

THE MOVEMENT OF 1968

Acts of Memory and Struggles of Signification

We often talk about '68, and the many '68s around the world, as if the date itself were the site in which a singular plural memory took place. In contrast to earlier periods of mass uprising (such as 1848), 1968 is usually considered one of the first moments in which more spontaneous and simultaneous uprisings took place across the globe, including northern and southern regions of the so-called Third World.¹ Yet the movements of '68 are often mired in the realm of the unclassifiable for having demanded a process of emancipation and democratization that did not conform to traditional representative politics (a party or a specific petition). To play off the idea proposed by Daniel Bensaïd and Henri Weber in *May 1968: a General Repetition*, 1968 has gradually become a kind of open “rehearsal” of history: a rehearsal whose premiere is missing and yet lingers on as a promise of future performances.² The idea is taken up again in the classic study by Giovanni Arrighi, Terence Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein on antisystemic movements, suggesting that '68 resurfaces as a historical citation, inspiration, or reference each time a new social movement breaks out—particularly those that are characterized by their brevity and the breadth of their demand for political transformation.³

Thus 1968 has continually reappeared in the streets, tweets, and memes circulated across the globe from 2011 onward (i.e., simultaneously in Greece, Spain, the United States, Mexico, Chile), concurrent with the crafting of new social responses to political and economic crises (15-M, Occupy Wall Street, #YoSoy132, the Chilean student movement). Taken as either something to leave in the past—as shown by an iconic piece of graffiti in Klafthmonos Square, Greece, at the beginning of the mobilization of 2008: “Fuck May 68, Fight Now”—or as an inspiration for overcoming local obstacles and evaluating the relationships between movements worldwide (the “global” revolution), 1968 keeps recurring in the imaginaries of different presents. Throughout the decades, it has returned or

reemerged—as a cascade of singular emancipatory moments around the world, or as a sort of *scream* that reverberates over and over again—to use the image that John Holloway proposes in order to approach movements that attempt to *change the world without taking power*.⁴ In the introduction to a recent journal issue dedicated to examining the relationship between 1968 and its futures, Kostis Kornetis uses the terms *surplus of utopia* and *inheritance of utopia* as connecting threads that bind reincarnations of '68 together more broadly and across time.⁵ Recent works on the global 1968s, such as *The Long 1968* and *Protests in the Streets*, make reference to the global mobilizations that started in 2011, pointing to a common impulse to change the system without relying on the authority of a specific ideology or a party.⁶ At the same time, references to '68 made by 2011 movements mention this axial year either to put words to something that is difficult to qualify as positive or negative (the idea of a movement without specific demands) or to defer to the authority of those who participated in '68 and their “judgment” of the new movement. In a paradoxical gesture, '68 works as a signal that helps to name the ambiguity and open character of the new movements; that is, it becomes a reference for something difficult to define from within the parameters of traditional politics.

We can ask ourselves: How does 1968 manifest itself in each of these returns? How has it been evoked in so many disparate circumstances? If we strip away the stigma imposed by the dominant European and American imaginary, what meaning lies beneath? For several decades, these questions have begun to take shape, questioning the leading imaginaries of '68 so often shaped by stigmas from the Global North. As we approach the fiftieth anniversary of '68, we face a series of inquiries: Is there anything left to say? What kind of memories can intervene to destabilize the dominant imaginary at such a crucial moment, which is widely considered the inception of a global consciousness? Nearly five decades after '68, we may find it curious that the proliferation of monuments that freeze the dynamic of the time contrasts with the need to go on constructing detailed studies that purport to *open up* the mainstream media narrative to other voices and views. Although the majority of anniversaries function as opportunities for monumentalization, they can also become *spaces for questioning* and *reconsidering timelines*, thus raising the possibility of depicting historical watersheds in new ways. As Katherine Hite contends, commemorations operate not only as exercises in recognition (generally led by the state with a conciliatory bent) but also as moments that revive the potential to transform “past meanings” in order to mobilize the present.⁷ Clearly, many of the chords that 2011 strikes with 1968 have to do with the emergence of a series of views and forms of experimenting

with the political that seemed to have been mutilated by the neoliberal era. By this I refer to the development of a capacity for self-organization, mutual aid, horizontal assemblies, the occupation of public spaces, and the development of sui generis organizational strategies. Also, 2011, like '68, occurred at a time when mobilizations could acquire a new global scope, thanks to new information and communication technologies—in this case, social networks.⁸ This marks the reemergence of something from the distant past that seemed to have been crushed by the overwhelming force of repressive acts in response to the collective organization of the sixties. This “something” seemed to have more to do with a horizon of change—the opening of the present to an array of possible transformations—than to specific, tangible content at each juncture. In this particular recurrence of '68, the connection between past and present was forged by an emancipatory desire for the collective transformation of the everyday, suspending more dominant versions of the memory of the past, which are usually darkened by the repression that followed. Generally, within discursive as well as media spheres, the idea of a “politics of memory” is often related to traumatic moments of repression, forging a metonymic bond between memory and atrocity that we have somehow naturalized; however, this connection buries the memory of movements in which a desire for collective and everyday forms of emancipation awakened. Consequently, from the expansion of studies on memories of the Holocaust, to official or camouflaged dictatorial regimes in Latin America and southern Europe, to the proliferation of wars and antiterrorist campaigns, a general *imbalance* seems to exist between the memory of horror and that of collective processes of emancipation.

In the introduction to her classic *May '68 and Its Afterlives*, Kristin Ross alludes to this phenomenon when she says that the near-instantaneous association between memory and atrocity has “in turn . . . de-familiarized us from any understanding, or even perception, of a ‘mass event’ that does not appear to us in the register of ‘catastrophe’ or ‘mass extermination.’ ‘Masses,’ in other words, have come to mean masses of dead bodies, not masses of people working together to take charge of their collective lives.”⁹ Undoubtedly, this observation prompts us to consider how we might configure a memory that elicits forms of pleasure, collective empowerment, and disappointment instead of trauma. Trying to move slightly beyond the ongoing history punctuated by state and capital with their multiple forms of repression, it is important to note that the general preponderance of interest in studying memories of horror and death remains problematic when those memories are stripped from an analysis of the struggles for collective emancipation embodied by the repressed movements.

Clearly, the as-yet-“unofficial” nature of much of the violence employed in the sixties, seventies, and eighties explains this, but it is also important to expand the practical and semantic boundaries of the word *memory* so as to encompass processes that are not merely punctuated by the necrological apparatuses of a repressive state. In the case of Latin America, “museums of memory” usually concentrate more on accounting for violence and state repression in those decades than on uncovering the processes of reconfiguring freedom that were also characteristic of the historical moments that had been harshly annihilated. A crucial issue at stake here is how, by overemphasizing the role of repression and death, one loses sight of the means by which the state perpetuates its prolonged massacre of movements and dreams of freedom. As we will see, this is a particularly crucial problem when we approach Mexico 1968 because, as Bruno Bosteels states, the merciless state massacre at Tlatelolco “put its stamp retroactively on any interpretation of the events leading up to the brutal repression.” This made melancholy and shame the main forces guiding the signifying processes of one of the most important political events. He argues that a different history of the events could be written “not from the perspective of the state but from the *subjective principle of equality* that universally resists the excessive power of the state.”¹⁰ Thus, a challenge for nearly “fifty years” of ‘68s—in all their manifestations (the long 1960s, the long 1968s)—consists of figuring out how to disentangle memory from massacre and terror without committing a naïve act of pure positivity or an epic affirmation of militancy that refuses to interrogate its own internal problems and contradictions. This task entails weaving dominant narratives of memory together with the *sui generis* mobilizations of those years, thus opening up memory to forms of communication and transformation that expand its capacity, particularly when that memory is linked to a historical moment marked by the radical interrogation of classic representational politics. Along these lines, I am reminded of Alain Badiou’s reflections, when he says that we are contemporaries of ‘68, at least regarding its problematization of emancipation: “We can say that we are still struggling with the difficult questions raised by May ‘68. We are the contemporaries of ‘68 from the point of view of politics, the definition of politics, and the organized future of politics. I therefore use the word ‘contemporary’ in the strongest possible sense. . . . Of course, the world has changed, and of course, categories have changed. . . . But *we have the same problem*, and are the contemporaries of the problem revealed by May ‘68: the classical figure of the politics of emancipation proved ineffective.”¹¹ We may well ask what this question regarding emancipation would mean if we were to transpose it into the realm of *memories* of ‘68, especially when it requires suspend-

ing the automatism with which official memories of '68 have been reproduced. In short, *what would an emancipation of memories of '68 look like?* Surely this possibility would introduce a new field of sayability, forging new meanings from the figure of emancipation in question. Thus, rather than entering into a discussion of the oversaturation of memorialist cultures in recent decades, I would like to briefly address the question of what it would mean to go beyond the “depoliticization” of '68, which Bosteels, Luisa Passerini, and Ross associate with those memorial processes, in the interest of opening other horizons for political memories.

Ross examines how forms of depoliticization, understood as the erasure of the innovative political dimension of '68, accomplished two processes that can be projected onto the experience of other countries, three of which are directly applicable to Mexico: reducing the event to a family conflict (“kids” versus adults) that is both generational ('68 as the concern of a particular generation) and transitional ('68 as a transition “toward”). To this Passerini adds the strategy of oscillating between mythicization and denigration, whereby a number of memorialist works end up producing a “void full of words of exaltation or denigration.”¹² Depoliticization connotes a powerful moralizing operation, postulating the question of how we might foster alternative approaches to memories and processes of transformation that extend beyond good and evil. Thus, the question of whether it is possible to avoid those registers bears important implications for our intellectual work, where we operate as collectors of memories, activating or paralyzing their potentiality through reflection. It also affects our critical capacity to indicate how the very idea of memory has often been weighed down by the same habits of accumulation encouraged by the glorified consumption of recent decades.¹³

Although this book focuses on 1968 Mexico, it is important to note that over the past few decades, a shift began to take place in academic studies of the so-called global sixties in reaction to the fact that common mappings of the movement systematically exclude the countries of the Global South. This has opened up a number of new lines of questioning about the 1960s and '68; take for example a recent volume, *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, edited by Samantha Christiansen and Zachary Scarlett, which attempts to map the global sixties by including only so-called Third World countries, while omitting connections to similar experiences in the United States and Europe. Although it is clear that the goal of the editors was to redraw the map of the decade from a totally different perspective, there is also a danger in omitting the 1968s in the north, as this runs the risk of reproducing the same division the authors are trying to

overcome. For across many 1968s, significant events involved the possibility of acknowledging and visualizing the many “souths” within the north, and vice versa, particularly because hard north-south divisions were a problematic structure that the 1968s made visible.¹⁴ Another work, *New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness*, offers an alternate view of the decade; bridging north and south, it proposes to examine how a global consciousness was built, adopting the struggles for liberation and decolonization in Third World countries as its focus.¹⁵ In the same tone but from a different perspective—centered on northern and southern Europe—the journal edited by Kornetis looks at the periodization of and communication among various 1968 and “long 1960s” movements: “This period . . . was characterized by a series of ‘cultural transfers’ that provided the missing link between protest movements; anti-authoritarian clashes and liberation struggles were facilitated by the globalizing tendencies that were brought about by new technologies, in particular television, that led to new forms of communication.”¹⁶ By identifying a series of points, Kornetis configures what he calls a mechanism of “cultural transfer” to explain the connectivity between ’68 in various mediums (rock music, the news, libraries, certain authors, etc.).

In addition to the different lines of study that the global sixties have opened, I would like to call attention to the rich line of analysis of the ’68s that focuses on studies of local mobilizations that defied national imaginaries. Perhaps it is the pioneering work of Ross that furnishes us with a series of fundamental questions that we need in order to uniquely deconstruct and analyze the version of ’68 that was promoted most around the world (as in the case of France’s May 1968). By discharging the ideological burden of monumentalization and studying the long exercise in depoliticization and dehistoricization that followed, Ross provides a new way of approaching the event. She dismantles the assumed “national” categories and acknowledges the internal colonialism so crucial to that moment. Along these lines, comparing the 1968s has been a task largely undertaken by sociologists and historians, with studies of individual nations united in volumes, anthologies, and so on. However, it is important to remember that 1968 was a key moment for the expression of a deep crisis within national grammars. Most of the liberation movements involved a radical critique of national tropes, as well as a national and international labor of deconstruction that laid the groundwork for new methodological queries. According to George Katsiaficas, “the worldwide episodes of revolt in 1968 have generally been analyzed from within their own national context; but it is in reference to the global constellation of forces and to each other that these movements can be understood in theory as they occurred in practice.”¹⁷ This is crucial, and

it also makes us wonder about what perspective we can take in order to come up with these simultaneous relations and processes. That is, how can a broad international analysis hope to achieve a deep and critical analysis of the political transformations at stake in so many disparate protests? While I agree with Katsiasficas's point, I would caution that international views often become *panoramic* overviews of a moment, wherein little attention is paid to the *nuances* and *complexities* of the specific form that each 1968 took within its own national-international dialectic. For instance, the expansive international scope of Katsiasficas's book leaves little room for analyzing the singular forms that movements took *beyond a mere description of protest-repression*. References to the "international" scene usually relegate minor instances of 1968 to the simple trope of "protest-repression," disregarding the struggle and political reinvention implicated in them.¹⁸ These take us back to the question of the primacy that repressive categories have when mass events are studied.

I would like to introduce the idea of the singular-plural as a form of decentering the narrative of a national unity that is radically split by such movements, simply by asking basic questions about the internal colonialism and racism of the era. I suggest that the singular-plural provides a way to write a history of the poetic political gesture that is 1968 from within the very crisis of national imagination that it brought about. How do we relate the singular-plural (non-unified, nonhomogeneous) to a fragmentary totality (the world, in the process of being changed)? In other words, how do we reconcile singularity with a process of historicizing complex unities? Given the singular-plural element of the event, we could make an argument for sustaining two simultaneous maps that honor the double temporality of '68. The first would present *a new way of inhabiting the present*—an irreverent impulse that opposes established cultural and political authorities and suffuses the present with the possibility of change. The second endeavors to reveal *an alternate history*, or the voicing of historical realities that had been smothered by dominant national narratives.¹⁹ The latter refers to a long history of internal colonialism that emerged in the sixties and became a crucial channel through which to reconfigure temporal and political circumstances. In the case of Mexico, many accounts describe '68 not only as a watershed moment but also as an *awakening* to a previously unknown Mexico, to a reality that had been stifled or marginalized up until that point. In the great northern metropolises, this same awakening—the role Algeria played in France's May revolt, as Ross masterfully demonstrates; the parallel role of the African American liberation movement in the United States, and so on—is often omitted from the mass-media stereotypes of the '68s.²⁰ Accordingly, the plurality of expressions of this unprecedented dislodging of the universal

narrative of nations takes us down two branching paths: national and international, each influenced by similar tropes—that is, the desire to democratize political structures, the participation of people who had never gotten involved in politics before, and the re-signification of freedom beyond the dichotomy hitherto imposed on the emancipatory narrative: the liberal imaginary versus dogmatic Marxism.

We can say that nearly fifty years after '68, much remains to be analyzed. The emergence of new perspectives on '68—such as Vania Markarian on the Uruguayan '68 and Ross on the French '68—signals a desire to build alternative memories, disentangling and deconstructing official attempts to undermine the movement's singular political force by controlling how it is remembered. They bring forth the disruptive capacity of '68 as a *sui generis* opportunity to proactively challenge sclerotic political institutions, triggering a dislocation of roles, social classes, and even accepted ways of intervening in politics. Markarian stresses the importance of identifying counterculture and singular forms of militancy that have been removed from the dominant memory of Uruguay '68, which is usually framed within a teleological process that leads to military dictatorship. Opening up the past to its own singularity means looking at still indistinct, everyday forms of organization that remain muffled beneath the crushing landslide of history. Ross approaches the same problematic from a different angle by studying the way mainstream memory domesticated France's '68, concealing the power and uniqueness of such a radical upheaval of fixed social positions and roles. Trapped in the familiar frame of a generation, a category of youth (a passing, fitful rebellion), the month of May, and a single neighborhood in Paris (*le quartier latin*), this revolution—an entire national political process that transcended sectors and classes—has been restricted to a small university yard and the primacy of a single voice: masculine authority and leadership. As we will see, many voices have begun to contribute to the discursive effort to rewrite Mexico '68, pointing out similar problems. It is almost as though, when the time came to think and remember the '68s, some dominant patron took over and privileged certain subjects—students, men, leaders—over others. So besides problematizing the northern paradigm (Paris, United States, Prague), there is still much to review and contemplate. For example, how does changing the perspective on and composition of memories of '68 alter our conception of the moment? Each instance of re-creation entails tracing a path from the event to the discourses that have reconfigured it in the present.

As for various discourses on Mexico '68, one can perceive a certain contemporary impulse to question dominant voices by opening the past to other

interpretations. Consequently, a text such as Gladys López Hernández's, published in 2013, which I will analyze in the final chapter, compels us to acknowledge how the official memory of '68 has not only reiterated masculine leadership but also upholds a clear schema of social class by elevating certain memories and discarding others. Usually, the symbol of the National Strike Council (Consejo Nacional de Huelga, CNH) works as a space for authorizing dominant memories of '68; but this tends to omit all the structures that made that organization possible: assemblies, committees of struggle (*comités de lucha*) at each school, brigades that wove the movement into the social fabric. Omitted too are certain crucial agents of the democratization of knowledge, such as the Popular Preparatory (Preparatoria Popular) schools or efforts to establish cooperative forms of knowledge(s) between students and the people of Topilejo.²¹ Seen in this light, it is intriguing that such hierarchical structures of memory have been imposed on such a profoundly democratizing moment. Half a century after the event, we can begin to delve into other areas, seeking more horizontal, less "proper" forms or memory that add ethical depth to current narratives. In so doing, we perceive how the democratization of memory can itself become a new iteration of the poetic gesture of that moment. Thus, the memory of the life and after-life of '68 around the world becomes a field of struggle for conflicting modes of signifying the past from the present that demands new, more democratic perspectives on a democratizing event. Creating space for new memories offers us recourse to interrupt and influence the present with a more expansive, singular past.

*The Struggle for Signification:
Memories and Accounts of '68 in Mexico*

In the dominant map of the 1968s, Mexico occupies a peculiar interstitial space of north and south because it hosted the Olympic games that year, generating considerable visibility just days after the Tlatelolco massacre. Thus, on the international stage, the Mexican '68 is typically characterized by two events: Tlatelolco and the Olympic games. The paradoxical and perverse juxtaposition of the massacre to the games (diversion, repression) is generally supplemented by the act of political protest that took place during the awards ceremony, when African American athletes Tommie Smith and John Carlos made the "Black Power salute" in a gesture that spread around the world like wildfire but dampened their future careers considerably.²² Due to the international nature of the Olympic Games and their immediate association with the terrible

massacre in Tlatelolco—with which the state attempted to dissolve the noise of the mobilizations and attract the entire international tourist population—Mexico strikes a paradoxical, dissonant chord in the greater symphony of '68s. The international memories of the moment's capacity to question the roots of state authority and its developmentalist fantasy (of which the Olympic Games were one expression) still tend to be limited to the punctuation of state and international capital, leaving the distinct political relevance of the actual movement of '68 aside. Undeniably, the question at stake here involves more than a mere choice between “games/massacre” and “political movement”; instead, it relates to the possibility of thinking through these instances side by side, reincorporating certain memories of '68 that may not yet be included in the state's political spectacle.

In the interest of creating a wider field of reference, Mexico '68 assumes different forms in this book: the specific year in which the student popular movement was formed, as well as a field of reflections and reconstructions that endeavor to consider the event or continue its existence in various afterlives. In this sense, '68 also relates to the site of a series of struggles for signification that help to shed light on various marginalized perspectives and provoke deeper thoughts about its implications via written or reflexive processes that do not necessarily focus on a mere account of “what happened”—a positivist accumulation of dates and actions. In those struggles for signification, a collage of narrative images depicting the afterlife of the event takes shape—something that involves an insistence of building a memory of disruptive politics that forces us to confront the official, instrumentalist, and fossilized ways in which the event has been domesticated by national history and confined to a specific legibility. Ross argues that the dominant management of the memory of France '68 erased a key component of the time: the flight from harsh social determinations that designated people's places and roles within a determined order.²³ Paradoxically, the prevailing memory adheres to a criterion of normalization, by which the story of '68 is inscribed in a familiar frame: a generation of young people rebelled against authority and helped to modernize the country by transferring power from the authoritarian state to a liberal and financial bourgeoisie.²⁴ In the case of France, this official frame eliminates a whole host of elements necessary for understanding the centrality and breadth of the phenomenon—the Algerian conflict, for example, as well as working-class immigration and participation. In Mexico, 1968 has also been placed within a temporal and developmental frame in which the rupture effectuated by the event is reterritorialized in the language of a “transition to” democracy. Samuel Steinberg argues that, in contrast to the role that transition played in the Southern Cone, in the case of

Mexico, the category has been left unanalyzed in more critical and speculative ways outside the field of social sciences.²⁵ Esmeralda Reynoso questions the discourse that has marked '68 as part of a successful democratic "transition," postulating that, for her, what occurred during that time was a series of victories in terms of social rights that usually are more difficult to measure than a transition to democracy. This includes, for example, the form in which the lives of many women changed quite radically, along with the changing attitudes of youth and the forms of imagining existential paths, among other things.²⁶ This involves a transformation that does not fit within the normalizing strategy that usually situates a transition as moving forward within a temporal line, an advancement within the narrative of progress. Under the shadow left by the disappearance in 2014 of forty-three students at Iguala, Rafael Lemus argues that Ayotzinapa shows how the so-called transition to democracy that had marked one way of framing '68 in a narrative of success (from above) never took place.²⁷ At stake here is the sense of what is conceived as democratic and political, something that was at the heart of the movement, where the reconfiguration of democracy and politics related to a right *to transform the political* in ways that went beyond the logic of party representation and electoral alternation between the parties in power. Somehow, the radical transformation of the horizon of politics that crystallized in 1968 has been also naturalized under the repetition of separate levels: on the one hand, the notion that the "personal is political" (with its different equivalents), and on the other, the analysis of the political sphere, with the discourses of transition, end of the monopoly of the PRI, and so on. However, this separation omits the complications that the events of 1968 made possible in terms of reconceptualizing politics as a form of daily imagination at different micro- and macropolitical levels. As Bosteels states, "One of the lasting consequences of the events of 1968 . . . consists precisely in *displacing the borders of the political* so as to include the everydayness—the infra-ordinariness, so to speak—of those who are the subjects of struggles for justice."²⁸ I take this displacement of the borders of the political to the temporal imaginary in which the lives and afterlives of 1968 can be staged; this also involves problematizing the relations between temporality and politics that question the developmental narrative that usually permeates the imagination of change, both left and right.²⁹

In terms of style, we might say that three tendencies have prevailed in studies of Mexico 1968: first, the testimonial form, wherein the dominant views of leaders or principal actors are reproduced; second, montages of repressive or traumatic moments that cast '68 in a more or less dramatic light; and lastly, studies that attempt to reconstruct '68 through the remembrance of activism and social

movements. Generally speaking, these tendencies do not intersect or dialogue very much, and the resulting fragmented image makes it impossible to draw a more dialectical map of interrelations and possibilities. However, it does seem possible to trace the emancipatory paths of various experiences of '68, which collectively hint at an international landscape—one of the common creative responses to the rejection of politics as usual—keeping in mind their long-term trajectory, as well as the repressive forces that penetrated many areas. In other words, we can compose a dialectical view in which affirmation and negativity complement one another, thus avoiding the one-sidedness of affirmative mania (the pure positivity of the time) or the obituary form (obsession with repressive structures).

With the passing decades, the dominant generational, modernizing, and transitional frameworks that undermine the narratives of multiple '68s have been modified in several key ways. In her classic *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*, Elizabeth Jelin alerts us to the metamorphosing dynamic characteristic of the social processes of memory. “New historical processes, as well as changing social and political conjunctures and scenarios, inevitably produce alterations in the interpretive frameworks for understanding past experience and for constructing future expectations,” she writes. “The complexity, then, refers to the multiplicity of temporalities at play, the multiplicity of meanings, and the ongoing transformation and change in actors and historical processes.”³⁰ This dynamic is clearly evident in the case of Mexico, where the narrative of the memory of '68 has changed a great deal over the decades. Eugenia Allier Montaño's detailed study describes it as transferring primacy from the figures of the “fallen” to those of “social activists.”³¹ The construction of Memorial 68—inaugurated in 2007 in the Tlatelolco complex where the October 2 massacre took place—brings about a synthesis of this process. Erected on the very site of the atrocity, the monument features a series of activist testimonies that trace the general course of events from July to December 1968. Although a book like Elena Poniatowska's *Massacre in Mexico* accomplished this double function perhaps more polyphonically, the memorial still represents a spatial materialization that speaks to the new epoch dominated by what Allier Montaño calls the “eulogy of '68,” whereby '68 is read as “a movement that propelled the democratization of Mexico forward.” This reading doubles as a paradoxical example of instrumentalized memory, “convenient for the ends of diverse social and political actors; for PRI as a symbol of divergence from earlier PRI government, for PAN (especially Vincent Fox's government), and for the many parties of the left, as the effective democratization of Mexico demanded.”³²

To introduce another point of view, Esmeralda Reynoso, the current coordinator of Memorial 68, mentioned in an interview that it is necessary to rethink the space more dynamically and put it in dialogue with the present. She remarked that when young students from various schools visit the space, they usually leave with two impressions: the pain of the massacre and admiration for the valiant young people of the past. The past feels distant, and the chiefly epic tone of the narrative expressed through the videos shown—mostly featuring the memories of the male leaders of CNH—compounds that distance with admiration and respect.³³ Multiple analyses of the narrative structure of the memorial emphasize the problems that emerge from a memory that remains framed by a limited selection of voices, showing only one side of a polyphonic moment of protest and mobilization.³⁴ It becomes necessary to criticize certain monuments of '68 in order to invent new processes, new avenues to pursue, in which the weight of moralization gives way to a different way of reconstructing this vital moment. If we agree with Daniel Bensaid's contention that "demoralizing" history equates to "politicizing it, opening it to strategic conceptualization,"³⁵ we are faced with the challenge of designing new itineraries and listening to other voices, as if our acts of interpretation could re-create the dynamic of a horizontal assembly that allows the memories of lesser-known contemporaries to speak.

Héctor Aguilar Camín begins *Thinking '68* with a series of statements and questions: "Remembering is not the same as thinking. . . . To what degree has the 'socialized' image of the Student Movement become a fixed photograph? Can this memorable event still move?"³⁶ We might say that this fixed photograph emerges from at least two dominant nuclei of memory that thinkers have begun to problematize over recent decades: first, the primacy of the Tlatelolco massacre as an almost metonymic reference to '68 Mexico; and second, the primacy of a few masculine voices of leadership in the creation of a history of '68, based on their experience in the student movement's National Strike Council. In the first case, the stain that the October 2 massacre left on '68 generates an interesting paradox in that the relevance of that moment, which opposed authoritarianism, remains punctuated by an act of despotism in which the state slaughtered an as-yet-undefined number of people.³⁷ As Esteban Ascencio observes, "There was violence—not just on October 2, but for the whole duration of the movement: military and police seizures of schools, provocations, threats, censure, the media's distortion of the facts, arrests, etc. The violence always existed. But to reduce the movement of '68 to what happened on October 2—to pack an entire process of struggle into a single day—is to minimize, on the one hand, the

multiplicity of its expressions; and, on the other, to pay tribute to a very basic kind of necrophilia.”³⁸ Surely there is no need to minimize the scope and horror of the massacre, nor the untimely role it played in sapping the vitality of a movement that had hitherto rendered the state police impotent. However, there is something problematic about the fact that the quasi-metonymic relationship sometimes drawn between the movement and the Tlatelolco massacre allows a repressive act by the state to undermine the entire exercise of democratic revolution. As Bosteels’s critical intervention at the moment of the fortieth anniversary of 1968 puts it, the force and imagination of the movement was captured by the discourses of a “revolution of shame.”³⁹ In the past decade, scholars have underlined the limitations of this closure, arguing in different ways how the memory of a political event—which did have its happy, festive moments—came to be reduced to a martyrological imaginary in which horror and death reign supreme. This culminates in what Gareth Williams calls the “Christian narrative of 1968 as inescapable martyrdom, sacrifice, and social trauma,” one that prevents us from grasping the revolutionary nature of the event, stripping it of the freshness that enveloped it.⁴⁰ Steinberg’s recent book, *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco*, also proposes the need for “critically traversing the *double* repression that conditions its reception,” understanding by this the “military and paramilitary policing of the student movement” on and *before* October 2, 1968, and the “subsequent *assumption* of that massacre as the point of departure of any future organized around 1968.”⁴¹

However, I would like to add that the memory of ’68 has been somehow limited to the viewpoint of a few, mostly male leaders from the National Strike Council, thus constituting another component of the “fixed photograph” that has recently come under scrutiny, primarily because it imposes a hierarchical memory on an extremely polyphonic, egalitarian movement. With so few voices contributing, it is difficult to reconcile the dominant conceptualization of the event with the common recollection of a vigorous, massive uprising in which, in the words of Gastón Martínez, “everyone was a protagonist.”⁴² According to David Vega, then a student at the Polytechnic, “sometimes, when we talk about the student movement, we mention one or two leaders or discuss warring personalities. But really, we are missing something much more profound and less individual that must be acknowledged in all of its magnitude.”⁴³ Along the same lines, Pablo Gómez Álvarez underscores the horizontality that characterized grassroots efforts: “I never saw a movement generate so much action from the very bottom, at the grassroots level. The creative decentralization of propaganda and political action was both impressive and truly admirable.”⁴⁴

In spite of the fact that the testimonies, essays, and disputes among the leaders will undoubtedly be incorporated into my analysis and have a fundamental value in reconstructing a certain trajectory of the movement, it is time to begin to trace other itineraries and include other voices. It is curious that a movement characterized by the polyphony and multiplicity of participants ends up appropriated by such a reduced and nonrepresentative number of those participants. Expanding this fundamental question to the political economy of memory, we can observe the increasing problematization of masculine dominance over the management of memories in the past decades. Deborah Cohen and Lessie Jo Frazier's analysis inspired a series of reflections on gender inequality in the constitution of dominant narratives about '68.⁴⁵ This involves something of a desacralization of the way the reigning hierarchical, masculine memory was constructed, particularly how it erases the mass political mobilization and participation of women from the movement. Upon reading the vast body of texts on this moment, Gloria Tirado Villegas noted that the majority of accounts were written by "participants, members of the National Strike Council, certainly social activists (a few of them prisoners), well-read journalists, academics. . . . Where were the women of '68? In so many texts, they barely receive mention."⁴⁶ Similarly, in a 2002 interview, Ana Ignacia Rodríguez, "La Nacha," said, "Discrimination against the women of '68 is—seriously!—a huge problem. Our participation was a decisive factor . . . but only our male comrades get to speak for the movement."⁴⁷ It is striking that those who struggle against the predominantly masculine memory of '68 are mostly women; with the exception of certain key retellings such as '68 by Paco Ignacio Taibo II and *Escritos sobre el movimiento del 68* (*Writings on the Movement of '68*) by Eduardo Valle, the egalitarian participation of women languishes off-stage.⁴⁸ By bringing up the question of gender in relation to the memory of '68, I do not aim to fall onto an essentialist or identitarian gesture that would assume women to be a simple, "transparent" subject whose voice would be sufficient to problematize masculine dominance in the narratives of the moment. Although I will go through this in more detail in chapter 4, I would like to state here that, by this question, I aim to point to the figure of the encounter, which is crucial to the book, with the hope of avoiding falling into some of the more typical operations of essentialism and identitarianism. That is, my hope is to avoid framing the analysis of the excluded as if they provided more "real" and "true" versions of the events by the mere fact of their exclusion. To do so assumes an essentialist approach to "otherness" that would overlook the complexity of the forms in which power relations are exercised through associations and positions. Luisa Passerini poses this problem in the introduction to *Memory and*

Utopia, where she addresses the epistemological issue at stake by following a feminist perspective that does not fall for the notion that any account could achieve fullness. Following Sally Alexander's idea, what is at stake is not to "recover" a full past but to write "a history which might begin from somewhere else."⁴⁹ Attuned to this approach, I hope to pay attention to the ways in which those who are not dominant voices in the official narratives elaborate their own ways of remembering and reconstructing the events. Within the complexity I mentioned above, these voices come from different positions, and I approach them from the following question: if a masculine schematic of leadership has dominated the memory of '68, what type of epistemological and imaginative operations emerge when memory is opened to other, less heroic, less masculine sites that address the encounters among different kinds of people?

Symbolic struggles over the memories that construct and reconstruct the event are important insofar as they express a distinct rejection of a monopoly over words. They seek to broaden access in order to illuminate points, problems, and situations that have not yet been articulated, especially given the multifaceted composition of the movement. In discussing how the moment has been remembered, Reynoso remarks that stylistic differences in the memory of '68 mirror those that distinguished the National Strike Council from the more polyphonic life of the brigades and the committees of struggle in their work on the streets and their conversations with common people with whom they actually engaged.⁵⁰ In the most minoritarian stratum of memory, narratives emphasize one largely neglected component that I consider fundamental: the moment of experiencing a sensation of *equality in participation*, which functions as a democratic structure that plays out in different forms of the day-to-day activities of the brigades, with their back-alley actions, paintings, mimeograph impressions, and kitchens. That memory of equality almost always surfaces in remembrances of everyday practices of the movement, as well as in memories of highly relevant moments such as the struggle and self-management of the Popular Preparatory, the experiences of activists in the village of Topilejo, and the mass participation of women, among other issues. In '68, Paco Ignacio Taibo II mentions equality as a key experience of '68 and describes the participation of women as a type of equality that did not ask permission, which was a crucial political gesture of the time. He declares that '68 predated the "new feminism": "It was better than feminism. It was *violently egalitarian*—and if it wasn't always, it always could be."⁵¹ These words capture something that emerged in various conversations with women who participated in the movement: a rebellion of participating as if every man and every woman were equal, without asking permission, with respect and camaraderie.⁵²

Undoubtedly many of the philosophical themes that we discuss today are part of the afterlife of the experience of 1968. The events, singularities, multiplicities, and margins of 1968 configured what has been regarded as the French post-1968 philosophical map, producing many debates and political positions that subsequently spread internationally. In this book, I approach 1968 as a moment of *encounter and equality* that opened up the stage for new configurations of freedom. Although encounter and equality are taken as the main guiding words with which I have chosen to characterize the moment in this book, there is not a homogeneous theory of them behind these pages; on the contrary, I am interested in seeing how encounter and equality work as guiding forces that constantly change and transform their territories according to the existential, conceptual, and political contexts in which they emerge at different points of time, including their reconfiguration in different acts of memory in the decades that followed the sixties. For instance, the encounter emerges in the work of José Revueltas through the formulation of the theoretical act, as a reflection on historicity and the connectivity among different fragments and layers of histories of emancipation that have been systematically repressed. It emerges in the visual realm as a form of performativity made possible by the image, thought of as a place of encounter able to connect people from different social places and realities in the process of making a film short or a communiqué. The encounter is crucially problematized, reconfigured, and transformed in different forms in the philosophical and testimonial works written by women, such as Roberta Avendaño, Fernanda Navarro, and Gladys López Hernández, as they attempt—each in her own way—to shed light on the epistemological and existential implications of the encounter, when this involves an encounter with what is nonanalogous or nonsymmetrical to my own self and situation. Here, questions of alterity and class difference emerge as an internal problematization of the areas that 1968 *made visible* and that also point to the limitations of the moment, its internal blindness toward forms of alterity that would stay outside the frames that had been opened by the moment (for instance, the fear of lesbianism in Avendaño's account of prison). The situation of imprisonment works as a place of *uncomfortable encounters* as well as a trope that allows us to see the walls imposed by middle-class patriarchal morality. It is also in the works written by women that the encounter emerges in a constant tension with equality.

In each chapter of the book, equality also emerges in different forms. It usually arises in many conversations and testimonies as a sense of equality felt in political participation. However, *equality* can be a confusing, misleading word, as it could be taken to mean a share in the political as usual, an access or entry into the existing political world, as when we think of the access of minorities

to an area that had been denied to them. In contrast to this sense of the word, the equality that emerges in many accounts of 1968 refers to a sense of *participation as a form of sharing the horizon of a transformative potential of the political*, which is different from an equal share in politics as usual; it is the possibility of being equal *within the common goal of transforming the system*.⁵³ This clarification is necessary, considering that one of the dominant, terrible destinies of the feminism that was gestated in this period was that this irreverent struggle was subsequently reterritorialized by a sense of equality that came to mean merely access (the idea of equal pay, equal rights that leave the inequality of the patriarchal system untouched).⁵⁴ In a similar way, the reterritorialization of 1968 as the path for a political transition in Mexico has also been framed as the creation of new parties that now have power equal to that of the PRI. Of course, access is important; however, what is essential to remember is that such access was intimately connected to a *transformative force of the political order*. It was not just about having equal access to the political system, as it was this political system itself that was being radically criticized. Sharing equality in participation was part of a bigger process of questioning politics and opening up a different sense for experiencing it. And this process of questioning relates to the possibility of changing the way in which politics is socially framed and experienced: it involves the passage from the passive sense of participation related to representation (the electoral process, voting) to a reconfiguration of the sense of politics as something that is happening in the everyday—an active form of transforming the components that make social life possible.

When I speak of equality, there are at least two horizons in question. One horizon refers to the *irreverent participation* of those who had been systematically excluded from or felt that they were outside the political arena. This included women of different ages or people who, having never been involved before, felt they knew nothing of the old politics. It also refers to the connectivity among different struggles that become equal, as democracy reconfigures a form of active participation in the everyday politics at stake at work, at home, and at school. The other horizon is related to worlds that still remain outside the radical reconfiguration of the political, which is the world that emerges mostly in writings by women remembering their imprisonment, a universe where a deep form of inequality emerges as the destiny of many invisibilized sectors of the population. This is what we could see as the world that refers to or constitutes the common form of imprisonment in these memories, and that poses a challenge for the revolutionary desire and scope of young educated women sharing a space in prison. What I am interested in seeing here is how a post-'68 landscape that takes its memory from re-creating the experience of women's imprisonment

makes the key idea-forces of the book take on other tones and tensions: *encounter and equality*, essential in descriptions of 1968, face a limit or limitation that is worked out in the texts, when the recently politicized women enter into contact with women from other social classes. It relates to the world of the socially rejected (common women prisoners) in both Avendaño and López Hernández, and also of those rejected by the university in López Hernández's remembrance of the Popular Preparatory. What does '68 look like from here? From both meanings of equality, '68 appears as an open promise, and at the same time, it is as if this way of looking opened other landscapes that had remained outside the memories of the moment. The itinerary that these texts create allows us to see how equality (in participation) leads to the vision of so many forms of inequality that somehow permeate invisible social divisions that become clearer in prison. Equality that was felt through participation in the movement became a limited, reduced experience when compared to the realities of the imprisoned women. This signals a problematization of equality and democracy where, as Judith Butler states, "the point of democratic politics is not simply to extend recognition equally to all of the people, but, rather, to grasp that only by changing the relation between the recognizable and unrecognizable can (a) equality be understood and pursued and (b) 'the people' become open to a further elaboration."⁵⁵ This is a limit, or the space of an unfulfilled promise that we can see emerging in some reconfigurations of 1968 made by women in the decades that followed.

Equality emerges in my own approach as a problematization of the voices and themes that have usually been the focus of accounts of Mexico 1968 while persistently silencing so many others. In other words, equality has gained little attention in the many *places of memory* that comprise the itineraries of '68.⁵⁶ One objective of this book is to shift perspectives on '68 away from the voices that have traditionally presided over its reconstruction. I do not mean to say that I will not include them, since I believe they have helped facilitate an extensive memory of the moment without which it would be difficult to even recognize it for what it was. That said, it is necessary to blaze new paths through figures and voices that have been pushed to the margins, with the aim of configuring another kind of constellation that would encompass points that these other memories or continuations of '68 make possible. As with a kaleidoscope, we will adopt different lenses that permit us to see different points and problems of the moment. It is a matter of supplementing dominant views with a more polyphonic style capable of reconstructing the edges of that moment and its historical, philosophical, and political relevance. Instead of going through the main archive of 1968, I decided to look at different interventions that did

not share an identical ground or position. Even though the usual names that constitute the main political and cultural archive of 1968 will be present in the background (Raúl Álvarez Garín, Gilberto Guevara Niebla, Luis González de Alba, Marcelino Perelló, Elena Poniatowska, Carlos Monsiváis), I decided to include other names and positions that would express a more varied, less canonical, constellation of the moment. Therefore, when reading the thinkers I analyze here, including José Revueltas, Fernanda Navarro, Roberta Avendaño, Gladys López Hernández; when watching the films of the *superocheros* (Super-eighters) and cooperative filmmakers; and when listening to the voices of Guadalupe Ferrer, Esmeralda Reynoso, Alberto Híjar, and Martín Dozal, taken from interviews carried out with the purpose of opening up 1968, I realized that even though the conceptual figures of the encounter and of equality emerged in all of them as a singularity of the moment that pointed to a radically new sense of freedom in their lives, they never emerge as stable and equal concepts. This is because they relate to different fields of signification and problematization, such as freedom and temporality in Revueltas, encounter and alterity in Navarro, and encounter and class inequality in Avendaño and López Hernández. Thus, 1968 is characterized by a polyphony of voices that express different and no less contradictory philosophical and political positions. Because of this, in each section the art of the encounter emerges as a *zone of both experimentation and struggle* that varies according to the different situations, practices, temporalities, and subjects involved. So, they become *conceptual territories* that are constantly changing and transforming their mappings in a heterodox way, posing a multiplicity of meanings and conflicts. This is one of the main characteristics of what I analyze here as *cognitive democratization* as a practice where paradoxes and contradictions are allowed to take place without expecting the transparency and coherence of an ideal theme or theoretical positioning. The open character of '68 addresses the poetics of a liberation that is not limited to specific and timely demands of a group, a union, or a party. In this sense, one of the distinctive characteristics of '68 was its zeal for *social connectivity*, that is, the way in which the demand for a change in the system was able to bring together the desires and feelings among diverse people and groups, who had mostly never met to act in common until this moment. Playing with an expression by Vinícius de Moraes, we could say that '68 could be defined as *the art of the encounter*, and that a great potentiality to illuminate other social processes resides in this figure.⁵⁷ Because of the connective character of the social fabric, I refer to its ability to manifest itself from the educational centers as a struggle beyond its particular situation, consolidating a national movement that had the support and participation of many groups united by a demand for democracy, equality, and freedom. This implied a recon-

figuration of the political and of the right to politics. For this reason, the figure of encounter has an essential role in this book, given that it refers to the connective nature of '68, unlike other movements that have emerged over the course of time. A phrase used by Mercedes Perelló sums up the tone of the moment: "in '68 for the first time we stopped fighting and we all joined together in the same struggle," referring to the way in which the movement brought together people who had diverse political positions as well as those who perhaps did not have any experience in political participation.⁵⁸

The moment of 1968 can be approached as an instant of opening where many contradictory positions coexisted; this made it possible to experience the political outside the dogmatism of party rules or ideologies. It is an instant when the relaxation of the rigidity of the political allowed for the creation of a space where disparate concepts could be articulated in a common language. One of the crucial differences between movements and parties is that the former allow for a freedom of positions without having fixed principles and rules that would guide further actions from above. This relates to the primacy that processes have in movement politics as well as to the notion of change that is at stake. Instead of being guided by a goal (such as state takeover), movement politics are permeated by the practice of finding the political in the everyday—that is, in what is closest and therefore most difficult to articulate and modify. This can be seen in the attempt to develop a sense of equality in its practices (assemblies, horizontality), as well as a form of uncertainty that sometimes makes movements illegible, as there is no goal other than to transform the system in a piecemeal, more micropolitical way. One of the most innovative points of the '68 moment that I am interested in delving into here is the destabilization that '68 provokes on the horizons that organize the field of the sayable and imagination about freedom and liberation from the perspective of liberalism and dogmatic Marxism. I say destabilization because it is not about an absolute rejection but rather forms of tension, deconstruction, and impure mixes of elements that form the languages to express and live freedom. In the philosophical field, this generates interesting positions within the tradition of a heterodox Marxism and refines modalities of understanding the practice of liberation. Philosophical figures and trajectories like those of Grace Lee Boggs, Angela Davis, Fernanda Navarro, Henri Lefebvre, and José Revueltas are marked by this moment and refer us to critical gestures and revolutionary movements within the field of the conceptualization of the free, something that makes them think in a critical and creative way the instances of the capture of dialectical thought without fully renouncing, at least in that moment, the language of Marxism. It is the possibility of thinking together, in a single space, the figures of the complex composition that mark the passage between more traditional

political *language* (as Marxism was in the seventies) and the babbling that expresses other alternative forms of collective freedom. Such alternate forms were based on the role that the everyday, the marginalized, and the singularity of desires divergent from the norm begin to have, renewing the understanding of the free and of processes of emancipation in a revolutionary mode. In this sense, the '68 moment radically modified an entire philosophical, artistic, and political climate.⁵⁹

The Transversality of the Movement and the List of Demands
(pliego petitorio): *Political Overflow and the Eruption of Dissent*

Setting aside polemics for or against the popular nature of '68, one indisputable historical singularity of the movement was its desire for *social connectivity*; that is, refusing to limit itself to a specific group with a specific demand and instead interweaving many threads in the social fabric, as it partially succeeded in doing.⁶⁰ The new capacity for participating and transforming the political took on a kind of *demand for social democratization* that, originating in the university, was able to spread across various sectors of the population in many different parts of the country. Although the capital became the very center of signification of the movement as well as a space in which the symbolic takeover of a political history gathered uncommon momentum (takeover of the streets, the Zócalo, the seizure of the UNAM), one distinctive element of the movement was its ability to take root in many educational centers and social sectors across the country. Therein lies the national and popular element that constitutes and defines the movement, without intimating a kind of homogenous collective for struggle. Furthermore, although the movement specifically and crucially originated from the higher education offered in the capital, its *political impetus* is not constrained to the academic sphere but calls for a transformation of all possible fields of the political across various dimensions. These range from everyday practices and their forms of subjectification to the demands for liberty and equality contained in the list of demands put forth by the National Strike Council. The global nature of the movement aligns with the type of general demand to dismantle the state's monopoly over the very meaning of freedom, so enmeshed in violence and authoritarianism: a false, imposed consensus. Therefore, its demand for *democratization* can be understood as a demand for equal right to participation and dissidence, which, to quote Sergio Zermeño, "does not simply mean to solicit an aperture of already established institutional channels. Rather, participation took the form of criticism and a rejection of existing

forms of participation and expression, and there we find that which united all sectors.”⁶¹

Delving into the movement’s imaginary, César Gilabert points out that the movement lacked a concrete, long-term agenda in the most traditional sense of a “political plan” to use as a platform, for its political power derived from opening up a utopic imaginary.⁶² Within that utopia, we find a defense of the universal right to the political, which enables a reconfiguration of the political by shifting the meaning of democracy outside traditional schemas that limit it to a form of “partyocracy” and of electoral processes.⁶³ Given the demand for dialogue and active participation in the political on various levels, the movement postulated a reinterpretation of the very meaning of freedom and equality as a way to transform the realm of political possibilities. Thus ’68 opens “a new dimension of Mexican politics,” for unlike the conflicts that preceded it (such as the railroad workers’, teachers’, doctors’, or telegraphists’ movements), the students neither “made claims by and for themselves” nor acted as spokespeople for a union organization or a specific party.⁶⁴ Part of the everyday creativity that unfolded over those intense months originated from a collective effort to leave the academic sphere and generate more encounters in the streets, smashing automated life with happenings, fliers, and spontaneous conversations. It is relevant to note that some of the demands on the petition refer to a history of struggles that had been systematically imprisoned and repressed, as well as to a way of forging a link between *democracy, equality, and freedom* that went beyond the concrete in order to postulate a change in the political order itself—as Adolfo Gilly states, the Mexican ’68 consisted in a *social mobilization for democracy*.⁶⁵ It is the *transversal* nature of ’68 that makes it stand out from the many other movements that preceded and followed it; that is, its capacity to *traverse the social field* with a demand for democracy, freedom, and equality in participation that rethinks the terms and conditions of the political, its possibility and existence.

As Raúl Álvarez Garín states, the number of struggles unfolding through and around the repressive acts perpetrated by the police from July 22 onward began to highlight the need for unification of dispersed struggles. In this context, the idea of creating a *single* list of demands responded to the desire to create a common plane for the unification of all the struggles that had been progressing in various colleges and institutes.⁶⁶ These student mobilizations, which began in protest of the harsh repression dealt to Vocational Schools 2 and 5 after a fight over a soccer game with students at Isaac Ochoterena Preparatory, are generally considered to be the starting point of the movement. This

said, it should not be forgotten that all of this occurred within a greater context of struggles that had been going on in educational centers in various regions *throughout the decade*. Gilberto Guevara Niebla provides a detailed analysis of the various student struggles and acts of solidarity that marked that turbulent decade. He also comments on the distinctive nature that the '68 movement acquired in its "national" form, as well as its dissolution of the student identity, which fused with the whole of society to issue a democratic demand.⁶⁷

The disproportionate burden of repression that the riot police (*granaderos*) inflicted on vocational students in the wake of July 22—on top of the generalized repression that occurred on July 26 with the march to commemorate the Cuban Revolution and the National Federation of Technical Students' march to protest police repression—gathered force that found an outlet on July 27 in a takeover of various educational centers (UNAM Preparatory Schools 1, 2, and 3) and an organization of assemblies. Two days later, the police and the army raided the campuses, unleashing the monstrous bazooka shot that destroyed the colonial gate of Preparatory School 1. The following day, classes were suspended and a crucial march took place, headed by the rector of UNAM, Javier Barrios Sierra. In the first days of August, the National Strike Council had already formed, uniting students with the Coalition of Secondary and Post-Graduate Professors for Democratic Liberties (Coalición de Profesores de Enseñanza Media y Superior Pro Libertades Democráticas), a group of teachers in support of the student proposition. At that point, assemblies were proposed so that each school could designate three representatives to the council. Thus, the National Strike Council relied on representation from each of the seventy schools on strike, eventually accumulating 210 members who mediated the decisions made by the committees of struggle and the assemblies at their respective institutions.

The agreement about the list of demands became a moment of *unifying struggles in a common force* extending across all sectors that adhered to it, and the six points were an expression of the request for a political reconfiguration that first had to dismantle the repressive mechanisms of the state: (1) freedom for political prisoners; (2) the removal of police chiefs Luis Cueto Ramírez, Raúl Mendiola, and Armando Frías; (3) the dissolution of the *granaderos*; (4) the repeal of Article 145 and 145A of the Federal Penal Code that sanctioned "crimes of social dissolution"; (5) compensation for the families of the dead and those who fell victim to the constant aggression perpetrated since July; and (6) the demarcation of responsibility in respect to the repressive excesses of the police, the *granaderos*, and the army. These articulated the disparate struggles realized in various educational centers under a common language, one that called for

freedom, equality, and democracy by demanding that the repressive fabric of the state, which annulled any disagreement, be unraveled. In this sense, the list of demands constituted both an opening and a common point of encounter that enabled the movement to spread across various social sectors to form a national struggle. Its strength lay in the fact that the six points, detached from student and academic life, comprised a democratic demand that asked for freedom and equality in the participation and construction of a political system by and for all.⁶⁸ Zermeño characterizes it as a “point of confluence” of many different sectors, unveiling a “comprehensible dimension for all layers of society through the request for a public dialogue with the government to resolve these demands.”⁶⁹

Once the list of demands was agreed upon, it was proposed that “all post-graduate institutions of the national academy and numerous provincial universities go on strike” until the government responded to the above points. As for the government’s response, the only thing that came of this request for a dialogue was an even greater increase in repressive deployments, which made the demand for political rights even more necessary.⁷⁰ From then on, creative forms of political action emerged everywhere: assemblies, brigades, committees of struggle, festivals, and acts of solidarity on the part of various groups and sectors of workers, including electricians, railroad workers, doctors, primary and secondary schoolteachers, and journalists.⁷¹ This generated informative rallies, assemblies, and conversations in the street, at the gates of government offices, and in factories. According to Gilbert, the clout that the National Strike Council has in the ’68 imaginary perpetuates a “myth of the Central Committee,” which often obscures other decision-making and participatory bodies that tended to feature greater engagement and horizontality. These assemblies, committees, and brigades “offered the floor to anyone who wanted it, regardless of their status or political affiliation.”⁷² That said, many people in the National Strike Council also took part in everyday activism, where the movement held together best. Being in charge of public relations in Preparatory School 1’s committee of struggle, Reynoso recalls that people came from all over with stories, problems, and demonstrations of solidarity: “I had to talk to people who came to ask questions or wanted to know things, but only for a little while. The rest of the time what we did was go out to paint buses and hold flash rallies in plazas and markets. I remember we went to a very famous factory—the Clemente Jacques—to hold flash rallies as the workers were heading home, passing out fliers . . . and it was our daily work, aside from being at the school awhile.” Reconstructing the day-to-day of the movement, she also remembers the marches as a practice that brought all

schools and social sectors under the same banner: “We were all comrades. The magic word was *compañero, compañera*. Being a *compañero, compañera* was a safe conduct that meant everyone supported you and took care of you.”⁷³

These spaces and sites of encounter functioned as intersections among “democratic, libertarian, anarchist, and lucid aspirations; reasonable and frustrated hopes, transgression and excess. Suddenly, designated political spaces—delineated by State authoritarianism—were overtaken by powerfully disruptive elements, united ideologically around everyday life instead of politics.”⁷⁴ There are two important things about this characterization that will prove fundamental to this book: the suspension of an orderly system of fixed, designated spaces; and the overflow this suspension achieved on various levels once people started organizing in unexpected places. The possibility of breaking with designated political spaces unleashes the force of a true demand for *democratization* as a way of intervening in a structure that maintains a political order as an entity separate from society by situating it in privileged spaces.⁷⁵ Thus, essential to the ’68 moment is the art of overflowing social spaces and roles, making us reconsider the eruption of the political as a series of crossings and flights from static forms of identification of actors within an authoritarian order that attempts to put everyone in their place. At the root of the demand for democracy is a form of intervention in the very spaces that had annulled the possibility of political democracy in an authoritarian regime.

The list of demands put forth a specific request to dismantle a police force that fed the repressive, authoritarian character of Mexican politics. This put an entire political order in question as it involved a momentary suspension of the force of authority underlying the social contract, which is dictated by a sort of mandatory consent in which any act of discrepancy against the state is repressed or annihilated. Thus, the idea of ’68 as a *watershed* of the twentieth century, which appears in the majority of testimonies and accounts, has to do with the colossal way in which it suspended—practically for the first time—the official version of the revolution through a collective practice of emancipating its imaginary. In *Democracy in the Streets*, Guevara Niebla affirms that ’68 constituted “the first great modern urban political crisis to confront the regime of the Mexican Revolution. Its outbreak spectacularly revealed the absurd degree of despotism, rigidity, and concentration of power that Mexico’s political system had achieved during the cycle of industrialization, building out from a democratizing imperative.”⁷⁶ It is important to underscore that this moment of satiation and rupture with a certain postrevolutionary state destiny opened up a completely different mode of conceiving the political. It implies a struggle against the disproportionate role that authority and authoritarianism play in

the political system, as a constitutive component, something that is expressed in many ways but particularly through the use of force and repressive deployment whenever disagreement arises between a group of common people and the cupola of political elite (presidentialism and the monopoly exercised by the PRI). Moreover, it signifies a challenge to the ways in which authoritarianism permeates the life of institutions that organize life within a political order and their dominant processes of subjectivation. This involves not only the organization of an entire institutional bureaucracy but also various ways of controlling and co-opting any organized body of dissent, whether in a union organization (something that the railroad workers', peasants', and doctors' movements made apparent in the fifties and early sixties) or on a more personal level—such as, for example, authority within a patriarchal family structure and the gender inequality it reproduces, or relations of power reproduced in educational centers (who gives orders, who enforces the orders).⁷⁷

The breaking point that was reached in '68 amounts to a loud cry of "Enough!"—a manifold, festive demand for democratization in which common people lay claim to basic freedom and equality in the political process as a common right that is expressed through their everyday and institutional lives. Thus, the demand for democracy entailed a new configuration of the discernible political order at as-yet-unexplored levels, because emancipation did not entail a specific, prompt demand issued by a determined group (in the style of union petitions) but rather a demand for freedom and equality. These words, emptied of meaning until that point, came alive as expressions of democracy in everyday communal life, in people's desires and in their bodies, in language that is opened up and analyzed for new meanings, in questions of how to rethink institutions and propose alternatives. In a country where the word *revolution* had been monopolized by an authoritarian state, the question of a *democratic revolution* became a space open to the exploration of new ways of experiencing the political. Undoubtedly this generated an unprecedented wealth of ideas, which facilitated the construction of connecting bridges between those who belonged to determined groups or parties, and those who had never been the least interested in participating in politics. The work of organizing into committees of struggle, participatory assemblies, brigades, mimeographs, kitchens, graphic designs, and festivals transformed educational centers into realms of collective democratic experimentation that traversed a world of affects and their own capacity for collective action. As Carlos Monsiváis observes, "Acts of individual and collective feelings of solidarity and political imagination were the solid foundation and clear *raison d'être* of the Movement."⁷⁸ We can describe the path that '68 begins to tread as a form of creative and revolutionary rupture with

the fiction of a transparent national “unity,” which, as Guevara Niebla argues, attempted to provide a “basis for the political regime of the Mexican revolution,” thus stripping bare the despotic character “of a political system in which the relationship between the governors and governed are mediated by the principle of authority.”⁷⁹ By reiterating the demand for a “dialogue” with the government, the movement proposed to establish a conversation founded on the basis of a radical disagreement over ways of understanding the political.

In his analysis of sovereignty and exception in the twentieth century in Mexico, Gareth Williams explains how the point of departure from Mexican modernity took the form of “a police state understood as the direct governmentality of the sovereign qua sovereign.”⁸⁰ This is notable because the suppression of the duality of state and society implies a persistent repression and *invisibilization* of disagreement as the expression of alternative ways of constructing the political. In 1968 the division became even greater with a movement that cut across various sectors of society with an explicit political and democratic demand that was systematically invisibilized through silence, indifference, and the permanent *crescendo* of the state’s repressive response. If we carefully examine, as Jorge Volpi does, the “Fourth State of the Union Address by President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz” on September 1, 1968, it would seem to present a kind of official pronouncement of the single order enforced by the state. In it, the president accomplishes the negation and invisibilization of the very existence of the list of demands: “To date, we have not received a single concrete petition, either from educational administrators or organizations or from groups of teachers, students or others.” Not only does he declare the nonexistence of the list of demands, but he also insists on the invisibilization of the realities to which it alludes. For example, he says, “I do not concede that political prisoners exist. Political prisoners are those who are detained *exclusively* because of their political ideas, without having committed any crime”—which means that political prisoners do not *exist* in the eyes of the government; instead, they are “vandals” or delinquents.⁸¹ Here the president reestablishes “order” and invisibilizes dissent: “By the same concept, having exhausted the means that good judgment advises, I will always exercise when strictly necessary the authority contained in Article 89, Section VI of the Constitution, which says, ‘The authorities and obligations of the president are to utilize the totality of the standing armed forces, or the army, navy, and air force, for the interior security and exterior defense of the Federation.’”⁸²

It is evident that this State of the Union communicated an explicit denial of the student movement and the entire population that supported it. By counteracting the list of demands point by point, it is admitting its existence through

a performative declaration of inexistence: defining what does and does not count in its political order. In the next chapter, I am interested in examining how that declared invisibilization of the movement erases the meaning of its words and demands, dismissing them as mere noise because they do not conform to the state's monopoly on logos. Thus, the clash between two heterogeneous logics—the monological authority of the president and the movement's demand for equality and democratic participation—is followed by the silencing and invisibility of dissidence. As Rancière explains, "The police is thus first an order of bodies that defines the allocation of ways of doing, ways of being, and ways of saying, and sees that those bodies are assigned by name to a particular place and task; it is an order of the visible and the sayable that sees that a particular activity is visible and another is not, that this speech is understood as discourse and another as noise."⁸³ Undoubtedly, the verbal declaration of war that the State of the Union made when it symbolically invisibilized the list of demands was soon to find a physical correlate in the savage October 2 massacre and the subsequent torture and detention of all those who had inhabited that space of equality, which the power of authority still refused to recognize. In short, disagreement is first negated by order of logos and then by order of *bodies*, thereby reaffirming the badly perforated fiction of political and social unity. Sovereignty is both affirmed and immunized when confronted with a heterogeneous logic that threatens its authority, breaking the partition of a political order that since July had been gathering momentum in the social sphere. In this sense, words, images, and bodies would operate as sites of struggle: mechanisms of affirmation and aperture of what is officially negated and declared nonexistent.

The petition for democracy in the face of a partyocratic and presidentialist structure emerges as a kind of polyphonic culmination of actions and words that "revindicate and empower political content by emphasizing their quotidianness" and thus ask to speak: "The movement is to request the word. . . . In that sense, it is, as [Herbert] Marcuse says, more marginalized than oppositional."⁸⁴ On "freedom of the press" day, José Revueltas would write from Lecumberri Prison: "They have sought to rob us of the freedom of these words, the freedom that people exercised by yelling them in the streets. *We are persecuted words*, isolated in cellblocks, filtered through cellblocks."⁸⁵ Words, images, and bodies are territories that all texts that seek to analyze, historicize, or continue the movement must acknowledge as central to a vital struggle for that right to logos. In his fourth State of the Union address, the president carried out the symbolic closure through word and image that the Tlatelolco massacre and mass imprisonment of the movement would soon inflict on bodies. Therefore,

the objective of the next two chapters is to traverse the points of a constellation of '68 that allows us to see the concrete ways in which the essential disagreement underlying the struggle for the right to the political was expressed in words, images, and subjective accounts. By continuing to practice dissidence through language, images, and bodies, the world negated by authoritarianism continues to sustain itself by the force of a struggle based on reflection, creativity, and uncertainty. If this was indeed a moment of redefining what freedom means in a society, as well as the construction of subjectivities that live within and rebel against it, one might ask: How did this problematization of freedom affect the entire language with which it was designated and configured? Put differently, how did this moment of dislocation we call '68 affect various practices of memory, texts, and disciplines? How was the freedom claimed by '68 expressed by virtue of remembering, rethinking, and imagining the event through other temporalities? What comes out of '68 if it is remembered through accounts that do not adhere to the closed circuits that have traditionally defined the event? The following chapters seek to answer these questions.

Chapter 1 focuses on the work of self-taught, heterodox Marxist thinker José Revueltas. Questioning how Revueltas configures '68, as well as how '68 configures Revueltas's own thought, I analyze how the movement impacted his late work, since its everyday practices of democratic, horizontal organization and self-management required a reconsideration of finite ideas about freedom. First, I look at his philosophical writings on self-management (*autogestión*); on the democratization of knowledge (which he called "cognitive democracy"); and on the theoretical act, which is posed as a form of answering the question of how we can interpret a historical singularity such as 1968 without either assigning it an unhistorical spontaneity—thus depoliticizing the originality of its political demands—or falling prey to the kind of linear causality that so often typifies our definition of progress. These three interrelated idea-forces expose how 1968 is configured in relation to a broader philosophical landscape of the time, when materialism, freedom, and dialectics had been radically transformed. I continue by analyzing two of Revueltas's literary works: *The Apando* and the posthumous novel-project *Time and Number*, as well as miscellaneous writings on the collective experiences of the political prisoners at Lecumberri Prison. Revueltas problematizes language, historicity, and temporality in relation to the freedom of the movements and the constant waves of repression and death that the Mexican state uses to paralyze them.⁸⁶ I relate reflections on dialectics and the possibility of thinking about a different, nondevelopmentalist, manifold temporality of social movements to the horizon of questions

posed by other Latin American critical Marxists of the time (such as José Aricó and René Zavaleta Mercado).

Chapter 2 analyzes the effects of 1968 on the visual regime, paying attention to how the movement continued into the early seventies in different marginal cinema collectives. The chapter elaborates the meanings of the autonomy of the image and the ways in which these experiences reconfigured aesthetics and politics. I analyze two specific groups in Mexico that proposed different forms of articulating cinema and liberation as a path toward a fourth cinema (*cuarto cine*), diverging from the then-dominant currents of militant cinema. One is the Cooperative of Marginal Cinema (Cooperativa de Cine Marginal), made up of students and amateur filmmakers who decided to superimpose the experience of the movement on the visual real, at the moment of depoliticization following the Tlatelolco massacre and mass imprisonment. The cooperative filmed different comunicués that linked various independent strikes throughout the country. Both the plot and the sound of the movies were created by the workers, thereby decentering the role of the artist and the work of art. The other group I study is one led by filmmaker Óscar Menéndez that clandestinely brought Super 8 cameras into Lecumberri Prison. The prisoners became artists recording their own situations, able to visually confirm political imprisonment at a moment when the president denied that political prisoners existed. I analyze the fascinating international itinerary of the resulting film, *History of a document*, which, with Jean-Paul Sartre's help, was edited in Paris by a group convened specifically for this purpose: the Groupe de Recherches Technologiques—Atelier d'expérimentation Super 8.⁸⁷ *History of a document* was going to be broadcast by the Office de Radiodiffusion-Télévision Française (ORTF) but was censored at the last minute. These experiments dislocate the social place of the image and operate as mechanisms that respond to a certain demobilization after '68, continuing the event beyond its temporality and connecting it with a larger history of social realities.

Chapter 3 focuses on how memories and critical re-creations of 1968 have been placed in a masculine, hierarchical paradigm that has erased the participation of women. Here, I approach the question of how a moment characterized by radical forms of democratization and equality in participation ended up *remembered and configured* from the angle of male leaders, but with the idea of moving beyond the constancy of women's participation in order to study different interventions made by women in different fields. After analyzing a series of interventions by women and the connections between 1968 and the emergence of second-wave feminism in Mexico, I examine the forgotten philosophical work of Fernanda Navarro,

Existence, Encounter, and Chance.⁸⁸ I argue that Navarro's book reconstructs the figure of the encounter—a crucial figure in my approach to 1968—and re-laborates it from a perspective that prioritizes bodies and gender relations. Thus, through Navarro's work, I enter into the wake left by second-wave feminism in the decade that followed the movement in order to address her philosophical intervention around a materialism of the encounter.

Chapter 4 analyzes how the figure of the encounter emerged in the nineties with the publication of a memoir of '68 written by Roberta "La Tita" Avendaño, *On Freedom and Imprisonment*.⁸⁹ One of the few women on the National Strike Council, Avendaño accomplishes an unusual task: instead of providing her account and evaluation of the movement (as most of the National Strike Council's male leaders have done), she offers a reflection on 1968 that focuses solely on the personal experience of political imprisonment at the women's prison. The text re-creates the complexity of everyday life in prison through the relationships that Avendaño established with common prisoners. These were lower-class women who had remained outside 1968's dominant imaginary, mostly populated by the epic figures of the political prisoners. Reflecting on class difference and imprisonment raises questions about the "democratization" at stake in the movement. This had remained completely outside the more dominant voices and points to a contextualized form of addressing dialogue and inequality in an environment that arose from and exceeded the forms of otherness (white- and blue-collar workers, peasants) that were closest to the students at the height of their mobilizations. Finally, I move to the present and analyze a memoir written by a working-class woman who was seventeen years old in 1968: *Ovarimony: Me, a Guerrilla Fighter?* by Gladys López Hernández.⁹⁰ The text offers insight into class and gender difference in both the movement and the experience of imprisonment, but from another angle and social space. The text develops around a series of memories of experiments of '68 that were crucial for the lives of so many young people of the lower classes and that have remained marginalized in the dominant memory of the university. *Ovarimony* provides one of most detailed histories of the experience of the Popular Preparatory located at 66 Liverpool Street, the embryo of an experience of self-management and cognitive democratization that brought into practice what Revueltas theorized as a crucial component of the moment. Connected to the UNAM's School of Philosophy and Letters—mostly through the Marxist group called "Miguel Hernández"—the Popular Preparatory was a space in which students from the lower classes could continue their studies. From this experience, a question arises regarding who are the privileged subjects of education; that is, who qualifies for and who is excluded from the right to postsecondary education, which cre-

ates the different futures that will make up the productive life of the country, its professionals and its laborers. From this perspective, '68 emerges in *Ovarimomy* as a liberating learning process with respect to the possibility of breaking with the predestination of class and gender, thus opening a whole set of micropolitical memories.

This itinerary is marked by a temporal line that I have chosen to respect, as it moves through different decades, choosing works and figures that take us out of the “familiar” environment of memories. At the same time, the constellation of memories that I propose to trace here does not follow the dominant figure around which narratives of '68 have been predominantly constructed: the university student who was a leader. Outside the figure of “La Tita” Avendaño, who was one of the few women in leadership who is remembered, the rest are figures who introduce ways of looking that illuminate modes of thinking about or continuing '68 from other angles, almost forcing us to think about how an event survives its time in disparate and numerous ways. Therefore, this work proposes a configuration that, attending to the dominant history and conceptualization of the moment, also introduces other points that flicker on the margins, pointing to the possibility of reading a different constellation. *Self-management, in word and in image, the encounter among different people, the demand for equality*—these issues open a territory of questions and reflections that became possible through '68. They have to do with textual, reflexive, and visual processes that construct a face of the event or participate in it from certain acts of interpretation that recall it from fragile points (such as class or gender inequality) or strong points (the encounter among different people, the sensation of liberation and of the reality of an equal participation in the political). Thus '68 emerges in a multifaceted way: it is about the specific year in which the student and popular movement forms, and which, in the course of a few months, revolutionizes the social, political, and subjective lives of many people. The events of '68 are also about a constellation that goes beyond these months of action and continues in different ways afterward, what we could better denominate as the “'68 moment,” taking inspiration from the study by Michelle Zancarini-Fournel. Her book *The 68 Moment: A Contested History* sets out to displace the way of looking at the temporal fixation made in France of the month of May, in order to be able to attend to a larger figure, a “moment” that has been continuously interpreted and made into a space of struggle for political and historical signification, as well as a “field of experience” in which the past is constantly mobilized by a present and the horizon of a future.⁹¹