marcuse is especially useful for developing global perspectives on domination and resistance, radically criticizing the existing system of domination, valorizing movements of resistance, and projecting radical alternatives to the current organization of society and mode of life.

In particular, Marcuse’s identification with the New Left and attempt to sharpen his critique of the current society and to project radical alternatives could be taken up again in the contemporary era. As a new millennium unfolds, accompanied by the dual forces of terrorism and militarism that are confronted by a growing global antiwar and social justice movement, we find ourselves in a highly turbulent and conflicted era, similar to the 1960s and 1970s. A younger generation may well find theoretical and political guidance and insight in the life and work of Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse attempted to articulate the theory and practice of a New Left during an era of widespread social protest. Hence, a new generation involved in an emergent anti-corporate globalization and a worldwide peace and social justice movement in the making may find theoretical and political guidance in the Marcusean texts collected in this volume.

It is now possible to gain the historical distance and understanding to grasp and appraise the interconnection of Marcuse's philosophy with the struggles of the day. A wealth of fresh material from the Herbert Marcuse and other archives contains documents, collected in this and accompanying volumes, helps provide a richer and deeper grasp of the era and the role of Marcuse in the theoretical and political dramas of the day than was originally possible. I will accordingly in this introduction situate the largely unpublished or little known texts collected in this volume within the context of Marcuse's major works of the era and the historical period to which they respond. Let us, then, return to the 1960s and examine the remarkable theoretical and political odyssey of Herbert Marcuse and the New Left.<sup>3</sup>

### **One-Dimensional Man, The Great Refusal, and the Rise of the New Left**

While *Eros and Civilization* provides the most detailed depiction of his vision of liberation, *One-Dimensional Man* provides Marcuse's most systematic analysis of the forces of domination.<sup>4</sup> *ODM* explored the development of new forms of social control that were producing a "one-dimensional man" and "society without opposition." Citing trends toward conformity, Marcuse described the forms of culture and society which created consumer needs that integrated individuals into the existing system of production and consumption via mass media, advertising, industrial management, and uncritical modes of thought. To "one-dimensional society," Marcuse counterpoised critical and dialectical thinking that perceived a freer and happier form of culture and society, and advocated a "great refusal" of all modes of repression and domination.

*One-Dimensional Man* theorized the decline of revolutionary potential within the industrial working class in capitalist societies and the development of new forms of social control. Marcuse claimed that "advanced industrial society" created consumer and conformist needs that integrated individuals into the existing system of production and consumption. Domination in institutions of labor, schooling, the family, the state, social relations, culture, and contemporary modes of thought all reproduced the existing system and tended to eliminate negativity, critique, and opposition. The result was a "one-dimensional" universe of thought and behavior in which the very aptitude and ability for critical thinking and oppositional behavior were withering away.

Not only had capitalism integrated the working class, the source of potential revolutionary opposition, but the current capitalist system had developed new techniques of stabilization through state and corporate policies and the development of new forms of social control. Thus Marcuse questioned two of the fundamental postulates of orthodox Marxism: the revolutionary proletariat and inevitability of capitalist crisis. In contrast with the working class focus of orthodox Marxism, Marcuse championed non-integrated forces of minorities, outsiders, and radical intelligentsia and attempted to nourish oppositional thought and behavior while promoting radical thinking and opposition.

For Marcuse, domination combined economics, politics, technology and social organization. For orthodox Marxists, domination is inscribed in capitalist relations of production and the logic of commodification, and for Heideggerians,

Weberians and others it is technology, technological rationality, and/or the coercive logic of political institutions that are the major force of societal domination. Marcuse, by contrast, had a multicausal analysis that ferreted out aspects of domination and resistance throughout the social order. Moreover, Marcuse insisted that contradictions of the system, theorized by classical Marxism as the antagonism of capital and labor, continued to exist, albeit in altered forms. He also constantly cited the unity of production and destruction, highlighting the ways that creation of wealth produced systematic poverty, war, and violence. Hence, for Marcuse there was an "objective ambiguity" to even the seeming achievements of advanced industrial society which had the wealth, science, technology, and industry to alleviate poverty and suffering, but used the instruments of production to enhance domination, violence, aggression, and injustice. Since this dialectic continues unabated into the 21st century, Marcuse's critique of the growing distance between the possibilities of justice, the alleviation of poverty and suffering, and a freer and happier life for all in contrast to growing inequality, intensified violence, and proliferating suffering is as relevant as ever.

In contrast to his Frankfurt School colleagues who were becoming increasingly depoliticized,<sup>5</sup> Marcuse constantly attempted to politicize critical theory and to detect forces of resistance and transformation to contrast forces of domination and repression. After a period of pessimism during the phase of One-Dimensional Man, Marcuse was encouraged by the global forces of revolt, centered around the student and anti-war movement, the counterculture, national liberation movements, and what became known as the new social movements. Marcuse sought in these forces the instruments of radical social change that classical Marxism found in the proletariat.

But just as oppositional working class movements were defeated in the course of the twentieth century and the working class, in Marcuse's view, was integrated into contemporary capitalism, so too, for the most part, were the radical movements of the 1960s defeated or integrated into the triumphant system of global capitalism by the late 1970s.<sup>6</sup> Up until his death in 1979, however, Marcuse continued to seek agents of social change in oppositional social movements and in the most critical and radical forms of art and philosophy.<sup>7</sup>

During the 1960s and 1970s, Marcuse's work generated fierce controversy and polemics, and most studies of his work are highly tendentious and frequently sectarian. One-Dimensional Man was severely criticized by orthodox Marxists and theorists of various political and theoretical commitments. Despite its negativity, it influenced many in the New Left as it articulated their growing dissatisfaction with both capitalist societies and Soviet socialist societies. Moreover, Marcuse himself continued to foster demands for revolutionary change and defended the emerging forces of radical opposition, thus winning him the hatred of establishment forces and the respect of the new radicals.

One-Dimensional Man came out as the civil rights movement intensified and an antiwar coalition was beginning to arise against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.<sup>8</sup> Marcuse's sharp critique of the totality of advanced capitalist and state socialist societies won him a large audience among the growing struggles against racism, imperialism, and other forms of oppression. During the 1960s when he

gained world renown as "guru of the New Left," Marcuse was probably the most controversial public intellectual of the day, as students painted "Marx, Mao, and Marcuse" on walls, the media debated his work, and intellectuals of every tendency criticized or defended his views. Simply reducing Marcuse to the politics of the 1960s, however, does him a disservice, as it covers over his important contributions to philosophy and social theory, by reducing his thought to his political positions of the day.<sup>9</sup>

Marcuse was not the first Marxist to formulate theories of the integration of the working class and capitalist stabilization, but few on the Left have presented such a theory so bluntly and at the same time vigorously sought alternative forces. Marcuse wanted at the same time to remain a Marxist, be loyal to the project of critical theory developed by the Institute for Social Research, be an independent thinker, and advance the struggles of the New Left. In view of his writings and activity both before and after the publication of ODM, it is clear that he fervently desired *total revolution*, described as a radical upheaval and overthrow of the previously existing order, bringing about wide-ranging changes that would eliminate capitalism and establish a new liberated society and way of life.<sup>10</sup>

Although the postwar conservative environment pre-1960s of the United States seemed to rule out the sort of radical social transformation affirmed by Marxism, Marcuse continued to affirm the relevance and importance of the Marxian critique of capitalism, and near the end of ODM confirmed his belief in the superior rationality of socialism:

the facts are all there which validate the critical theory of this society and of its fatal development: the increasing irrationality of the whole; waste and restriction of productivity; the need for aggressive expansion; the constant threat of war; intensified exploitation; dehumanization. And they all point to the historical alternative: the planned utilization of resources for the satisfaction of vital needs with a minimum of toil, the transformation of leisure into free time, the pacification of the struggle for existence. (ODM, pp. 252-3)

This affirmation of his continued commitment to socialism is followed by a poignant and revealing passage in which Marcuse articulates his anger and regret that there is not in fact a revolutionary situation, or class, to carry through the Marxian theory of revolution: 'the facts and the alternatives are there like fragments which do not connect, or like a world of mute objects without a subject, without the practice which would move these objects in the new direction. Dialectical theory is not refuted, but it cannot offer the remedy. It cannot be positive ... On theoretical as well as empirical grounds, the dialectical concept pronounces its own hopelessness.' (ODM, p. 253)

Whereas, previously, the critical theory of society could count on oppositional forces within the society, disintegrating tendencies that would activate these forces, and the 'liberation of *inherent* possibilities' (ODM, pp. 254ff), by the early 1960s Marcuse no longer saw in the early 1960s any possibility for revolutionary forces to explode the society from within, believing

that advanced capitalism is so totalitarian and pleasantly repressive that only absolute refusal can be sustained as a ‘truly revolutionary mode of opposition’ (*ODM*, pp. 255ff). Marcuse explicitly renounces here advocacy of any reformism, or piecemeal change, and claims that only non-integrated ‘outsiders’ can be a genuinely revolutionary force (*ODM*, pp. 256-7).

In 1964 Marcuse perceived only a slight chance that the most exploited and persecuted outsiders, in alliance with an enlightened intelligentsia, might mark ‘the beginning of the end’ and signify some hope for social change:

However, underneath the conservative popular base is the substratum of the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colours, the unemployed and the unemployable. They exist outside the democratic process; their life is the most immediate and the most real need for ending intolerable conditions and institutions. Thus their opposition is revolutionary even if their consciousness is not. Their opposition hits the system from without and is therefore not deflected by the system; it is an elementary force which violates the rules of the game and, in doing so, reveals it as a rigged game. When they get together and go out into the streets, without arms, without protection, in order to ask for the most primitive civil rights, they know that they face dogs, stones and bombs, jail, concentration camps, even death. Their force is behind every political demonstration for the victims of law and order. The fact that they start refusing to play the game may be the fact which marks the beginning of the end of a period. (*ODM*, pp. 256-7)

This passage bears witness to the hope that the civil rights struggle signaled the beginning of a period of radicalization and change of consciousness which would create new possibilities for qualitative social change. However, this was merely a hope, and Marcuse thought that there was just a ‘chance’ of a radical coalition forming: ‘The chance is that, in this period, the historical extremes may meet again: the most advanced consciousness of humanity and its most exploited force. It is nothing but a chance’ (*ODM*, p. 257). Hence Marcuse ended One-Dimensional Man on a note of pessimism, bordering on resignation and stoical opposition for the sake of loyalty to humanity’s highest hopes and reverence towards those who have died in the struggle for those hopes: ‘The critical theory of society possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and its future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative. Thus it wants to remain loyal to those who, without hope, have given and give their life to the Great Refusal. At the beginning of the fascist era, Walter Benjamin wrote: “It is only for the sake of those without hope that hope is given to us”’ (*ODM*, p. 257).<sup>11</sup>

Marcuse’s concept of the ‘Great Refusal’ and his advocacy of the revolutionary potential of those strata, groups and individuals not integrated in advanced industrial society provide the crux of his oppositional politics at the time. ‘The Great Refusal’ is a highly complex and multidimensional concept that signifies at once individual rebellion and opposition to the existing system of

domination and oppression; avant-garde artistic revolt that creates visions of another world, a better life and alternative cultural forms and style; and oppositional thought that rejects the dominant modes of thinking and behavior. The term the ‘Great Refusal’ was inspired by Andre Breton,<sup>12</sup> who defended the total refusal of the institutions, values and way of life in bourgeois society. Marcuse long admired bohemian and counterculture refusals to conform to existing bourgeois society and admired the modernist art that rejected its contemporary society and projected visions of a freer and happier mode of life.

Marcuse’s emphasis on individual revolt and refusal is indeed a deeply rooted aspect of his thought. In his early writings, he championed the ‘radical act’ against capitalist society,<sup>13</sup> and although he formulated the concept in Marxian terms, there were elements of Heideggerian individualism in his project which surfaced again in EC, *ODM* and other later writings. Some of Marcuse’s critics see concepts like the Great Refusal as ineradicable individualist and anarchist dimensions in his thought. Yet Marcuse’s emphasis on individual revolt and self-transformation arguably constitute a vital component of a radical politics which maintains that there can be no meaningful program of social change unless individuals themselves are liberated from capitalist needs and consciousness and acquire ‘radical needs’ for thoroughgoing social change. Instead of seeing Marcuse’s emphasis on the Great Refusal as a capitulation to ‘bourgeois individualism’ -- or ‘one-dimensional pessimism’ -- his use of the concept in *ODM* can be read as a revealing indication of the depth and parameters of the crisis of Marxism in an era when a revolutionary theorist could simply not point to any forces of revolution, or revolutionary class, in the advanced capitalist countries. Marcuse was thus honestly questioning the Marxian theory of revolution during an era in which proletarian revolt was for the most part absent and there were no spectacular revolutionary struggles or forces evident in the advanced capitalist countries during a period of almost unprecedented affluence and relative stabilization.

Almost on the eve of *ODM*’s publication, however, the civil rights struggles that Marcuse alluded to at the end of his book intensified, and the New Left and anti-war movement began to grow in response to the accelerating American military intervention in Vietnam. At this time, a generation of radicals turned to study Marcuse’s *ODM*, which seemed to have denied the possibility of fundamental political change. During the heroic period of the New Left in the 1960s, *ODM* helped to show a generation of political radicals what was wrong with the system they were struggling against, and thus played an important role in the student movement. Marcuse himself quickly rallied to the student activists’ cause and in 1965 began modifying some of his theses to take account of the surge of militancy that both surprised and exhilarated him. Yet although the Great Refusal was being acted out on a grand scale, Marcuse’s theory had failed to specify in any detail agents of social change or strategies for revolution. Consequently, Marcuse began a search for a radical politics that was to occupy him the rest of his life. This search led him to defend confrontation politics and, under specific conditions, revolutionary violence, and deeply alienated Marcuse from those who advocated more moderate models for social change.<sup>14</sup>

From the mid-1960s to the early 1970s Marcuse made a major effort to repoliticize theory and directed much of his work towards the concerns of the New Left. He traveled widely in Europe and America, speaking at conferences and to a wide variety of audiences, and published many books and articles on the topics of liberation and revolution that became the central focus of his work. In 1965, Marcuse moved from Brandeis University, where he had taught since 1954, and began teaching at the University of California at La Jolla.<sup>15</sup> In his post-1965 writings, Marcuse sought forces of revolution that would make such change possible, as well as a political strategy that they could follow. Since the industrial working class was, in his view, integrated into advanced capitalism, Marcuse sought new radical political agency, successively, in non-integrated outsiders and minorities, in students and intellectuals, in a ‘new sensibility’, and in ‘catalyst groups’ (see below). Marcuse supported strategies of militant confrontation politics from about 1965-70, then shifted to the advocacy of political education and the formation of small oppositional groups modelled on workers’ councils; during the 1970s he called for a ‘United Front’ politics and the long march through the institutions’. Throughout, Marcuse remained faithful to a Marxist tradition of revolutionary socialism represented by Marx, Luxemburg and Korsch, while he increasingly criticized orthodox Marxist-Leninist conceptions of revolution and socialism.

Marcuse was the only member of the original Frankfurt school who enthusiastically supported political activism in the 1960s, gearing his writing, teaching and political interventions towards New Left struggles. The result was a remarkable series of writings, from ‘Repressive Tolerance’ in 1965 up until his death in 1979 which attempted to articulate the theory and practice of the New Left while repoliticizing critical theory. Some key examples of texts that articulate the theory and politics of the New Left and that could inspire oppositional theory and politics for the contemporary era are collected in this volume.

Marcuse’s political involvement in New Left politics won him notoriety as a guru of the student movement, thereby creating a heated political-intellectual situation that made it extremely difficult to appraise his works dispassionately and to measure his larger contributions to critical theory. Caught up in the political debates of the day, Marcuse’s ideas were subject to both fierce polemics and fervent espousal. Moreover, he himself frequently revised his views, developing new revolutionary perspectives, while his critics were attacking his previous positions. Marcuse’s political writings thus theorized the vicissitudes of the New Left and both reflected and commented on its development. With the passage of time, it is now possible to gain the necessary distance and perspective to evaluate critically Marcuse’s writings from 1965-79 and to analyze his theoretical and political positions in relation to New Left and other political movements of the day.

### **Marcuse’s Advocacy of Confrontation Politics: ‘Repressive Tolerance’**

In 1965, Marcuse staunchly defended confrontation politics in his provocative essay, ‘Repressive Tolerance’, published in the book *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (hereafter CPT). Liberalism had historically advocated tolerance

and pluralism as dominant values and Marcuse and two friends, Barrington Moore and Robert Paul Wolff, undertook to write essays appraising the continued validity of the concept in the context of the then increasing violence in contemporary U.S. society, the repression and murder of blacks and progressive political leaders, the escalating of the Vietnam war and imperialist violence on a global scale, and the many regressive features apparent in supposed ‘advanced capitalist societies.’

Marcuse’s politically charged essay ‘Repressive Tolerance’ was criticized harshly for its obvious partisanship, violating the academic taboo of neutrality, as it called for ‘intolerance toward prevailing policies, attitudes, opinions, and the extension of tolerance to policies, attitudes, and opinions which are outlawed and suppressed’ (CPT, p. 81).<sup>16</sup> In effect, Marcuse proposed intolerance towards the established society and its racism, militarism and imperialism (the Vietnam war was beginning to be an explosive issue), as well as towards its waste and planned obsolescence, advertising, environmental destruction, pollution and the other ‘intolerable’ phenomena that Marcuse was criticizing. His stated goal was the elimination of violence and the reduction of repression, which he argued was prevented by ‘violence and suppression on a global scale’ (CPT, p. 82).

Marcuse criticized imperialist violence in Indo-China, Latin America, Africa and Asia, as well as the harsh repression of oppositional minorities in the centers of Western capitalism. These racist and imperialist policies ‘should not be tolerated because they are impeding, if not destroying, the chances of creating an existence without fear and misery’ (CPT, p. 83). Marcuse’s essay responds to the contemporary repression of blacks and civil rights workers in the south, the fear of nuclear annihilation in the Cuban missile crisis, escalation of the Vietnam war and U.S. support of military dictatorships and repressive regimes throughout the world, French atrocities in Algeria, and Goldwater’s presidential candidacy, which together stirred up atavistic sentiments on the right and increased repression and destructiveness throughout the capitalist world. Marcuse maintained that if the society is thoroughly irrational and destructive, then it must be militantly opposed and its excesses and negativities must no longer be tolerated.<sup>17</sup>

Basing his argument on Justice Holmes’s position that civil rights could be suspended if society faced a ‘clear and present danger,’ Marcuse claimed that militaristic and repressive policies do constitute a ‘clear and present danger.’ For Marcuse, advocacy of war and calls for the suppression of dissenting radicals constitute threats to civil liberties and even to human survival that could no longer be tolerated (CPT, pp. 109ff). Not only free speech and academic freedom *per se* are at stake in ‘Repressive Tolerance’, but also whether increasing racism, militarism and repression should be tolerated or actively opposed. Marcuse argued that ‘pure tolerance’ and neutrality only strengthen the system, and impede liberation and the reduction of violence. Since the mainstream media are controlled by conservative corporate forces, the people are indoctrinated in advance and are immunized against oppositional ideas (CPT, pp. 94ff).

Hence, the need for radical means to break through the distorted universe of thought and to bring the public to an awareness of the dangers of aggressive

and brutal policies, which were currently being tolerated. Such an activity of enlightenment aiming at radical change ‘could only be envisaged as a result of large-scale pressure which would amount to an upheaval’ (CPT, p. 101). Refusal of tolerance could be translated into resistance to the war, draft, and the military, strikes and boycotts, civil disobedience, marches on Washington, occupation of universities and factories, and intolerance towards the representatives of the policies opposed.

It is questionable, however, whether it was appropriate to advocate an ‘intolerance thesis’ to justify confrontation politics. The ‘clear and present danger’ argument (as a justification to repress ‘intolerable’ ideas) is often used as an excuse to repress radicals. Therefore, it seems that radicals should defend free speech and civil liberties, while at the same time urging militant struggle against obviously dangerous and repugnant practices and policies (such as imperialist wars, racism, brutality towards women and children, etc.) ‘Intolerance’ towards the worst aspects of imperialist capitalism, bureaucratic communism, or other oppressive political systems or groups may well be justified or necessary, but it should not be formulated in any way that suggests the suppression of free speech, for such arguments often play into the hands of authorities who are all too eager to suppress radicals and tend as well to alienate people from what is often perceived as the ‘authoritarian Left’.

Thus, radicals might arguably take the position of Rosa Luxemburg, who urged the defense of free speech as the freedom to speak differently, to dissent, thus defending unrestricted communication and the development of an open and lively ‘public sphere’.<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, given the tight control of the means of communication by the established society at the time, Marcuse was probably correct that confrontation politics were the most effective means for radicals to express their dissent from the prevailing policies and their opposition to the dominant institutions.

Marcuse’s position on violence was even more controversial. Put simply, Marcuse opposed the violence of the established society and supported violence to overthrow it. He argues that ‘in the advanced centers of civilization violence prevails’ (CPT, p. 102) in police brutality, in prisons and mental institutions, against racial minorities and women, and in increasingly brutal forms against the people of underdeveloped countries who dare to struggle for their liberation against imperialist domination. Marcuse makes distinctions between the structural violence embedded in the system and the violence that would eliminate systemic violence, between reactionary and revolutionary violence, and between violence of the oppressors and the oppressed. In his view, applying standards of pacifism and non-violence to the struggles of the oppressed against their oppressors serves ‘the cause of actual violence by weakening the protest against it’ (CPT, p. 103).

The capstone of his argument is the insistence that individuals must choose sides between Establishment and Opposition, and people must make every effort to distinguish between true and false, right and wrong, and oppose militantly what are perceived as false ideas and erroneous policies. To a generation of intellectuals nurtured on relativism, ambiguity and neutrality, this was a difficult pill to swallow, and when students drew the line and told their

teachers, either you're with us or against us', confused academics turned on Marcuse and accused him of corrupting the youth. Marcuse firmly committed himself to the New Left, siding with the militants. He supported his position by arguing that historically the Left had furthered progress, that violence emanating from the rebellion of the oppressed had reduced injustice, cruelty and war, while increasing freedom, equality and justice (CPT, pp. 99ff).

In short, the Left had furthered the cause of 'progress in civilization' (CPT, p. 107). As examples Marcuse cited the English civil war, the French Revolution and the Chinese and Cuban Revolutions (but not the American or Russian Revolutions!).<sup>19</sup> He argued that violence that had come from the ruling classes had not aided progress, but had instead created a depressing history of oppression and a long series of dynastic and imperialist wars, culminating in fascism (CPT, pp. 108f). Marcuse concluded that the ruling classes have historically 'tightened and streamlined the continuum of repression' (CPT, p. 109) and that to perceive this and to motivate people to fight for a different history requires radical re-education and a change of political consciousness to break through the prevailing distorted consciousness and to shift the balance of public opinion from Right to Left.

### **Dialectics of Liberation and Revolution**

Marcuse's critique of pure tolerance, his insistence that individuals must take a pro or con stance concerning the existing society and its policies, and his advocacy of discriminating tolerance and militant opposition to oppression, made his ideas the centre of heated debate. At this point Marcuse also took a resolutely revolutionary socialist perspective. This move is recorded in many articles, including his 1967 Berlin lectures, the 1967 London talk "Liberation From the Affluent Society," An Essay on Liberation (1968), and other texts collected in this volume.<sup>20</sup>

Since the mid-1960s, Marcuse had criticized the U.S. intervention in Vietnam as imperialist, a position he sketched out in an article collected in this volume, 'The Inner Logic of American Policy in Vietnam' (pp. 00) presented at a UCLA Teach-In on March 25, 1966. In an April 1966 conference on 'Karl Marx in the Modern World' Marcuse asserted that Vietnam should not be considered as an isolated entity, but as part of a world capitalist system in which the U.S. was fighting for domination and to control markets and sources of cheap raw materials. He posited the National Liberation Movements against capitalist domination as resistance to global capitalism that contained a 'revolutionary potential' and might act as a 'major catalyst' in future struggles.<sup>21</sup>

In May 1966, Marcuse participated in a conference organized by German SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund [German Socialist Students]) on 'Vietnam — Analysis of a Model.'<sup>22</sup> In addition to denouncing U.S. policy in Vietnam, Marcuse raised the question of whether a non-capitalist form of industrialization in the developing world could avoid the 'repressive, exploitative industrialization of early capitalism.' Such a possibility is blocked, he suggests, by the capitalist countries that attempt to prohibit development of an alternative socialist model and the fact that developing countries depend on dominant

Western and Eastern societies for capital and technology that promote bureaucratic and non-democratic industrial models. Yet the potential exists in Third World developing countries, he believed, to promote an alternative model of socialism and Marcuse concluded that ‘the militant liberation movements in the developing countries represent the strongest potential force for radical transformation.’

As the 1960s progressed, Marcuse would continue to reflect upon the potential for liberation in Third World revolutionary movements, the possibilities of solidarity between those organizations and radical forces in the highly industrialized countries, and the prospective for emancipatory social transformation in the New Left, student anti-war movement, feminism, black power, and other social forces of the era. Marcuse was indeed an exemplary public intellectual in the 1960s and 1970s. He had supported the civil rights movement and was an early participant in the antiwar and student movement, and continued to speak out and demonstrate against injustices up until his death in 1979. In turn, New Left struggles and the emergence of oppositional social movements of a diverse range encouraged Marcuse to focus on articulating oppositional forces and potentials for radical change, strategies of transformation, and the goals of liberation, returning him to the utopian and emancipatory themes that he had sketched out in the 1950s in Eros and Civilization.

Summer 1967 was busy and eventful for Marcuse. He traveled to Berlin where beginning on July 12 he participated in a four-day event organized by the German SDS, providing lectures on ‘The End of Utopia’ and ‘The Problem of Violence in the Opposition’ and participating in panel discussions on ‘Morals and Politics in the Transitional Society’ and opposition to the Vietnam war. The students in Berlin were in a high state of politicization, after a student demonstrating against the Shah of Iran had been shot and killed on June 2, and there were a series of demonstrations protesting this police brutality. Moreover, leaders of the German student movement, such as Rudi Dutschke, had indicated their approval of Marcuse’s ideas that they interpreted as legitimization for the sort of radical politics they were practicing.<sup>23</sup>

Marcuse’s lectures both sketched out a radical alternative in ‘The End of Utopia’ and legitimized radical student politics in ‘The Problem of Violence in the Opposition’ where he begins by emphasizing that the student movement is an important global force of transformation, but not ‘an immediate revolutionary force.’ The student opposition is part of the New Left, which Marcuse defined as Neo-Marxist, influenced by Maoism and Third World revolutionary movements, and opposed to the Old Left that is Marxist “in the orthodox sense.” The New Left includes neo-anarchist tendencies, is antiauthoritarian, and is not bound to the working class as the sole revolutionary force.

Marcuse characterized the New Left broadly as including intellectuals, groups from the civil rights movements, and youth groups, including hippies. The New Left rejects the forces of domination, exploitation, and conformity that Marcuse described in One-Dimensional Man and includes both outsiders and underprivileged groups that are not fully integrated into advanced industrial society and privileged strata that rebel against it. Focusing on the student

opposition, Marcuse described what in the existing society it opposes, what forms it takes, and what its prospects are. In Marcuse's view, it is the total opposition of the New Left to the system's imperialism, racism, sexism, and manifold forms of oppression that distinguishes it, as does the multiple forms of resistance it advocates ranging from peaceful non-violent sit-ins and demonstrations to militant opposition to institutions and practices of violence within the system itself.

Repeating his distinction between revolutionary violence against the violence of the system and systemic violence presented in CPT, Marcuse affirmed once again a 'natural right' to resistance. This conception was sharply criticized by conservatives, liberals, and others. In the face of escalating violence by the student movement in the years to come, that sometimes used Marcusean ideas to legitimate it, Marcuse later modified his ultraleft discourse on violence and talked more of a 'long march through the institutions.' He began in the late 1960s emphasizing the importance of education and organization, and arguing against violence that did not further social progress and that brought forces of repression down on the movement (see below).

Right after the Berlin conference, Marcuse traveled to London to participate in the 'Dialectics of Liberation' conference. In his contribution 'Liberation from the Affluent Society,' included in this volume (pp. 00), he affirmed his commitments to both the New Left and the counterculture, arguing that a 'new sensibility' and alternative ways of life are necessary to transcend the dominant modes of oppression and conformity in the established society. The Congress of the Dialectics of Liberation attempted to bring together major political theorists like Marcuse and Monthly Review editor Paul Sweezy with political activists like Stokely Carmichael, representatives of the counterculture like Living Theater director Julien Beck and poet Allan Ginsberg, and spokespeople for the antipsychiatry movement like David Cooper and R.D. Laing who were instrumental in organizing the event. Held in the Roundhouse at Chalk Farm, London from July 15-July 30, 1967, a vast number of intellectuals, activists, and counterculture types came together for lectures, debate, poetry, music, films, and other cultural events.

Marcuse was in a session led off by a Living Theater performance, mantras by Allan Ginsberg, a rousing affirmation of 'Black Power' by Stokely Carmichael followed by Marcuse's talk 'Liberation from the Affluent Society.' The session included intense political debate, and poetry and performance art, combining the cultural and political, participatory and theoretical. Key essays were published the next year in London and in a 1969 Collier Books paper edition titled To Free a Generation!, a label that accurately described the ambitions of the conference and many of the participants.

Marcuse's contribution vividly synthesized New Left political perspectives with affirmations of the counterculture. Marcuse opened with an invocation of flower power and defined the dialectics of liberation as 'involving the mind and the body, liberation involving [the] entire human existence.' He quickly turned to Marx, however, identifying himself with Marxian socialism, but of a kind that advocates more radical qualitative social change, using the

technological capacities of the affluent society to liberate individuals from socially unnecessary labor, repression, and domination. Socialism was projected by Marcuse as a complete negation of the existing society and a rupture with previous history that would provide an alternative mode of free and happy existence with less work, more play, and the reduction of social repression.

This unabashedly utopian notion articulated counterculture desires for an entirely new society and way of life with alternative values, sensibilities, relationships, and culture. Yet Marcuse used Marxist terminology to critique existing capitalist societies and insisted that socialist revolution was the most viable way to create an emancipated society, thus identifying with the perspectives of the political activists at the conference such as Stokely Carmichael and Paul Sweezy. Genuine socialism for Marcuse, however, depended on oppositional needs, values, and a new sensibility that would produce a higher and better form of society than the one based on labor, repression, and social domination. Creating a freer, happier, and more just society, however, required education, political organization, and solidarity with Third World revolutionary struggles and movements for radical change within the affluent society itself.

1968 has been widely celebrated as the year of revolution and Marcuse was excited by the worldwide student movement that seized universities from Berkeley to Columbia and that culminated in the May 1968 upheaval in Paris where students and workers threatened the existing French system and which Marcuse observed at first hand (see the testimony collected in this volume, ‘Remarks on the French Revolution,’ pp. 00). For Marcuse, the Paris events of May 1968 demonstrated how students could spark spontaneous revolutionary action that could bring the entire society to a standstill. In Marcuse’s view, the French student protest movement, like the one in the United States and elsewhere represents

a total protest, not only against specific evils and against specific short-comings, but at the same time, a protest against the entire system of values, against the entire system of objectives, against the entire system of performances required and practice in the established society. In other words, it is a refusal to continue to accept and abide by the culture of the established society. They reject not only the economic conditions, not only the political institutions, but the entire system of values which they feel is rotten to the core.

And in this sense I think one can indeed speak of a cultural revolution in the sense that the protest is directed against the entire cultural establishment, including the morality of the existing society.<sup>24</sup>

Such radical affirmation of the student protest movement and their call for a total revolution alienated Marcuse from his former Frankfurt School colleagues Max Horkheimer and T.W. Adorno. Tension and differences over the Cold War had already emerged with Marcuse exchanging letters in the 1950s and 1960s criticizing their anti-Communist views.<sup>25</sup> But in 1968-1969, relations became

more strained as Frankfurt University students occupied offices, and Adorno was severely criticized for calling in the police and more generally distancing himself from the student revolts that Marcuse embraced. In a 1969 exchange of letters, concluded by Adorno's sudden death in August 1969, Marcuse made clear that he sympathized with the student radicals and was disappointed by Adorno and Horkheimer's distancing themselves from current struggles. The exchange of letters documents the growing distance and signals that Marcuse alone, of his former Institute colleagues, was prepared to embrace the new revolutionary movements.<sup>26</sup>

### **Marcuse as Revolutionist: An Essay on Liberation**

Marcuse's gloom about the demise of revolutionary opposition is dispelled in his late-1960s writings, which glow with revolutionary optimism. His perspectives, articulated in countless lectures, interviews, and articles, some of which we have selected for this collection, are summed up in his incandescent text An Essay on Liberation.<sup>27</sup> Marcuse saw new prospects for revolution, since the 'outsiders' and relatively few practitioners of the Great Refusal have expanded to a growing opposition to the global domination of corporate capitalism, (EL, p. vii). He maintained that the 'threatening homogeneity has been loosening up and an alternative is beginning to break into the repressive continuum' (EL, p. viii). The alternative is liberation: 'an emergence of different goals and values, different aspirations in the men and women who resist and deny the massive exploitative power of corporate capitalism even in its most comfortable and liberal realizations' (EL, p. vii).

An Essay on Liberation is a highly charged work that expresses the ambience of revolutionary utopianism in the 1960s. Its close connection with its historical situation constituted the text's relevance and interest, but also accounts for its shortcomings. At the time of its publication EL was enthusiastically read as an affirmation of total revolution; it at once exhilarated radical students and shocked the academic establishment.<sup>28</sup> Marcuse unabashedly presented the counterculture and student movement as the manifestation of a 'new sensibility', producing 'a political practice of methodical disengagement from the refusal of the Establishment aiming at a radical transvaluation of values' (EL, p. 6).<sup>29</sup>

The new sensibility 'expresses the ascent of the life instincts over aggressiveness and guilt' (EL, p. 23), and contains a negation of the needs that sustain the present system of domination and the negation of the values on which they are based.<sup>30</sup> Instead of the need for repressive performance and competition, the new sensibility posits the need for meaningful work, gratification and community; instead of the need for aggression and destructive productivity, it affirms love and the preservation of the environment; it refuses obscene consumerism, waste and planned obsolescence, and calls for a simpler, more humane life; against the horrors and ugliness of capitalist industrialization, it claims a need for beauty and sensuousness. It translates these values into 'a practice that involves a break with the familiar, the routine ways of seeing, hearing, feeling, understanding things so that the organism may become receptive to the potential forms of a non-aggressive, non-exploitative world' (EL, p. 6).

This total refusal of the dominant societal needs, values and institutions represents a radical break with the entirety of the society's institutions, culture and life-style.

The new sensibility, Marcuse believes, is a radically anti-capitalist political force and a catalyst of revolutionary change. It contains a subversion of the needs on which capitalism depends for its very existence and produces new needs that represent the negation of capitalism. Marcuse totally affirms those bearers of the new sensibility which he finds in the New Left and counterculture as portents of a possible liberation from the capitalist warfare state. Throughout the book, Marcuse championed the student movement and youth culture that was horrifying the established society (see EL, pp. 7ff, 34ff, 49ff, and 79ff).

Following the publication of An Essay on Liberation, Marcuse modified his formerly positive evaluation of the counterculture, as well as the political use of obscenity, rock music, guerilla theatre, and 'flower power'.<sup>31</sup> There is no doubt that he was carried away by the enthusiasm generated by the struggles of the 1960s to the extent that he exaggerated the importance of the student movement and diffuse counterculture revolts as agents of revolutionary change. However, it should be noted that even at the height of his militant enthusiasm, Marcuse never said that the counterculture and new sensibility were a revolutionary force. He claimed that the emergence of a new sensibility is encouraging because 'it signifies a total break with the dominant needs of repressive society' (5L, p. 69); it is characteristic of a state of disintegration and thus indicates cracks in the system, a possible breaking through the continuum of domination; and it is a catalyst for change which may play a revolutionary role in connection with other forces, as it is contagious and may spread throughout society.

Moreover, Marcuse does not see any substantial mass support for the New Left in the working class and continues to stress that a revolutionary upheaval is unlikely unless there is an acute economic crisis to politicize the masses. Over and over in essays, lectures and interviews Marcuse indicated that in his view there can be no revolution without the working class, and never claims to see evidence that the working class is responsive to the New Left.<sup>32</sup> He concluded that advanced capitalist societies are in a pre-revolutionary situation and that radical change requires intensified work in political education: 'Historically, it is again the period of enlightenment prior to material change -- a period of education, but education which turns into praxis: demonstration, confrontation, rebellion' (EL, p. 53).

Contrary to many interpretations of Marcuse's position, his evaluation of the 'subverting forces in transition' in EL does not claim that blacks, students and the counterculture are the new agents of revolution; instead he offers a rather well balanced account of the political potential and limitations of these groups. He saw radical possibilities in ghetto uprisings and the emergence of black power, but he carefully analysed contradictions 'which were defusing the revolutionary potential of ghetto revolt and the black liberation movement' (EL, pp. 57ff). Likewise, he was restrained in his evaluation of the radical potential of the student movement (EL, pp. 59ff).

From about 1965-72, the student movement in the United States and throughout the world engaged in a series of spectacular actions which made it appear that a new revolutionary force was in the making. Marcuse's An Essay on Liberation was written at the peak of this radicalization period and was concluded shortly after workers in France joined with students in a remarkable show of revolutionary zeal and solidarity. At this time, students all over the world were taking over universities, demonstrating and fighting against the Vietnam war and the military machine that was waging it, driving Lyndon Johnson to resign and revitalizing leftist rhetoric while nourishing hopes for socialist revolution. During this tumultuous period, Marcuse was proclaimed guru of the student movement, and he indefatigably defended and advised students and movement radicals.

Stressing the strategic role of students and university in society, Marcuse noted that the student rebellion poses a threat to the system which depends on them to provide administrators, scientists, lawyers, teachers and the like to keep it going (EL, pp. 59ff). Their opposition to a university system that produces society's elite, combined with demands for radical reforms, touched on a very vulnerable pillar of the society that would be increasingly dependent on education and intellectual skills. Most frightening to the establishment powers was the total character of the refusal, which was at once political and moral. For the radical students' revulsion was not only aimed at the society's worst imperialist and racist excesses, but attacked the university, middle-class culture, decaying liberalism, abstract parliamentary democracy, and fetishistic consumerism -- a total rebellion that struck at the foundations of society. But Marcuse made clear to students in Berlin in 1967 that: 'I have never said that the student opposition today is by itself a revolutionary force, nor have I seen the hippies as the "heir of the proletariat"! Only the national liberation fronts of the developing nations are today in a revolutionary struggle' (5L, p. 93).

Marcuse's revolutionary hopes were based on the belief that Third World liberation struggles were weakening the global framework of capitalism and were shifting the balance of power from capitalism to socialism. His argument was that:

by virtue of the evolution of imperialism, the developments in the Third World pertain to the dynamic of the First World, and the forces of change in the former are not extraneous to the latter ... The National Liberation Fronts threaten the life line of imperialism; they are not only a material but also an ideological catalyst of change. The Cuban revolution and the Viet Cong have demonstrated: it can be done; there is a morality, a humanity, a will, and a faith which can resist and deter the gigantic technical and economic force of capitalist expansion. More than the 'socialist humanism' of the early Marx, this violent solidarity in defence, this elemental socialism in action, has given form and substance to the radicalism of the New Left; in this ideological respect too, the external revolution has become an essential part of the opposition within the capitalist metropoles. (EL, pp. 80, 81-2).<sup>33</sup>

Marcuse had an expansive globalized view of the current world capitalist system and the emergent forces of opposition within it. In his view, Third World revolutionary movements threaten to cut off markets, sources of raw materials, a cheap labour supply and super profits, and by their success spur on other revolutionary movements (the core of truth in the domino theory!), including the opposition at home. He included the so-called “Third World” within the global space and dynamics of capitalism, arguing that these areas and forces are not external to the capitalist sphere. They are an essential part of its global space of exploitation, they are areas and peoples that this system cannot allow to let go and shift into that other orbit (of socialism or communism), because it can survive only if its expansion is not blocked by any superior power. The National Liberation Movements are thus expressive of the internal contradictions of global capitalism and a threat to its global domination.

Marcuse is aware that synchronization between revolutionary struggles in the Third World and the advanced capitalist countries is extremely difficult, but insisted that revolutionaries everywhere had common interests that were eliciting a growing solidarity (see EL, pp. 79f). He himself maintained solidarity both with New Left struggles and Third World liberation movements, criticizing the Soviet Union and European Communist parties from the Left, arguing that they were not sufficiently revolutionary.<sup>34</sup> Unlike his analysis in One-Dimensional Man, which offered little hope for radical change, Marcuse now argued that a crisis was possible, and in essay after essay called attention to the contradictions in capitalism which could erupt into a crisis, thus emphasizing the weaknesses and disintegrating factors in the system that were portents of the possibility of radical change.

These provocative positions evoked the full wrath of the system against Marcuse who was subjected to intense media criticism, pressures from reactionary groups on the University of California to fire him, and threats on his life. In 1968, a campaign began, supported by the American Legion and other rightwing groups, to revoke Marcuse’s university contract. In July 1968, Marcuse received a death threat from the Klu Klux Klan and went into hiding before embarking on a planned trip to Europe; at other times, devoted students would stand guard at his house. Marcuse was now achieving renown as one of America’s greatest professors, who was unusually revered by his students -- if not by all his colleagues and the public. His students included many radicals, and several have written appreciative tributes to his effectiveness as a teacher.<sup>35</sup>

Near the end of his summer 1968 Europe trip, Marcuse gave an interview ‘Marcuse Defines his New Left Line’ to Paris Express that was translated and published in October 1968 in the New York Times and that we collect in this volume (pp. 00). Marcuse discusses here the paradox that a relatively unknown German-American philosopher was suddenly affirmed in the European and global media as a revolutionary prophet linked with Marx and Mao. The probing interview forces Marcuse to clarify what distinguishes his ‘New Left line’ from traditional liberalism and Soviet communism and the difficulty of defining a New Left that was continually mutating and expanding.

In December 1968, Marcuse gave a talk at the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the radical newspaper The Guardian which we are publishing in this collection (pp. 00). Introduced by Bernadine Dohrn, who would soon gain notoriety as a representative of the radical Weatherman faction, Marcuse discussed dilemmas of the situation of the New Left, strategies, targets, and forms of organization. Recognizing that it is unlikely that the New Left could become a mass organization in the present situation and that most political parties are bureaucratically coopted, Marcuse suggested that

The strength of the New Left may well reside in precisely these small and contesting and competing groups, active at many points at the same time, a kind of political guerrilla force in peace or so-called peace, but, and this is, I think, the most important point, small groups, concentrated on the level of local activities, thereby foreshadowing what may in all likelihood be the basic organization of libertarian socialism, namely councils of manual and intellectual workers, soviets, if one can still use the term and does not think of what actually happened to the soviets, some kind of what I would like to call, and I mean it seriously, organized spontaneity.

This talk was endlessly misquoted by Marcuse's rightwing critics who claimed that he was advocating violent guerrilla attacks on the established system, whereas he was merely recognizing that the New Left consisted largely of small groups carrying out a variety of activities. The New Left would continue to splinter and fragment, and Marcuse and others were constantly searching for new forms of organization, while recognizing achievements and limitations of New Left groups.

In 1969, Marcuse continued to give high-profile lectures, was widely discussed in the media, and was the target of rightwing hate mail and political campaigns to fire him. After a detailed review by a faculty committee and a near-unanimous faculty vote to keep him as a professor in 1969-1970, Marcuse agreed to return for another year and the right went wild continuing to attack him.<sup>36</sup> Tiring of the harassment, however, Marcuse agreed to retire in 1970, although he worked out an agreement that enabled him to keep his office and teach students informally.

Marcuse's FBI files are a useful source of information concerning his travels and activities of the epoch. The subject of frequent FBI inquiries since his work with the Office of War Information and OSS in World War Two which required FBI security clearance,<sup>37</sup> Marcuse was closely surveilled by the FBI in the 1960s and there are copious, sometimes comical, reports on his lectures, writings, and travels. Around 1968, the FBI purchased all of his major books, wrote out full reports on them, collected newspaper articles and critiques of his work, reported in detail on his travels, and provide a rich dossier of his ideas and activities, and their global impact.

### **Towards a 'United Front': Counterrevolution and Revolt**

Beginning around 1970, however, Marcuse turned the major focus of his attention from the world political constellation and analysis of the prospects for

world revolution to an analysis of prospects for radical social transformation in the United States, focusing on strategies for the New Left in the bastion of world capitalism. The results of his inquiry were published in Counterrevolution and Revolt.<sup>38</sup> In this book he turns from the militant Third World strategy implicit in his late 1960s writings to a United Front strategy, which he seems to propose at least for the U.S. and advanced capitalist societies.

In CR&R and his subsequent 1970s writings, Marcuse significantly modifies his theory of one-dimensional society and modifies his defense of confrontation politics. Whereas his perceptions of the integration of the working class and the stabilization of capitalism led him to affirm the New Left as an important oppositional political force and to defend their forms of struggle, his perceptions of limitations of the New Left in an era of disintegrating capitalism led Marcuse to re-evaluate both his theory of society and of radical social change.

In the opening pages, Marcuse claims that, 'The Western world has reached a new stage of development: now, the defense of the capitalist system requires the organization of counterrevolution at home and abroad' (CR&R, p. 1). To impose its system and order so as to protect its vested interests, the counterrevolution 'practices the horrors of the Nazi regime' (CR&R, p. 1): cruel persecution, torture and even genocide. The counterrevolution strives to prevent not only socialist revolution, but even minimal and long overdue social progress. The bulwark of the counterrevolution is the United States of America. Abroad, this means U.S. support of military dictatorships, police states, reactionary governments who maintain the status quo and protect U.S. interests, counterinsurgency and the suppression of national liberation movements, use of the US military in an attempt to police the world and contain Communism, and imperialist destruction of countries who dare to resist the will of the capitalist Superpower.

At home, Marcuse projects the frightening possibility that the discontent and crises which he sees as a possible breaking up of capitalist domination may lead not to progressive radical change, but rather to a new fascism. The people's frustrations and aggressions could provide a mass base for fascism, and Marcuse sees signs of such a proto-fascist syndrome in the United States today) (CR&R, pp. 24- 9).<sup>39</sup> As a refugee from German fascism, Marcuse is extremely sensitive to the dangers of fascistic tendencies. He proposes the term 'preventive counterrevolution' to describe repressive policies that try to prevent even the possibility of a revolution, and he continues to analyse counterrevolutionary tendencies and the dangers of fascism. But Marcuse stresses that the 'preventive counterrevolution' is not yet fascism, which, if it emerged in the U.S., would in any case take a different form than German fascism. In a 1971 talk at Berkeley, Marcuse states:

We are far from a fascist form of government, but some of the possible preconditions are emerging. They are well known and I will just give you a list: the courts, used more and more as political tribunals; the reduction of education and welfare in the richest country in the world; anti-democratic legislation, such as preventive detention and the no-knock laws; economic sanctions if

you are politically and otherwise suspect; the intimidation and self censorship of the mass media. These are very frightening signs. You cannot say history repeats itself; it never repeats itself in the same form. The fact that we cannot point to any charismatic leader, the fact that we cannot point to any SS or SA here, simply means that they are not necessary in this country. If necessary, other organizations can perform the job, possibly even more efficiently. I do not have to tell you which organizations I have in mind (pp. 00).

In view of the counterrevolution, ‘The only counterforce is the development of an effectively organized radical Left, assuming the vast task of political education, dispelling the false and mutilated consciousness of the people so that they themselves experience their condition, and its abolition, as vital need, and apprehend the ways and means of their liberation’ (CR&R, p. 28). Marcuse warns that if U.S. society does enter a period of acute crisis, and if a fascist solution is attempted to solve capitalism’s contradictions, then it is of utmost importance that the radical opposition becomes stronger and offers a viable alternative in order to become an effective political force in a period of disintegration and change.

Marcuse maintains that the ‘Marxian theory remains the guide of practice, even in a non-revolutionary situation’ (CR&R, p. 33). He criticizes, however, what he sees as a prevalent tendency among the New Left (as well as the Old Left) to ‘the distortion and falsification of Marxian theory through its ritualization’ (CR&R, p. 33). For Marcuse Marxian theory is dialectical and historical: it describes the changes and transitions in the social-historical world. In his view, neo-Marxist theory must describe changes in the economy and society and the effect that these changes have on the totality of life and the prospects for social transformation. Because the Marxian concepts are historical, all of the concepts used to describe eighteenth- and nineteenth-century capitalism cannot obviously be used to describe twentieth-century capitalism. Consequently, for Marcuse, Marxist theory and practice require constant reconstruction to keep in touch with the changes in the historical situation (CR&R, pp. 33ff). He stresses the need continually to revise the Marxian theory and suggests the relevancy of the New Left’s reformulation of Marx’s thesis on Feuerbach: ‘Philosophers have previously only interpreted Marxism in various ways; the point, however, is to change it’.

The New Left is to be commended, Marcuse believes, for the vision of a free, liberated individual in a non-repressive society.<sup>40</sup> In Marcuse’s view, the New Left is an especially advanced political force because it has drawn political struggle into the realm of non-material needs (self-determination, non-alienated human relations, solidarity, autonomy, co-operation and community, Women’s liberation, etc.); and the physiological dimension (the preservation of nature, aesthetic-erotic satisfaction and happiness, etc.) (CR&R, p. 129). The radicalization of the New Left is, at its best, integral, and combines the revolt of reason with the revolt of sensibility and the instincts, and the political revolution with the personal revolution, the gesture of the barricade with the gesture of love

(CR&R, p. 130). The movement is novel in that it embraces new values, life-styles and alternatives which are a radical refusal of the prevailing values and ideology, and is therefore a subversive threat to the system that has evoked a violent response from the underlying population whose values are being attacked and refused.

In Marcuse's view, although the majority of the population resists the thought and action of the New Left, it reflects a growing discontent and dissatisfaction with the system and contributes to undermining its power further (CR&R, p. 31). The problem is that the 'countervalues, counterbehaviour' and its Marxist-socialist theory and practice are alien to the large majority of the working population, who are not aware of the radical cleavage between what is possible and what is actual, or of the existing possibilities for qualitative change. The New Left's survival and possibilities of becoming a political force for radical change therefore depend on overcoming this hostility, communicating its vision, and changing and raising consciousness.

These activities require political education and a demonstration that all members of the existing society are oppressed and exploited by capitalism to such a degree that radical change is in the interest of the society as a whole. Marcuse now proposes that a critical theory of society must show the shared, common condition of oppression and exploitation in the current society in concepts which at once characterize, criticize and project constructive alternatives, in a language that avoids canned vocabulary and cliches. The task is to convince people of the need for radical change and to make alternative ideas acceptable and attractive. Although critical theory should avoid the fetishism of the working class (as the sole or principle agent of social change), it must nonetheless attempt to radicalize all the people by showing how their dissatisfactions and frustrations are a result of the capitalist system. Marcuse's insistence that emancipatory change requires a juncture of the working class and radical opposition seems to indicate a new 'United Front' turn in his thought: 'Radicalism has much to gain from the "legitimate" protest against the war, inflation and unemployment, from the defense of civil rights - even perhaps from a "lesser evil" in local elections. The ground for the building of a united front is shifting and sometimes dirty - but it is there' (CR&R, p. 56).<sup>41</sup>

During the 1970s, Marcuse became open to and involved with a variety of social movements, connecting with the ecology movement, feminism, and other progressive perspectives with he attempted to link with the New Left and socialism.<sup>42</sup> In a symposium on 'Ecology and Revolution' in Paris in 1972, some of which we include in this volume, Marcuse argued that the most militant groups of the period were fighting 'against the war crimes being committed against the Vietnamese people' (p. 00). Yet he saw ecology as an important component of that struggle, arguing that 'the violation of the earth is a vital aspect of the counterrevolution' (*ibid*). For Marcuse, the U.S. intervention in Vietnam was waging ecocide' against the environment, as well as genocide against the people:

It is no longer enough to do away with people living now; life must also be denied to those who aren't even born yet by burning and poisoning the earth, defoliating the forests, blowing up the dikes.

This bloody insanity will not alter the ultimate course of the war but it is a very clear expression of where contemporary capitalism is at: the cruel waste of productive resources in the imperialist homeland goes hand in hand with the cruel waste of destructive forces and consumption of commodities of death manufactured by the war industry (00).

There was, for Marcuse, a contradiction between capitalist productivity and nature, for in its quest for higher profits and the domination of nature, capitalism inevitably destroyed nature. Capitalist production manifested an unleashing of aggressive and destructive energies that destroyed life and polluted nature. In this process, human beings are transformed into tools of labor and become instruments of destruction. Introjecting capitalism's aggressive, competitive, and destructive impulses, people engage in ever more virulent devastation of the natural environment and anything (individuals, communities, and nations) which stand in the way of its productive exploitation of resources people, and markets.

In his major writings, Marcuse constantly followed the Frankfurt school emphasis on reconciliation with nature as an important component of human liberation, and also stressed the importance of peace and harmony among human beings as the goal of an emancipated society.<sup>43</sup> Marcuse continually called for a new concept of socialism that made peace, joy, happiness, freedom, and oneness with nature a primary component of an alternative society. Producing emancipatory institutions, social relations, and culture would make possible, in his liberatory vision, the sort of non-alienated labor, erotic relations, and harmonious community envisaged by Fourier and the utopian socialists. A radical ecology, then, which relentlessly criticized environmental destruction, as well as the destruction of humans being, and that struggled for a society without violence, destruction, and pollution was part of Marcuse's vision of liberation.

Marcuse also became involved in the early 1970s with the women's movement and in 1974 lectured at Stanford and then in Europe on 'Marxism and Feminism'. Here he enthusiastically embraced the goals of women's liberation and defended women's rights, sexual liberation and the equality of the sexes in terms of his categories in Eros and Civilization and more recent works. Marcuse stated that he believed 'the Women's liberation Movement today is perhaps the most important and potentially the most radical political movement that we have, even if the consciousness of this fact has not yet penetrated the Movement as a whole' (pp. 00).

In the widely-published and discussed lecture, Marcuse attempted to merge Marxism and feminism and to develop a "socialist feminism," a project he would continue to work on during the remainder of his life in which he consistently stressed the importance of the women's movement. Marcuse continued as well to reflect on and update the Marxian theory, and gave a lecture in 1974 on 'Theory and Practice' at the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Frankfurt Institute. It is appropriate that Marcuse would defend on this occasion the politicizing of critical theory and the continued relevance of Marxism, and analyze the prospects and strategy for social change, as he, of all the original members of the 'inner circle'

of the Frankfurt Institute, had gone the furthest in actually relating critical theory to political practice.

Marcuse seemed to mellow somewhat as he became older although he maintained his radical critique of capitalist and socialist societies and his ideals of liberation. Yet he was a revolutionary realist who recognized during the 1970s that the period of radical upheaval of the 1960s was over. A reporter summarized a 1977 talk to an audience at Washington University in St. Louis as recommending: "So what was his advice at the lecture? Work within the system; it can be done without damaging one's idealism. Seizure-of-power tactics are self-defeating. Avoid any suggestion of terrorism. It is self-defeating and self-destructive. Don't get radicalism black marks on your record That would make finding a job even more difficult. Tune in. Don't drop out."<sup>44</sup> To the end, Marcuse remained active, adjusting his views to the situation of the time, lecturing to the American and European Left, and continuing to write, lecture and discuss theory and politics with colleagues and young radicals until his death in 1979.

### **Concluding Remarks: Marcuse and the New Left**

In a sense, Marcuse's political writings from 1964 throughout 1979 articulate successive theories and practices of the New Left. The individualistic 'Great Refusal' advocated at the end of ODM corresponds to revolt that was fermenting within advanced capitalist societies, and concluding pages of ODM valorize the civil rights struggles. 'Repressive Tolerance' and his late 1960s essays and lectures justify the confrontation politics that were emerging in the anti-war movement as a response to the Vietnam war. EL expresses the moment of revolutionary euphoria during the spectacular struggles of 1968, and CR&R articulates the political realism of a Movement which saw in the early 1970s that it was facing a long and difficult struggle to transform the existing society.

The extent to which a German-American professor entering his seventh decade involved himself with the New Left is quite remarkable. After decades of deep political gloom, corresponding to devastating defeats of the Left, Marcuse saw his hopes for socialist revolution enlivened by New Left radicalism. Consequently, one encounters a change in the tone of his writings in the mid-1960s from a stoical pessimism to more optimistic and utopian perspectives. In this way, the New Left rejuvenated Marcuse, intensifying and radicalizing his thinking. In the New Left, Marcuse found concrete referents for his dialectical categories of contradiction, negation and the Great Refusal. In Marcuse, the New Left found a teacher, defender, and spokesperson.

Marcuse was, however, somewhat embarrassed by the media image of New Left 'prophet' or 'father'. In a 1978 interview with the BBC, he insisted:

I was not the mentor of the student activities of the sixties and early seventies. What I did was formulate and articulate some ideas and goals that were in the air at the time. That's about it. The student generation that became active in those years did not need a father figure, or grandfather figure, to lead them to protest against a society which daily revealed its inequality, injustice, cruelty and

general destructiveness. They could experience that -- they saw it before their own eyes.<sup>45</sup>

Marcuse's actual involvement with the New Left was stormy. Although he was revered by many, for others he was a 'revisionist', 'idealist philosopher', 'elitist,' and even a CIA agent!<sup>46</sup> While, in 1967, Marcuse's defense of socialism and revolutionary violence were acclaimed in Berlin, in 1968 his comments on utopian socialism were met with disdain by some of the same students. Many of the New Left were angry, impatient and ready to tear down the 'monster' and slay the 'beast' immediately. Marcuse always cautioned the New Left against 'counter-productive' action which were not part of a well thought-out theoretical strategy for social change. He insists:

I combated the anti-intellectualism of the New Left from the beginning. The reasons for it are, in my view, the isolation of the student movement from the working class, and the apparent impossibility of any spectacular political action. This led gradually to some kind of ... well, let me say, inferiority complex, some kind of self-inflicted masochism, which found expression in, among other things, contempt for intellectuals because they are only intellectuals and 'don't achieve anything in reality'. This contempt serves well the interests of the powers that be.<sup>47</sup>

Whereas that faction of the New Left who would become 'Weatherman' wanted to destroy the universities, Marcuse told them that educational sites provided the best refuge for radicals in American society to struggle for socialism. When Progressive Labor wanted to go to the factories and wake up the working class, Marcuse was skeptical and told them it might be better to organize and radicalize the students. The 'action-faction' of the U.S. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) wanted revolutionary action; Marcuse advised theory. Newly born Leninists wanted a party; Marcuse proposed revolutionary affinity groups, based on workers' councils, loosely organized into a mass movement and united by demonstrations, confrontations and, when appropriate, direct action. Consequently, sectarian radicals also developed global critiques of Marcuse's politics, often attacking him as vehemently as did his academic and right-wing critics.

In general, Marcuse represented the non-sectarian, antiauthoritarian wing of the New Left, criticizing the more excessive 'action factions', as well as the authoritarian-sectarian groups which began to spring up in the early 1970s. He was constantly open to new struggles and impulses in the movement and totally identified with the New Left. When asked by Bill Moyers in a 1974 television interview, included in this volume, whether the New Left was dead, Marcuse insisted: 'I don't think it's dead and it will resurrect' (pp. 00) and he continued to claim throughout the 1970s that the New Left had not 'collapsed.' And in his 1975 lecture, included in this volume, 'The Failure of the New Left?', Marcuse answered his question negatively, insisting that the New Left was an avant-garde and anticipatory movement that represented possibilities and goals that advanced

capitalism had made possible but had suppressed which continued to be relevant (pp. 00).

Moreover, Marcuse long carried out a sustained critique of orthodox Marxist-Leninist theories of revolution and developed new revolutionary perspectives. Instead of waiting for capitalism to collapse, or fantasizing about revolutionary insurrection, Marcuse proposed throughout the 1970s less dramatic concepts of social transformation, calling for a ‘long march through the institutions’ and the development of ‘counterinstitutions’. In a 1974 address at the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Marcuse championed ‘intelligence in opposition’ and called for the development of a ‘counter-psychology’, ‘counter-sociology’, ‘counter-education’, and radical therapy.<sup>48</sup>

Although he supported radical politics aiming at the structural transformation of society, he argued that he did not think that ‘revolutionary violence’ is justified in the advanced capitalist countries in the contemporary situation. In a 1977 article “Murder is Not a Political Weapon” published in Germany during a period of terrorism, collected in this volume, Marcuse argues that terrorist violence is counterproductive since it: provokes violence from the society which is destructive for the Left; has little real possibility of gaining mass support or altering the system; and violates revolutionary morality (pp. 00). Hence, in the present situation of advanced capitalism, Marcuse rejects the concept of armed struggle by a conspiratorial party, or terrorist group, as an element of political change.

Marcuse also put in question the ‘myth of October’, which posits revolution as a dramatic process of violent upheaval which in an armed uprising overthrows the previous bourgeois-capitalist order and overnight institutes a socialist (or ‘transitional’) society. As Karl Korsch and others have argued, the Marxian concept of revolution itself was formed by the Jacobin theory in the French Revolution, and the Leninists appropriated this tradition.<sup>49</sup> The (at least immediate) success of the October Revolution created a ‘myth of October’ that the revolutionary process of a dramatic insurrection and violent overthrow of a previously existing social order provided the proper model for revolution. Since such events have indeed played a role in many Third World revolutions, the myth has a basis in reality. In question, however, is the relevance of this vision of revolution to the transition to socialism in advanced capitalist countries.

In his later writings, Marcuse suggests that structural transformation aiming at the elimination of capitalism and the institutionalization of a socialist democracy will be a long and protracted process, implying that the myth of ten glorious days which will shake away capitalism is misleading and irrelevant to the ‘long revolution’ at stake. Up until his death in 1979, Marcuse kept working on theories of social change, searching for oppositional political tendencies and movements, and developing his perspectives on liberation and an alternative society. Subsequent volumes will document his life-long engagement with Marxism, his work on psychoanalysis and philosophy, and his writings on art and liberation. Marcuse’s combining of critical social theory, perspectives on emancipation and revolution, and attempts to link theory with practice produced a

long imbrication of his work with that of the New Left. Many of his students and those of us influenced by his work are now teaching and attempting to carry his ideas into a new millennium and we hope that this volume provides access to Marcuse for new generations, as well as providing material for those of us for whom he has long been an inspiration.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> For background on Marcuse and the Frankfurt School, see my Herbert Marcuse and the Crisis of Marxism (London and Berkley: MacMillan Press and University of California Press, 1984) and the first two volumes in the Routledge Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, edited by Douglas Kellner, Technology, War and Fascism (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) and Towards a Critical Theory of Society (London and New York: Routledge, 2001). See also Herbert Marcuse, Reason and Revolution (hereafter R&R) New York: Oxford University Press, 1941; reprinted Boston: Beacon Press, 1960 and Eros and Civilization (hereafter EC). Boston: Beacon Press, 1955; reprinted London and New York, Routledge Press, 1998.

<sup>2</sup> Fredric Jameson, Late Marxism. Adorno, or, the Persistance of the Dialectic. London: Verso, 1998, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> For earlier studies of Marcuse and the New Left, that I draw upon here, see Kellner, Herbert Marcuse, Chapter Nine; Paul Breines's articles in Antworten auf Herbert Marcuse (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1971) and New Left Perspectives on Herbert Marcuse: Critical Interruptions (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972); and Jean-Michel Palmier's Herbert Marcuse et la nouvelle gauche (Paris: Belfond, 1973), which contains an exhaustive study of the relevance of Marcuse's ideas to New Left theory and practice in France and America. For more critical accounts of Marcuse and the New Left, see A. Quattrocchi and T. Nairn, The Beginning of the End: France, May 1968 (London: Penguin, 1968) and Henri Lefebvre, The Explosion: Marxism and the French Upheaval (New York: Monthly Review, 1969). Cohn-Bendit is sceptical of whether Marcuse had much influence on the French student movement: 'Some people try to foist Marcuse upon us as a mentor. This is a joke. None of us have read Marcuse. Some people have read Marx, perhaps Bakunin and when it comes to modern authors - Althusser, Mao, Guevara, Lefebvre. Almost all the rebels have read Sartre'; cited in E. Batalov, The Philosophy of Revolt (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977) p. 52. Palmier contests this, claiming that many had read Marcuse and that there was a surge of interest in his writings during and after the May events. On this topic, see Palmier's earlier book Sur Marcuse (Paris: Union Genrale d'Editions, 1968) and La Nef 36 (Janvier-Mars 1969) on 'Marcuse. Cet Inconnu.' On Marcuse and the German New Left, see Rolf Wiggershaus, The Frankfurt School (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1994) and the documents collected in Wolfgang Kraushaar, Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946-1995, 3 volumes. Hamburg Rogner & Bernhard. Subsequent histories of the New Left and appraisals of Marcuse tend to stress his importance for and influence on the oppositional political movements of the era.

---

See George Katsiaficas, The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968 (Boston: South End Press, 1987) and John Bokina and Timothy J. Lukes, From the New Left to the Next Left. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas Press, 1994.

<sup>4</sup> See Herbert Marcuse (1964): One Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon Press, second edition, 1991; Routledge classics edition with an Introduction by Douglas Kellner, London: 2002 (henceforth ODM).

<sup>5</sup> See Wiggershaus, The Frankfurt School and Kraushaar, Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung.

<sup>6</sup> See Katsiaficas' balanced study The Imagination of the New Left (op. cit.) for detailed analyses of the suppression and dissolution of many New Left groups and the continuing impact of the movements of the period. For Katsiaficas, the period from the late 1960s to the early 1970s was a "world-historical epoch," similar to the 1848-9, 1907, and 1917-8 upheavals, where forces throughout the world struggled for emancipation and created long-term changes in the political, cultural, and personal spheres.

<sup>7</sup> Subsequent volumes in this series will present Marcuse's writings on philosophy and art.

<sup>8</sup> See Marcuse's statement against the Vietnam war in this collection, "Remarks on Vietnam," pp. 00.

<sup>9</sup> See the volumes in the Routledge Herbert Marcuse Collected Paper series dealing with War, Technology, and Fascism and Toward a Critical Theory of Society; Jurgen Habermas's afterward to the latter volume makes the point that one of Marcuse's enduring legacies is his philosophical and theoretical contributions. Subsequent volumes in this series will deal with Marcuse's philosophical contributions, his aesthetics, his engagement with Freud and psychoanalysis, and his contributions to Marxism. Thus it is a mistake to reduce Marcuse's contributions simply to his writings on the New Left. This volume will accordingly attempt to show how Marcuse's politics are grounded in his theory and how both his theory and politics were an important influence on the New Left that continue to be of theoretical and political value in the contemporary era.

<sup>10</sup> Marcuse often stated that his experiences in the German Revolution of 1918 gave him a sense that genuine revolution was characterized by a totality of upheaval -- a view articulated at the time by Rosa Luxemburg, whom he greatly admired and who decisively influenced his concept of 'revolution.' See Kellner, Herbert Marcuse, Chapter 1.

<sup>11</sup> For Marcuse's appraisal of Benjamin, where he elaborates on this notion, see his 'Nachwort' to Walter Benjamin, Zur Kritik der Gewalt und andere Aufsatze (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1965) pp. 99-106. Marcuse's increasingly embittered critic, Erich Fromm, jumped on this passage and wrote: 'These quotations show how wrong those are who attack or admire Marcuse as a revolutionary leader: for revolution was never based on hopelessness, nor can it ever be. But Marcuse is not even concerned with politics; for if one is not concerned with steps between the present and the future, one does not deal with politics, radical or otherwise. Marcuse is essentially an example of an alienated intellectual, who presents his

---

personal despair as a theory of radicalism'; Fromm, The Revolution of Hope (New York: Bantam, 1968) pp. 8-9. This quote shows how Fromm tends to take a single passage out of Marcuse's complex theory and build a global critique on the basis of it. Marcuse's later activity and theoretical perspectives show the groundlessness of Fromm's 'critique.' For Marcuse's critique of Fromm, see the Epilogue to Eros and Civilization.

<sup>12</sup> On Breton, see Manifestoes of Surrealism (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969) and What is Surrealism? (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1978).

Marcuse makes explicit the connection between Breton, the Great Refusal and the artistic *avant-garde* in the 1960 preface to R&R, pp. x-xi.

<sup>13</sup> See Kellner, Herbert Marcuse, Chapter 1.

<sup>14</sup> See 'Ethics and Revolution', where Marcuse defines revolution as 'the overthrow of a legally established government and constitution by a social class or movement with the aim of altering the social as well as the political structure ... such a radical and qualitative change implies violence'; in Ethics and Society, ed. Richard T. DeGeorge (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) p. 134. See also Marcuse, 'ReExamination of the Concept of Revolution', New Left Review, 56 (July-August 1969) pp. 27ff.

<sup>15</sup> Marcuse left Brandeis in 1965 when, after a series of disputes with the university President Abram Sacher, his post-retirement contract was not renewed. See Atlantic Monthly (June 1971) p. 74. There is a rich dossier of letters supporting Marcuse's appointment to the University of California, La Jolla in the Marcuse archive.

<sup>16</sup> Right-wing critics had a field day with 'Repressive Tolerance', quoting Marcuse out of context and labeling him an 'elitist authoritarian', 'nihilist' and worse. See Vivas, Contra Marcuse, pp. 171-7, who calls Marcuse 'the Torquemada of the left' and 'an intellectual termite' with a 'Nazi mind'. Hysterical conservative attacks continued on Marcuse for decades, including Allan Bloom who in The Closing of the American Mind (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987) blamed Marcuse and Mick Jagger for the excesses of contemporary life! In The Shadow of History (New York: The Free Press, 1998), Alan Kors and Harvey Silvergate blame Marcuse for inspiring a totalitarian "political correctness" movement in the University. For more intelligent critical discussions of the essay, see David Spitz, 'Pure Tolerance', Dissent, XIII (September-October 1966) pp. 510-25; Michael Walzer's critique of Spitz and Marcuse, 'On the Nature of Freedom', Dissent, XIII (November- December 1966) which contains Spitz's reply (pp. 725-39); and Elinor Langer, "Notes for Next Time," Working Papers for a New Society 1, 3 (Fall 1973), pp 48-83.

<sup>17</sup> For an indication of the gravity of the situation to which Marcuse was responding, and the dangers of nuclear extinction, see Robert Kennedy's memoir of the Cuban missile crisis, Thirteen Days (New York: Norton, 1969). Other accounts of the period, which render plausible Marcuse's call for intolerance against the policies of the existing society, include Bruce Miroff, Pragmatic Illusions (New York: McKay, 1976) and Geoffrey Hodgson, America in Our Time (New York: Doubleday, 1977).

---

<sup>18</sup> See Rosa Luxemburg, The Russian Revolution (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962) for her defence of civil liberties. On the concept of a 'proletarian public sphere', see Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, Offentlichkeit und Erfahrung (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972).

<sup>19</sup> Marcuse cites Fanon and Sartre (CPT, pp. 103 - 4), whose advocacy of revolutionary violence against violent oppressors no doubt influenced him. See Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth (London: Penguin, 1967) with an introduction by Sartre, and Jean-Paul Sartre, On Genocide (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971). For critiques of these theories of revolutionary violence, see Mohandas Karmarmchand Gandhi, Gandhi on Non-Violence (New York: Norton, 1965) and Gil Green, The New Radicalism (New York: International Publishers, 1971). Marcuse elaborates his defence of revolutionary violence in 'Ethics and Revolution' and 'The Problem of Violence and the Radical Opposition,' collected in this volume, pp. 00.

<sup>20</sup> In works like EC, SM and ODM, Marcuse's commitment to socialism is muted and is often expressed elliptically. In his post-1965 writings, however, he articulates his commitment to socialism much more explicitly. Marcuse constantly says that the only alternative to capitalism is socialism and openly proclaims himself a socialist and Marxist: see 5L, pp. 67ff and 80ff; EL, passim; and a 1968 lecture given in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of The Guardian, where he says, 'I believe that the alternative is socialism', and affirms his solidarity with the struggle for socialism. See Kellner, Herbert Marcuse, Chapter 10, for more detailed discussion of his concept of socialism. There is also a tone of revolutionary buoyancy in his post-1966 writings that first appears, appropriately, in the 1966 preface to a new Beacon Press edition of Eros and Civilization and his Hans Meyerhoff UCLA memorial lecture "Beyond One-Dimensional Man," both collected in Toward a Critical Theory of Society.

<sup>21</sup> See M.S. Handler, "Marxist Views Vietnam in Context of Capitalism," New York Times (April 29, 1966). Evidently, Marcuse's talk and the Times report caught the attention of the FBI which started once again following his activity and producing a large dossier on him.

<sup>22</sup> See "Vietnam – Analyse eines Exempels" in Neue Kritik 7,m Jg. Nr. 36/37 (Juli/August 1966: 30-40, and Kraushaar, Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung, Band 2: 205-209.

<sup>23</sup> On Marcuse's 1967 trip to Berlin, see the account in Der Spiegel, Nr 25 (1967) pp. 103-4, and the lectures that were later published in 5L and a 1980 Verlag Neue Kritik edition of Das Ende der Utopie (Frankfurt, 1980). For an account of Marcuse's less successful visit to Berlin in 1968, see Melvin J. Lasky, 'Revolution Diary', Encounter, vol. XXXI, no. 2 (August 1968) pp. 6-8. Documents, letters, and other texts of the era are collected in the three volumes edited by Kraushaar, Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Wiggerhaus in The Frankfurt School provides detailed documentation of the relationships between Marcuse, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Habermas and their complex interactions with the German Left. While Wiggerhaus provides an excellent contextualization and some sharp critique of

---

the relation of leading Frankfurt School theorists to the student movement, he arguably ultimately downplays the affinities between Marcuse and the German radical movements and the glaring differences between Marcuse and Adorno and Horkheimer.

<sup>24</sup> See “Remarks on the French Revolution” (pp. 00). For Marcuse’s concept of cultural revolution, see his study with that title in Toward a Critical Theory of Society.

<sup>25</sup> See Towards a Critical Theory of Society, pp. 212-218.

<sup>26</sup> See the documents collected in Kraushaar and the Introduction to and translation of key Adorno and Marcuse letters by Esther Leslie, ‘Correspondence on the German Student Movement,’ New Left Review, Number 233 (January-February 1999), pp. 118-136. Horkheimer was especially critical of Marcuse, presenting him as a dangerous example of the radical revolutionary; see Horkheimer, “Die Pseudoradicalen,” “Marcuses Vereinfachung,” and “Herbert Marcuses Argumente” in Kraushaar, Vol. II, pp. 237 and 285-287. Yet it is interesting that Adorno wrote an especially affirmative letter in support of Marcuse when efforts were made to fire him from the University of California at San Diego in 1968; see Adorno’s letter that we include in this volume (pp. 00).

<sup>27</sup> See Herbert Marcuse, An Essay on Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969 (hereafter EL). Interestingly, letters in the Marcuse archive indicate that throughout 1968 and up until shortly before its publication every EL was to be called Beyond One-Dimensional Man, signaling the shift in Marcuse’s work from his 1964 book to his late 1960s writings. A formal submission of the manuscript (no date) suggested a title Beyond One-Dimensional Man: A contribution to the debate on prospects for liberation (thanks to Beacon Press for making available material from Marcuse’s editor Arnold Tovell’s archive).

<sup>28</sup> I recall vividly the excitement with which the student movement received this book. See Palmier, Herbert Marcuse et la nouvelle gauche, and Johann Pali Arnason, Von Marcuse zu Marx (Neuwied and Berlin: Luchterhand, 1971) for the European reaction. The Right was again outraged by this book, violently attacking it in a spate of vitriolic reviews. See John Sparrow, ‘The Gospel of Hate’, National Review (October 21, 1969); Sidney Hook, The NY Times Book Review (April 20, 1969); Lewis Feuer, Book World (February 23, 1969); and Vivas, Contra Marcuse, for some choice violent and intemperate attacks that chide Marcuse for being violent and intemperate.

<sup>29</sup> On the historical roots of the ‘new sensibility’ in the beatnik generation, civil rights movement and 1960s counterculture, see Morris Dickstein, Gates of Eden (New York: Basic Books, 1977). For an unabashed celebration of the ‘new sensibility’ as a revolutionary form of consciousness, see Charles Reich, The Greening of America (New York: Random House, 1970) and the collection of reviews of this book, including a critical essay by Marcuse included in this volume, The Con III Controversy (New York: Pocket Books, 1971).

<sup>30</sup> See Herbert Marcuse, Five Lectures. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970 (hereafter 5L), p. 67.

---

<sup>31</sup> There was some ambivalence as to the status Marcuse assigned to the ‘new sensibility’ and New Left groups-in-revolt in the revolutionary process. On one hand, he argued: ‘The social agents of revolution - and this is orthodox Marx - are formed only in the process of transformation itself, and one cannot count on a situation in which the revolutionary forces are there ready-made, so to speak, when the revolutionary movement begins’ (5L, p. 64). On the other hand, in his more enthusiastic moments in EL, it seemed as if the new sensibility might be a new revolutionary subject, or at least a ‘catalyst’ producing a new revolutionary subject (EL, pp. 23ff, 52f).

<sup>32</sup> EL, pp. 16, 53-6. See the interview with Marcuse in the New York Times Magazine (October 27, 1968) where he discusses spontaneity and organization, students and workers (included in this volume, pp. 00).

<sup>33</sup> Many of the New Left were attracted to the Third World revolutionary theories of Fanon, Mao, Debray, Castro, Guevara and others; Marcuse was often associated with this tendency; see the critique of this ‘Third Worldism’ in Robert E. Wood, ‘Rethinking Third World Revolutions’, in Socialist Review 45 (May-June 1979), pp. 159ff.

<sup>34</sup> From the late 1960s on, Marcuse significantly accelerated and radicalized his critique of Soviet Marxism and orthodox Communist parties from his more restrained criticism in Soviet Marxism (New York: Columbia University Press; second edition 1988); for commentary on the book see Kellner 1984, Chapter 7 and Peter Marcuse, “Marcuse on Real Existing Socialism: A Hindsight look at Soviet Marxism” in Bokina and Lukes, op. cit, pp. 57-72. No doubt the continuing stifling repression in the Soviet bloc, the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the reformist nature of Communist parties in the West, together with the emergence of new socialist forces, led him to re-evaluate Soviet Marxism. See EL, pp. 54f.

<sup>35</sup> On Marcuse’s 1967 trip to Berlin, see the account in Der Spiegel, Nr. 25 (1967) pp. 103-4, and the lectures that were later published in 5L. For an account of Marcuse’s less successful visit to Berlin in 1968, see Melvin J. Lasky, ‘Revolution Diary’, Encounter, vol. XXXI, no. 2 (August 1968) pp. 6 - 8. California newspapers regularly attacked Marcuse, and pressures from the California Board of Regents forced Marcuse to give up teaching officially in 1969, although he was allowed to keep his office and to give informal seminars. On the death threats he received, see The Nation (28 October 1968) p. 421. Many of Marcuse’s students are today teaching at universities and publishing works influenced by him. See Angela Davis, An Autobiography (New York: Random House, 1974) for her account of Marcuse’s influence on her, as well as her introduction to this volume. Other evaluations include ‘Marcuse as Teacher’, William Leiss, John David Ober and Erica Sherover, in The Critical Spirit. pp. 421 – 6; Ronald Aronson, ‘Dear Herbert’, Radical America, vol. IV, no. 3 (April 1970); and George Katsiaficas’ recollections that serve as an afterward to this collection.

<sup>36</sup> This story is told in the excellent documentary by Paul Alexander Juutilainen, Herbert’s Hippopotamus (1998).

---

<sup>37</sup> 1943 FBI reports include numerous reports on his work with the Institute of Social Research, his writings, and academic activity at Columbia University with some interviewed presenting him as a thorough-going Marxist who did not understand U.S. democracy and who was a security risk, while most interviewed presented him as a top-notch scholar, strong opponent of fascism, and excellent government worker. Marcuse continued to work for the U.S. government until 1950 (see War, Technology, and Fascism, op. cit.) and thus continued to be the subject of FBI security reports. These include testimony from a UCLA librarian who found his research interests “suspicious,” from neighbors, and from fellow government workers who provided a rich variety of commentary. When in San Diego in the mid-1960s, Marcuse became increasingly outspoken politically and involved with New Left politics, FBI interest increased and he was put on the “Reserve index” list and then elevated to the “Security index” list and a large FBI dossier was compiled. Ironically, this will help future scholars trace Marcuse’s trajectory through the tumultuous 1960s and into the 1970s. Marcuse’s FBI dossiers constitute two full volumes of hundreds of pages of material and provide a provocative, although problematic, source of information on Marcuse and materials for a probing diagnostic critique of the FBI, allowing critical scrutiny of its methods, sources, materials, and effects.

<sup>38</sup> See Herbert Marcuse, Counterrevolution and Revolt. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972 (hereafter CR&R). Rereading the book during the Bush era of extreme rightwing reaction suggests uncanny resemblance to the regime of Richard Nixon that Marcuse was describing in 1972. See Douglas Kellner, From 9/11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003) for comparison and the Bush Junior regimes.

<sup>39</sup> For Marcuse’s reaction to the publicity that William Calley received after being brought to trial after revelations of the US massacre of Vietnamese in My Lai, see his article in *The New York Times* (13 May 1971) p. 45, collected in this volume, pp. 00.

<sup>40</sup> Marcuse’s favorite book on the New Left at the time was A Disrupted History: The New Left and the New Capitalism, by Greg Calvert and Carol Neiman (New York: Random House, 1971); see CR&R, p. 10. See also The New Left: A Documentary History, ed. Massimo Teodori (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969). It is not an accident that the two most engaging books on the New Left and the explosive year of 1968 were by Marcuse students; see George Katsiaficas, The Imagination of the New Left, op. cit., and Andrew Feenberg and Jim Friedman, When Poetry Ruled the Streets. The French May Events of 1968. Albany: State University Press of New York, 2001. On the New Left, feminism, and cultural battles of the era, see Alice Echols, Shaky Grounds. The Sixties and Its Aftershocks (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002)

<sup>41</sup> It might be noted that the term ‘United Front’ historically signified in Marxian discourse a merger of left-wing parties, both in leadership and base (as with the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution), or at least a unity of action between working-class parties - and not a loose coalition of democratic groups and rebellious individuals. Marcuse’s concept is actually closer to what

---

has been called a ‘popular front’, in which separate parties, or groups, remain autonomous while they struggle for a ‘common programme’ or for specific goals. It seems that Marcuse’s use of the term ‘United Front’ serves as a rhetorical device which makes it appear that a coalition of democratic-populist groups may be the most promising force for developing a revolutionary movement in the United States. Obviously, discourses of the “Popular” or “United Front” do not resonate in the contemporary era, although discourses of alliance and solidarity have become an important part of politics today; see, for example, Steven Best and Douglas Kellner, The Postmodern Adventure (New York: Guilford Press, 2001).

<sup>42</sup> “Ecology and Revolution” is collected in this volume, pp. 000 and a later article “Ecology and the Critique of Modern Society” will be collected in a forthcoming volume in this series. On Marcuse’s ecological theory, see Timothy W. Luke, “Marcuse and Ecology” in Bokina and Lukes, op. cit., pp. 189-207.

<sup>43</sup>. On the Frankfurt school concept of the “reconciliation with nature,” see my book Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity (London and Baltimore: Polity and Johns Hopkins Press, 1989).

<sup>44</sup> Robert Sanford, “Marcuse on Revolution; Not In This Generation.” St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 13, 1977: 2f.

<sup>45</sup> Marcuse, BBC interview with Bryan Magee, published as part of Men of Ideas (London: BBC, 1978).

<sup>46</sup> The latter claim was made in a Progressive Labor article “Marcuse: Copout or Cop?” Progressive Labor, vol. 6, no. 6 (February 1969: 61-66. Marcuse was quite angered by this accusation and while he had worked for the OSS that was predecessor for the CIA he was a constant critic of the latter organization and of U.S. foreign policy in the 1960s and 1970s. For discussion of Marcuse’s wartime activities with U.S. intelligence services, see Technology, War, and Fascism, op. cit. and for responses from Marcuse and his wife Inge Marcuse to the charges of being a CIA agent, see their letters in Der Spiegel, Nr. 29/1969 criticizing spurious allusions to Marcuse’s CIA connection in a previous article.

<sup>47</sup> Marcuse, “Interview with Bryan Magee.”

<sup>48</sup> Marcuse, “Theory and Practice,” op. cit, pp. 32ff

<sup>49</sup> See the material in my book Karl Korsch: Revolutionary Theory. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.