

A map for countercultural art in the 1960s: Transcultural mobility and Art History

Juliana F. Duque

Universidade de Lisboa, Faculdade de Belas Artes

Contact: Juliana F. Duque jduque@campus.ul.pt

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the countercultural artistic expressions of the late 1960s as a transcultural phenomenon. These artistic expressions are the result of a network of ideas and trends, with an aesthetic born from the interchange among its participants. Despite its innovative character and the impact at the time, the relation of countercultural artistic practices within Art History is complex, not fitting into any precise artistic category or style.

The 1960s, stage of several social and political revolutions around the world, saw the rise of manifestations such as Psychedelia. The decade was also noted for an increment on migrations, with more people being able to travel overseas, leading to the fading of geographical, social, and mental barriers. With more connections and means for traveling, more countercultural artists and young participants, from all social ranges, had the opportunity to go abroad and overseas. That increased the attendance at events, from rallies to psychedelic gatherings, influencing music and other countercultural artistic performances, including graphic design, painting, or light shows.

Following the border-crossing tradition of the Beat Generation that got inputs from places such as Mexico, France, and even Russia years before, counterculture's participants created a multicultural mosaic composed by music, poetry, visual arts, and graphic design. From the analysis of the mobility of prominent counterculture figures such as Allen Ginsberg, Timothy Leary or the Beatles, as well as of the artistic expressions, it is possible to map the countercultural artistic flows during the late 1960s between the United States, Britain, and beyond. However, the transcultural combination of influences and trends, often boosted by hallucinatory substances, may explain why countercultural artistic practices such as Psychedelia got distant from Art History.

KEYWORDS

counterculture, 1960s, transcultural, transnational, countercultural artistic expressions, psychedelia, art history

Introduction

This paper focuses on the role that transcultural flows had on countercultural artistic manifestations, such as graphic design and the light shows, during the 1960s. Emerging in different parts of the world, counterculture, along with the creation of social and artistic trends, had its artistic manifestations shaped with the help of key figures and their mobility. The uniqueness of the counterculture of the 1960s seems to rely on “its social composition and its geographic breadth, expanding considerably on its cultural antecedents” (Suri 2009, 47). Although recent studies show a transcultural or transnational perspective of the 1960s, following historians such as David Farber (2011), there is still the need to extend this perspective onto the artistic realm.

Transculturality implies a notion of exchange, or a certain degree of interaction amongst different elements. It “offers a conceptual landscape for considering cultures as relational webs and flows of significance in active interaction with one another” (Benessaieh 2010, 11). The prefix “trans” already reveals that there is something that goes across, through, or even beyond an initial state, situation, or position. It indicates change or, according to Carpenter (2014), a poetic of “coming and going”. As a concept, it derives from factors such as migrations – including short travels – from different places, commingling distinct cultural traits. In the words of Benessaieh, transculturality “captures more adequately the sense of movement and the complex mixedness of cultures in close contact” (2010, 16).

The idea of transculturality, however, is not the sole means of interchange in counterculture: it is associated with transnational flows, thus overcoming national borders. During the 1960s, both transcultural and transnational inputs seem to have had affected countercultural manifestations, from those social and political to that artistic.

These concepts might help to explain why the 1960s is a rich period in social, cultural, political, and artistic movements, a bit all over the world (Goffman 2005; Blackman 2005; McKay 2005; Greenwood 2015). The post-war generation showed little interest to embrace the social models their parents were passing them, considering them obsolete and in some cases repressing, while society was regarded as conformist and severe in its morality and rules (Miles 2016). They rejected “not just the policies of their elders, but the very assumptions upon which their elders had built their authority” (Suri 2009, 47). Change thus became the goal for the many manifestations carried out by the young generation. Standing against the establishment made the young baby boomers blossom their own communication channels, creating a new countercultural wave. Counterculture, inspired by the mobility of predecessors such as the Beatniks, the on-the-road poets, had as bottom line the communication among participants – including those from different places and with diverse cultural backgrounds (Bertrand-Dorléac 1996; Salvatore 2016). The phenomenon would soon be seen as “an oppositional movement with distinct norms and values generated out of its conflictual interactions with the dominant society” (Auther and Lerner 2012, xix).

The countercultural artistic expressions of the late 1960s discussed in this paper - graphic design and the light shows – are major examples of the transcultural epiphenomenon that took place in this period, i.e., these manifestations were created, or at least affected, by transcultural contacts and transnational travels, or migrations, as a result of an interchange of ideas and artistic practices. Another aspect analyzed in this paper is how Art History has been regarding these transcultural artistic manifestations, or in this case “trans-countercultural”.

The choice of graphic design and light shows relies on the fact that both had a great impact at the time, attracting a lot of attention as well as large audiences. Being different expressions, yet still aesthetically related, graphic design and the light shows allow us to understand the diversity of the countercultural artistic manifestations. If the light shows themselves were at least initially depending on the music scene (although not exclusively), graphic design was developed also for other purposes, such as the countercultural press, so as to advertise rallies and every kind of underground events.

To attest the presence and efficiency of transcultural and transnational practices in countercultural graphic design and light shows it is important to follow not only the key figures of the epiphenomenon, such as Allen Ginsberg, Timothy Leary, or even the Beatles, but also to understand how these artistic practices were developed.

The light shows are an immediate example: matured in the United States, this practice “exploded” in the United Kingdom due to the presence of two Americans, Joel and Tony Brown, that were in London for a short visit (Wilson 2005; Salvatore 2016). Moreover, the transcendental character of this artistic practice is accentuated, among other factors, by transnational and transcultural movements that brought oriental meditative experiences to Europe and North America. On the other hand, countercultural graphic design seems to result from a direct blending of influences and interactions between elements of different countries and backgrounds, hence producing distinct varieties or styles – there is not a cohesive or unified style of countercultural graphic design, but rather visual and technical characteristics that are common to the graphic production of that time. Following the trends of the musical counterpart, graphic design, either in the United States or in the United Kingdom, was developed along with the mobility of countercultural participants in between both countries, and even other places such as India or Mexico. Examples of these transnational interactions can be observed on posters and record covers, the most iconic graphic materials of counterculture. However, this type of interaction was not solely established by western participants abroad. For instance, in the case of Indian influences, the role of Indian artists and intellectuals, such as musician Ravi Shankar or guru Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, that were travelling throughout Europe and America, was important. The same process happened in other parts of the world: in Brazil, the rise of Tropicália as a countercultural force reveals an influence of the psychedelic graphic design that was being produced both in America and Europe (consequently absorbing their influences too), melted with elements of a Brazilian identity. The mass media, functioning as a “gatherer”, by broadcasting and sharing (worldwide) countercultural music, rallies, and the visual artistic practices of the phenomenon, were also contributors to this process.

All these interactions enriched the countercultural phenomenon and its artistic manifestations. It is thus not possible to talk about graphic design or the light shows, without acknowledging the impact that the aforementioned forms of interchange had upon them. Beside the multiple influences coming from different parts of the world, resulting sometimes in direct cultural appropriations, migrations seem to have had an impact in the countercultural circles creating an “interrelated networks of people who all bought in to more or less same ideas and possibilities for the future” (Auther and Lerner 2012, xvii). Counterculture not only spread its goals and principles around the world – although with a greater impact in the West – as it gave and received inputs from different places at the same time. Without an eased mobility, favoring the connection of people from distinct parts of the world, perhaps it would have not been possible to create the countercultural epiphenomenon we know today.

The fading of frontiers in the 1960s

Borders can be seen as “regions”, whether physical or abstract, “within which meanings, forms of intellectualization and perception, motivations, self-awareness, attachments, loves, hatreds, ideas and art generate and decline” (Scott 2012, 161). First of all, the term implies the existence of limits: a separation between entities, from places to time, including concepts as thoughts. By defining limits as such, the concept of border opposes the values of counterculture, in which the very same limits should be surpassed, or even taken down for good. This element is thus important to understand counterculture, as well as the 1960s: the “spirit” of the decade is intimately connected to the blurring of borders and boundaries. Such event provided what Grunenberg calls a “favorable environment of imagination, experimentation and commitment”, through the coalescence of “art, politics and cultural circumstances” (2005, 17).

The fading of frontiers enabled both transcultural and transnational mobility – with “multiple exchanges and encounters” of “cultural intermingling and multiple identities” (Boudreau 2010, 71). According to Zhang, the emphasis on the prefix “trans”, already allows focusing on “elements of process and mobility characterizing transfer, transposition, transformation, transgression, transcendence, and boundary traversing” (2018, 278). All these elements are part, if not the core, of counterculture, being manifested through its social, political, and artistic spheres.

Having said that, the countercultural artistic manifestations, boosted by the fading of borders, were the fulcrum of “connectivity for the late 1960s, linking similarly minded people thousands of miles apart”, hence sharing a sense of community and goals (Broackes and Marsh 2016, 12). The whole phenomenon of counterculture was a reticular intertwining of orality, writing, sound, and visual expressions (Salvatore 2016). The communication between participants, crucial to the spread of counterculture, was being enhanced by the transcultural and transnational mobility of its key figures. During the 1960s, many of them crossed oceans, moving between countries, thus changing countercultural practices through interactions with local people: if they were bringing trends with them to those places, they were also getting inputs to bring back home.

Some authors documented several of these interchanges: the subjects vary from lists of countercultural events, to the transatlantic bridge and the socio economic realities that led to this accelerated network of knowledge and trends. Some examples that show perspectives on this subject are: *The social and (counter-) cultural 1960s in the USA, transatlantically* (2005), an essay where George McKay theorizes about the idea of a transatlantic counterculture in the 1960s with influences between the United States and the United Kingdom; *Transatlantic Sixties: Europe and the United States in the decade of counterculture* (2013), a compilation of several authors whose essays discuss the global flow in between the United States and Europe; *I Primi 4 secondi di Revolver e la crisi della canzone*, a book from Gianfranco Salvatore (2016) that discusses not only a transatlantic influence in music and culture, but also the interchanges with India; the exhibition catalogue of *You say you Want a Revolution: Records and Rebels 1966-1970* (2016) where Geoffrey Marsh, one of the curators, presents an essay on the transatlantic bridge, where he refers “a cultural exchange of ideas, sensibilities, sounds and images”, facilitated by the improvements on air travel (2016, 19).

The travels, including those not publicized at all, brought attention to the movement, promoting the transcultural interchanges. The examples (to be) discussed trace a map of the countercultural flows and

assess its consequences: early in the decade, the voyage of Ginsberg to India established a contact with the indo-himalayan spirituality (Guarnaccia 2017). These oriental trends – out of their context – became part of counterculture, bringing new forms of meditation that influenced artistic practices, from music to graphic design. For instance, the use of mandalas, or even the depiction of divinities, became recurrent in posters and record covers, reflecting an interchange with the East. This influence became so evident that *Life* magazine considered 1967 as the year of the guru. The oriental inputs were also seen in the social sphere, with practices such as meditation, vegetarianism, or a crescent ideology of non-violence (Salvatore 2016).

However, the Eastern inputs arrived in Europe and in the United States not only through a West-East flow, but also the other way around. These sociospatial and transcultural interactions provided an ongoing, always evolving, construction of identities (Boudreau 2010). From India and the Middle East to South America, the inputs were blended with those of the United States and United Kingdom, in the rise of counterculture (Darricau 2014).

Other interchanges of this kind occurred between the United States and the United Kingdom (Salvatore 2016). The countercultural gatherings held in both countries, with the presence of artists and other participants of the counterculture, either English or American, such as Timothy Leary, the Byrds, or even Joan Hills and Mark Boyle, also promoted an interchange that “connected” people and accentuated the values of counterculture – not to mention the overall influence of the Beatles that led to the “fever” of *Beatlemania* (Goffman 2005). There were likewise several interchanges between the United Kingdom and France, with happenings and other performances such as *La Fenêtre Rose* (Mellor 1996). The same kind of interaction has been established with other countries, such as Mexico or Japan, and the range of examples varies from the visual arts to philosophy, from music to literature. This “map” of interactions ultimately establishes what Roszak defined as a “subjective consciousness” of countercultural artistic performances, practices, and lifestyle (1969).

Graphic design and light shows

Both graphic design and the light shows, essential “ingredients” and visual outputs of counterculture, achieved great visibility (McKay 2005). Perhaps more associated to the psychedelic axis of the phenomenon, these practices, according to Rubin (2010), became ubiquitous in the late 1960s and, along with music, travelled throughout the world, aiming to blow minds and to represent the new countercultural wave. These underground artistic expressions became “the process, product, and remainder of endeavors to reimagine something no less than modern society at large” (Auther and Lerner 2012, xxvi). Besides the obvious mutual influences and mood, both practices were linked as part of a multimedia scene (Johnson 2011). Moreover, both presented an “amateurish-like” side, and perspired a “do-it-yourself” atmosphere.

Countercultural graphic design, excluding that from the United Kingdom and a few exceptions in the United States, was created by artists without professional training and made use of cheap printing processes. This reason, together with the visual “chaos” of colors and perception games, it was sometimes unrecognized by professional designers (Wild and Karwan 2015). Nonetheless, as a creative attitude able

to transform the society, in the words of Baur (2013), this kind of design was innovative, putting the (transcultural) process up front, hence enlivening the motto of Marshal McLuhan – the media is the message. With the focus on a method of interchanges, it expanded “into areas previously ruled by craft traditions, like newspaper design, and into the new media of television and video” (Hollis 1994,186). This expansion eventually changed graphic design, not only in posters and record covers, but also in the layouts of the underground press (Miles 2016).

The importance of this type of graphic design within the 1960s, a period fulfilled with intense counterculture publishing, is related to the growth of a youthful exuberance (Heller 2014). If we take a look at some of the graphic materials made during this fruitful period, it is possible to acknowledge the transcultural and transnational flows behind it, accentuated by the young participants of the counterculture. One of the first aspects to search for is the typography: distorted, almost illegible. The experiments with typography were inspired by those of Alfred Roller decades before (Grunenberg 2005). Initially “perfected” in the United States by the psychedelic graphic artist Wes Wilson, the typographic experiments crossed the Atlantic towards Europe. The poster *CLA UFO* (1967) designed by the English duo *The Hapshash and the Coloured Coat* is a clear example of this crossing. This poster shows the distorted – psychedelic-like – typography, mixing it with drawings of UFO’s, recurrent on the American imagery of the time. The whole paraphernalia is further blended with the British Arthurian world of mysterious castles, through illustration.

Another feature that seems to be transnational in countercultural graphic design is the presence of hallucinatory patterns. The use of such patterns, whose function is to mimic the effect of mental/visual hallucinations, seems to follow the proselytizing of LSD by Americans Timothy Leary and Ken Kesey while being inspired by the work of British artist Bridget Riley (Blackman 2005; Goffman 2005). The poster for the *14-Hour Technicolor Dream* (1967), designed by Michael McInnerney, as well as *Summer Sadness for John Hopkins*, featured in the countercultural magazine *International Times* number 14.5 (1967), created by *The Hapshash and the Coloured Coat*, represent well this cross-country characteristic. In both examples, the hallucinatory patterns are blended with a Beardsley-like illustration – the illustration style inspired in the Victorian artist Aubrey Beardsley was a common characteristic of the countercultural graphic design made in the United Kingdom.

Other examples, such as the use of oriental symbols, are shown in many posters and record covers in America and Europe. The album cover *In Blissful Company*, from the Quintessence (1969), designed by Barney Bubbles and J. Moonman, as well as the poster *Gay Liberation* (1970) by Peter Hujar, Suzanne Bevier, and SuNegrin, use symbols such as the mandala and other Hindu and Buddhist figures, together with western elements – they are thus the result of transcultural and transnational processes applied to graphic design. *A is for Apple* (1960s) by the collective *The Fool* is another example incorporating oriental features – many times understood as psychedelic – and those recurrent in western countries, such as the symbolism associated with the apple of Adam. Also *Hung on you*, a poster by *The Hapshash and the Coloured Coat* (1967), reveals a mix of oriental influences, in this case both Indian and Japanese, blended with the presence of disk-shaped UFO’s (again), and the Zodiac signs.

The poster *Are you Experienced* (1967) advertising Jimi Hendrix, designed by *The Hapshash and the Coloured Coat*, also results from transcultural and transnational inputs. In this case, it depicts Native Americans, showing how their imagery and cause were getting into countercultural graphic design, even outside the

United States – their homeland. The poster *Sam & Dave*, by American graphic artist Bonnie McLean (1967), portraying a totem, is another example representing the imagery of Native Americans.

Some materials are a melting pot of cultural references: *Exorcise the Pentagon*, by Martin Carey (1967) is an example of this complex mix with its multitude of references. So is *Listen Sleep Dream* (1967) by Wilfried Sätty, where he blends German and Russian references, and reveals “the residual effects of his childhood traumas in war-torn Nazi Germany” (Bisbort 1996, 29).

This transcultural/transnational process was a phenomenon that extended beyond the United States and the United Kingdom. The record cover of Belgian artist Ferre Grignard – of unknown author (Ferre Grignard – 1967), just as those of Brazilian musicians Caetano Veloso (Caetano Veloso – 1968) and Gilberto Gil (Frevo Rasgado – 1968), both designed by the Tropicalist graphic artist Rogério Duarte, show how the American and British psychedelic inputs travelled throughout the world.

Then, one of the best examples to show the turmoil of references and interchanges is the design made for the cover of The Beatles’ *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts club Band* (1967). Made by Peter Blake and Jann Haworth, the design shows all the important references for the band, from European Poets to Indian Gurus. The abundance of examples from different countries reflects the importance of transcultural/transnational flows had on counterculture artistic practices, and how graphic design, through posters and record covers, was a central medium in the mid-to-late 1960s (Poynor and Seago 2017).

Along with the popularity of graphic design during the late 1960s, there were the light shows, a kind of manifestation that was close to a disembodied color experience (Johnson 2011). Unlike graphic design, subject to mass production, this practice tended to be unique and consequently more ephemeral – no light show was exactly the same in that pre-digital period (Pouncey 1999; Bénard 2015).

The biomorphic nature of this artistic practice made it trendy during the period, showing “a more elastic definition of the notion of the medium” (Zinman 2008, 17). Also called as “liquid light”, due to the use of liquid coloring materials, as already defined in 1969 by Wier, this countercultural manifestation crossed oceans together with music and fulfilled the psychedelic desire, providing visual representations of the whole music experience (Miles 2016; Hathaway and Nadel 2011).

Overall, the transnational and transcultural character of counterculture is born from something as “being in the right place at the right moment”. In the case of the light shows, this characteristic becomes evident, as they seem to be the result of an interchange of aesthetical principles and techniques. The liquid lights were being developed in the United States, with groups such as the *Joshua Light Show*, *Light and Space*, or the *Light Sound Dimension* (LSD), and in Europe with Mark Boyle and Joan Hills, later forming the *Sensual Laboratory*, adding a performance element to the show. On the other hand, if the introduction of this practice within the music scenario in the United Kingdom (for a *Pink Floyd* concert) is due to the short visit of Americans Joel and Tony Brown at the *London Free School*, it is also true that Mark Boyle later perfected the technique and started spreading it (Wilson 2005; Salvatore 2016).

The light shows eventually became the product of a transnational process “associated with the emergence of psychedelic rock music” (Grunenberg 2005, 21). With an accentuated theatrical character, this practice, which was touring along the rock groups through different countries, urged for an effect that Harare

(2017) refers as “mind-expansion”, contributing also to the blurring of the barrier between artist/audience and to the search of an aesthetically totalizing experience (Molon 2007).

Perhaps one of the most memorable light shows was that of the *Single-Wing Turquoise Bird*, a group that started to be seen only in 1968 in Los Angeles. This light show managed to combine an abstract component, seen in the other light shows, with figurative images of diverse cultural sources, from the Native Americans to India. Here, the cultural influences of the group “intersected with the light installations of James Turrell and other of the Light and Space movement dominant in Los Angeles at the time” (James 2008, 16). It is also important to note that improvisation played a crucial part in this show, with the projectors being played just as the musical instruments, i.e.; the displayed images could result from the latest contacts and interchanges of the group.

The “trans-countercultural” phenomenon in art history

The previous studies with a transcultural perspective tend to be focused on the broader countercultural epiphenomenon, or at least in its social counterpart. This premise suggests the greater visibility of the socio-political axis and its consequences on society. After all, the decade represents today a time of protest and rebellion with identifiable cultural motifs (Stephens 1998). Moreover, the phenomenon is known to have opened a path of social transformations that continues to challenge our contemporary world (Pinchbeck 2010).

Such circumstance may also derive from a premise in which much of the art that was being made under a countercultural “label”, was considered more as part of the lifestyle, rather than art at all, or it was just perceived as “too much” (Larsen 2003; Auther and Lerner 2012; Harare 2017). Furthermore, unlike its contemporary Pop Art, the countercultural artistic production would be “undertaken outside the disciplinary boundaries of art – beyond studios, galleries, and museums – and enacted in the public spaces and places of popular life” (Blauvelt 2015, 11). This process of “aestheticisation of everyday life”, as Larsen describes it, made counterculture “indifferent towards the art concept”, overcoming the artistic non-conformity of its manifestations, including both graphic design and the light shows (2013). In short, instead focusing on the artistic object itself, counterculture was “identified with rock and roll, fashion, drugs, sex, and radical politics” (Drucker and McVarish 2009, 281).

Perhaps another element pushing this “popular/non-artistic” point of view is the agglomeration of all countercultural production under the psychedelic marker (Harris 2005; Blauvelt 2015; Duncan 2013). Although not all the countercultural artistic production was psychedelic, it is still associated with the psychedelic mood: a heavy use of LSD, the desire for transcendence, and an amateurish-like style composed of super bright colors, hallucinatory patterns, as well as cheap materials and production (albeit not exclusively).

Finally, the rapid marketization process during the 1960s may also have been disguising the countercultural artistic production, or “hiding” it behind commercial purposes – drifting away from an artistic scope. As a business of collectivities, as Larsen puts it (2014), ranging from the streets to the press, the countercultural artistic manifestations became hybrid, and thus difficult to categorize (Auther and Lerner 2012).

In Short

The 1960s, period of multiple technological and social changes, witnessed the fading of frontiers, either those geographical and those of “the mind”, in a phenomenon that allowed the spread of ideas, movements, and aesthetics (Gerverau and Mellor 1996). The contact between different people ultimately helped creating the countercultural flows that led to “a new world of cultural experiences and social rituals”, i.e., a whole lifestyle (Blauvelt 2015, 17). While the new technologies for communication and travel were pointing to the event of globalization, according to Alvin Tofler (1970), the decade itself became notable for showing “acts of protest and rebellion, a distinctive cultural mood”, and a special “style or atmosphere” (Stephens 1998, 10). An unprecedented speed, or the “critical space” defined by Paul Virilio (2000), was boosting this phenomenon, in which the acceleration of the communication media and means of transport created a time where “everything was moving faster and faster” (Duncan 2013, 155). As a consequence, “there was not a single focus, but many, crossing causes and continents” (Broackes and Marsh 2016, 12).

The “barrier-blurring” process, both transcultural and transnational, managed to get immersed in all the spheres of counterculture, structuring the artistic practices, including graphic design and the light shows. Both practices were ubiquitous visual forms, whose color, shapes and materials started guiding both the audience and the artists in the 1960s (Rageot-Deshayes and Pasi 2016).

It is pertinent to point out that the discussed transcultural and transnational character of counterculture may have been accentuated during the 1960s due to the aforementioned technological changes and improvements in the means of traveling, occurred in that period. It became easier – in terms of cost and stress – to travel than ever before. With this ease on travel, there was a consequent increase on migrations, allowing artists and intellectuals from all around the world, to travel abroad (Marsh 2016). The migrations that took place in this period, by participants of the counterculture or by people that could influence them, led to an interchange in between people from distant places, with different ideas, as well as social and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, the study of a transcultural and transnational perspective of the artistic practices of counterculture helps understanding the composition of the whole phenomenon and the countercultural artistic mosaic of the 1960s, composed by direct intersections of a multitude of people, influences, and places.

Although Art History seems to be confounded by the discussed countercultural artistic practices, due to their hybridity and commercial purposes, according to Criqui (2005), both manifestations – graphic design and the light shows – have been taken into consideration with some exhibitions in the last years, perhaps due to their involving nature. After all, both practices – overcoming possible tensions between design and art – were considered art pieces themselves (Bénard 2015). The transcultural and transnational processes might not have been the direct reason why Art History tended to overlook some of these countercultural practices. However, these processes – or the way they were built – seem to be at least indirectly related, once one of the problems appointed by art-historians was the amalgam of influences reflected either in graphic design and the light shows (Blackman 2005). Nonetheless, the presence of the transcultural/transnational process seems to be an important element for the construction of these practices, and one that defines its identity.

Bibliography

- Author, Elisa, and Adam Lerner. *West of Center: art and the counterculture experiment in America, 1965-1977*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Baur, Ruedi. *Les 101 mots du design graphique à l'usage de tous*. Paris: Archibooks, 2013.
- Bénard, Jean-Do. *Dictionnaire du psychedelisme 1965-1969*. Rosières-en-Haye: Camion-Blanc, 2015.
- Benessaïeh, Afef. "Multiculturalism, Interculturality, 'Transculturality.'" In *Amériques Transculturelles - Transcultural Americas*, edited by Benessaïeh Afef, 11-38. University of Ottawa Press, 2010. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1ch78hd.4>.
- Bisbort, Alan. *The White Rabbit and Other Delights. East totem West: A Hippie Company, 1967-1969*. Rohnert Park: Pomegranate Artbooks, 1996.
- Blackman, Cally. "Clothing the Cosmic Counterculture: Fashion and Psychedelia." In *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, edited by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, 201-222. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.
- Blauvelt, Andrew. "The barricade and the dance floor: aesthetic radicalism and the counterculture." In *Hippie Modernism: the struggle for Utopia*, edited by Andrew Blauvelt, 15-30. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 2015.
- Boudreau, Julie-Anne. "Moving Through Space and Being Moved Emotionally: Embodied Experience of Transculture." In *Amériques Transculturelles - Transcultural Americas*, edited by Benessaïeh Afef, 69-90. University of Ottawa Press, 2010. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1ch78hd.6>.
- Broackes, Victoria and Geoffrey Marsh. *You say you want a revolution: records and rebels 1966-1970*. London: V&A Publishing, 2016.
- Carpenter, J. R. "Translation, Transmutation, Transmediation, and Transmission in Trans.Mission [A.Dialogue]". Laboratoire NT2, 2014. <http://nt2.uqam.ca/en/cahiers-virtuels/article/translation-transmutation-transmediation-and-transmission-transmission>. (accessed on November 14, 2018).
- Criqui, Jean Pierre. "High Art." *Art-Forum*, January 2005.
- Darricau, Stéphane. *Culture graphique: une perspective. De Gutenberg à nous jours*. Paris: Pyramyd, 2014.
- Bertrand-Dorléac, Laurence. « Demain, vous serez tous des artistes. » In *Les Sixties: Années Utopies*, organized by Laurent Gerverau and David Mellor, 30-55. Paris: Somogy Editions d'Art, 1996.
- Duncan, Russell. "The Summer of Love and Protest: Transatlantic Counterculture in the 1960s." In *The Transatlantic Sixties: Europe and the United States in the Counterculture Decade*, edited by Kosciuszko Grzegorz, Juncker Clara, Monteith Sharon, and Waldschmidt-Nelson Britta, 144-73. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1wxt2b.9>.
- Drucker, Johanna and Emily McVarish. *Graphic Design History: a critical guide*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009.
- Farber, David. "THE RADICAL SIXTIES." *Reviews in American History* 39, no. 4 (2011): 712-17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41348930>.

- Rageot-Deshayes, Gaëlle and Marco Pasi. *Vidya Gastaldon: Les Rescapés*. Les Sables-d'Olonne: Société des Amis du Musée de l'Abbaye Sainte-Croix, 2016.
- Gerverau, Laurent and David Mellor. *Les Sixties: Années Utopies*. Paris: Somogy Editions d'Art, 1996.
- Goffman, Ken. *Counter Culture through the ages: from Abraham to Acid House*. New York: Villard Books, 2005.
- Greenwood, Katie. *100 ans de couleur: Art, Graphisme, Design, un siècle d'inspiration*. Paris: Éditions Eyrolles, 2015.
- Grunenberg, Christoph. *Summer of Love: Art of the Psychedelic Era*. London: Tate, 2005.
- Guarnaccia, Matteo. *Hippie Revolution: storie e avventure dalla Summer of Love 1967-2017*. Milan: 24 Ore Cultura, 2017.
- Harare, Guido. *Stone Free*. Alba: Wall of Sound Editions, 2017.
- Harris, Jonathan. "Abstraction and Empathy: Psychedelic Distortion and the meaning of the 1960s". In *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, edited by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, 9-18. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.
- Hathaway, Norman and Dan Nadel. *Electrical Banana: Masters of Psychedelic Art*. Bologna: Damiani, 2011.
- Heller, Steven. *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design*. New York: Allworth Press. 3rd Edition, 2014.
- Hollis, Richard. *Graphic Design: A concise history*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1994.
- James, David E. "Rock 'n' Roll and Expanded Cinema in L.A." *American Art* 22, no. 2 (2008): 14-16. doi:10.1086/591165.
- Johnson, Ken. *Are you experienced? How psychedelic consciousness transformed modern art* New York: Prestel, 2011.
- Larsen, Lars Bang. "Infernal Rodeo." *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry*, no. 7 (2003): 92-103. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20711500>.
- Larsen, Lars Bang. "One Proton at a Time. Art's Psychedelic Connections." Raven Row, 2013. <http://www.ravenrow.org/texts/51/> (accessed on October 1, 2018).
- Larsen, L. "Irritable Matters: An Interview with Lars Bang Larsen," interview by Silvia Mollicchi and Helen Stuhr-Rommereim, 2014. http://www.fufufo.com/post/lbl_interview/
- Marsh, Geoffrey. "A tale of two cities: London, San Francisco and the transatlantic bridge". In *You say you want a Revolution: Records and rebels 1966-1970*, edited by Victoria Broackes and Geoffrey Marsh, 16-55. London: V&A Publishing, 2016.
- McKay, George. "The Social and (counter-) cultural 1960s in the USA, transatlantically". In *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, edited by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, 35-62. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press; Tate Liverpool, 2005.
- Mellor, David. "Demain commence maintenant. Utopie et culture visuelle ». In *Les Sixties: Années Utopies*, organized by Laurent Gerverau and David Mellor, 12-29. Paris: Somogy Editions d'Art, 1996.
- Miles, Barry. "The Counterculture". In *You say you want a revolution: Records and rebels 1966-1970*, edited by Victoria Broackes and Geoffrey Marsh, 98-135. London: V&A Publishing, 2016.

- Molon, Dominic. *Sympathy for the Devil: Art and Rock and Roll Since 1967*. New Have: Yale University Press; Chicago: Museum of Contemporary Art, 2007.
- Pinchbeck, Daniel. "Embracing the Archaic: Postmodern Culture and Psychedelic Initiation". In Rubin, S. D. (Ed.) *Psychedelic: Optical and Visionary Art since the 1960s*, edited by David S. Rubin, 49-57. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
- Pouncey, Edwin. "Light Laboratories: Lightshows of the Beat Era". *Frieze*, May 6, 1999. <https://frieze.com/article/light-laboratories>.
- Poynor, Rick and Alex Seago. "Where is Pop? In search of the British Pop Poster". In *Pop Art and Design*, edited by Anne Massey and Alex Seago, 186-205. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017.
- Scott, Charles E. "Cultural Borders." *Research in Phenomenology*42, no. 2 (2012): 157-205. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24659727>.
- Roszak, Theodore. *The making of a counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Opposition*. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.
- Rubin, David S. *Psychedelic: Optical and Visionary Art since the 1960s*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
- Salvatore, Gianfranco. *I primi 4 secondi di Revolver: La cultura pop degli anni sessanta e la crisi della canzone*. Torino: EDT, 2016.
- Stephens, Julie. *Anti-disciplinary protest: sixties radicalism and postmodernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Suri, Jeremi. "The Rise and Fall of an International Counterculture, 1960-1975." *The American Historical Review* 114, no. 1 (2009): 45-68. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30223643>.
- Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Virilio, Paul. *A Velocidade da Liberdade*. Translated by Edmundo Cordeiro. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água, 2000.
- Wier, D. R. "Light Shows: A Kinetic Art Technique Using Chemicals." *Leonardo* 2, no. 3 (1969): 251-56. doi:10.2307/1572154.
- Wild, Lorraine and David Karwan. "Agency and Urgency: the medium and its message". In *Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia*, edited by Andrew Blauvelt, 44-57. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 2015.
- Wilson, Andrew. "Spontaneous underground: an introduction to London Psychedelic Scenes, 1965-1968." In *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, edited by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, 63-98. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press; Tate Liverpool, 2005.
- Zhang, Ling. "Rhythmic Movement, Metaphoric Sound, and Transcultural Transmediality: Liu Na'ou and The Man Who Has a Camera (1933)." In *Early Film Culture in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Republican China: Kaleidoscopic Histories*, edited by Yeh Emilie Yueh-yu, 277-302. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt22727c7.15>.
- Zinman, Gregory. "The Joshua Light Show: Concrete Practices and Ephemeral Effects." *American Art* 22, no. 2 (2008): 17-21. doi:10.1086/591166.