
SUSANA DRAPER
1968
MEXICO
CONSTELLATIONS
OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

1968
MEXICO

RADICAL AMÉRICAS
A series edited by Bruno Bosteels
and George Ciccariello-Maher

ME

Duke University Press Durham and London 2018

SUSANA DRAPER

1968

Constellations of Freedom and Democracy

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Designed by Courtney Leigh Baker
Typeset in Garamond Premier Pro and Futura by
Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Draper, Susana, [date] author.
Title: 1968 Mexico : constellations of freedom
and democracy / Susana Draper.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2018. |
Series: Radical Américas | Includes
bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018001471 (print)
LCCN 2018007843 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478002499 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478001010 (hardcover : alk. paper)
ISBN 9781478001430 (pbk. : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Mexico—History—1946–1970. |
Nineteen sixty-eight, A.D.
Classification: LCC F1235 (ebook) |
LCC F1235 .D73 2018 (print) | DDC 972.08—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018001471

Cover art, top: Protestors, 1968. Photo by Óscar Menéndez.
Courtesy of the photographer. Bottom, from left: M8 "Greyhound"
tanks at a demonstration at the Zócalo, Mexico City, August 28,
1968; Student demonstration, Mexico City, August 27, 1968. Photos
by Marcel·lí Perelló.

"What was '68 for you?"

MARTÍN DOZAL

"For me it was a party, at the beginning . . .
this awakening: an awakening that woke us up
and that did not wake us up."

GUADALUPE FERRER

"'68 for me was the opening of thought."

ESMERALDA REYNOSO

"'68 absolutely revolutionized my life."

GLADYS LÓPEZ HERNÁNDEZ

"'68 was like an awakening, not only for me,
but the young people of this time here in Mexico:
to see other horizons, other paths, other ways
of thinking, of living, of knowing, like an awakening to
a real reality, pardon the redundancy, not what
they put on television, in the family."

—Interviews with Susana Draper
and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo, *México 68:*
Modelo para armar; Archivo de memorias
desde los márgenes

MERCEDES PERELLÓ

"We had strong disagreements about how to make
revolution. In '68 for the first time we stopped fighting
and we all joined together in the same struggle."

—Interview with Heidrun Hozfeind,
México 68: Entrevistas con activistas
del movimiento estudiantil

Contents

Preface

There are interruptions: moments in which one of the machines that makes time function stops—it can be the machine of work, or of School. There are likewise moments when the masses in the street oppose their agenda to that of governmental apparatuses. These "moments" are not only ephemeral instances that interrupt the temporal flow, which is later normalized. They are also effective mutations of the landscape of the visible, the seeable, and the sayable, transformations of the world of the possible. —JACQUES RANCIÈRE, "Desarrollar la temporalidad de los momentos de igualdad"

The moment of '68 is a figure saturated by projections and evaluations: *point of origin, watershed of history, democratizing instance, historical failure.* However, the more we look and read, the more its contours, its dates, its coherence are blurred. In writing *Amulet*, this great poetic gesture about '68 Mexico, Chilean writer Roberto Bolaño plays with this confusion. His protagonist, Auxilio Lacouture, inspired by Alcira Soust, a Uruguayan poet who lived in Mexico without papers, is obsessed with how, in attempting to remember them, dates intertwine in a curious process of becoming: "The year 1968 became the year 1964 and the year 1960 became the year 1956. But it also became the years 1970 and 1973 and the years 1975 and 1976."[1] Locked in the women's bathroom at the School of Philosophy and Letters during the military occupation of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM, National Autonomous University of Mexico), Alcira-Auxilio feels "as if time were coming apart" and '68 becomes a lookout point of history.[2] One of the keys to *Amulet*, published thirty years after the student popular movement, resides in the emphasis on the disproportion that is involved in all acts of imagining the past. This implies a compelling critical gesture: not thinking about the past, en masse, as great failure or defeat that uses the present as a measure for projecting another future; but on the contrary, the text destabilizes all notions of progressive linearity in time, making us think about the singularity connected to the ways of making history perceptible, the leap implied by the passage from experience to its narrativization. This strikes me as important because the Mexican '68 (or "the '68s" everywhere) are encircled by a certain moralizing way of assessing it (did it fail, did it triumph, did it lead to a "transition," was it fruitful?), which

disregards the singular character of the event as mobilizing an entire political context, more than as a process that should lead to concrete results. As Jacques Rancière suggests in the epigraph that opens this chapter, there are moments in history in which certain interruptions take place and open up a transformation of language and a visibility of the political that is difficult to translate into an evaluative form. This also relates to a reconfiguration of the political that is key to 1968 around the world.

This book seeks to investigate some of the ways in which the emancipation and reconfiguration of the political took place, during and after '68. This involves bringing the question of emancipation to the realm of memory—a possible *emancipation* of memories of '68—and also to the reconfiguration of a series of movements that express the unique polyphony of the moment. It is a matter of avoiding a sense of property and ownership over meanings, expressed through certain *camouflaged or visible monopolies over words* about '68, thereby opening up and multiplying the archives, voices, and images that helped identify crucial problems of the time, such as self-management, the democratization of knowledge, a mass exodus into the streets, the circulation of words in numerous assemblies, the opening up of diverse processes of liberation from heteropatriarchal schemes of life, the permanent provocation of singular encounters, and so on. Thus 1968 emerges here as *the name and locus* of a series of revolts that seek a different language in which to discuss and perform modes of emancipation and liberation. It is a moment profoundly marked by changes to the way we understand the meaning and function of the word *revolution*, which we could see as in transition from noun (*revolution* as state takeover) to verb (*revolutionize*). One of the many crucial edges of '68 was the fact that the word *revolution* was grounded in everyday practices that affected a range of public, private, and common spaces. This was expressed through various *problematic units* particular to the time, which served to define the specific characteristics of each movement in different parts of the world. When I speak of problematic units, I am referring to several key forms of expression that composed new political horizons out of a desire to ascertain the meaning of self-management, practices of equality, participation in everyday acts, horizontality, creative forms of organization, and the displacement of the roles and functions performed by sectors of authority and of knowledge.

In thinking about this book, the notion of the constellation comes to mind as a way of naming what emerges here as '68: to follow the trace that links different flickering points in a multiplicity of concepts, images, bodies, and memories that emerge as modes of continuing it in thought, in image, and in a distant present. The idea of approaching 1968 as a constellation (and less

as a monumental and fixed instant of history) reconfigures 1968 as the name and place of an event that is constantly reconstructed, debated, and re-created. Hence, I do not think of this book as a way of accounting for the moment, in the sense of what a historian or a sociologist does, often reconstructing events from the demand for the truth required by the discipline. Incorporating those readings, but attempting to take them elsewhere, my desire has been to suspend a certain criterion of positivist veracity expressed in the proposal to "account for" what was right or wrong in a moment. In attending to the possibility of constructing a '68 constellation composed of a series of materials that open up different disciplines, I investigate the ways '68 is expressed, continued, and thought about on various planes: philosophical, essayistic, testimonial, visual. Thus, more than an analysis of an archive that '68 creates as an object, I look into how the *'68 effect* is configured and how it affects certain practices of writing, visualization, and subjectivization: that is, how '68 is repeated as a gesture that not only destabilizes politics and bodies but also institutes different forms of critical language, thought, cinematography, and pedagogy. Thus, I was interested in bringing to the structure of the book something that in '68 was a key for reflecting on self-management and the democratization of knowledge: interdisciplinarity, or dialogue among different languages and practices as a way of taking on a university that reiterated the technocratic mandate of hyperspecialization, which partitioned knowledge to the point that it lost sight of its connection to social problems.

On a personal note, it should be said that a book develops in many periods, to the rhythm of countless conversations, readings, experiences, and encounters. The writing of the book was interrupted by the emergence of Occupy Wall Street (OWS) in 2011, a moment in which '68 became present in many forms in the imaginary and poetics capable of naming the innovative nature of these movements. Participating in the movement suspended my writing for a long time, since, in addition to lacking time in the first months of an intense moment of projects and assemblies, I began to feel a strong distance from what I was writing. The proximity between many issues that we were putting forward connected to the idea of a democracy of knowledge, to the encounters among different people and the potential for dialogue—an entire series of points that were crucial in my project about '68. Suddenly, I felt full of questions, and the idea of writing in an individual way became something distant. At the same time, the sense of opening that the movements brought amid a fossilized, politically neoliberal scene at the center of capital made me want to dig deeper into some of the leading ideas of this project: Revueltas's cognitive democracy and the role of the encounters that provide one of the most singular characteristics

of these movements. Conversations among those who do not usually converge are some of the sparks in such moments.

As I reconnected with the project, all these learning experiences made me think of the kind of book I wanted to write. In order to analyze the idea of a democracy of knowledge and bring other voices to the stage, following some traces, like the "workshop on words" ("taller de palabras") at Lecumberri Prison that Revueltas names in "Imprisoned Words," or to look at the different memories of women who participated in different ways, I had to look for what was not in the usual writings and archives.[3] In conversation with me about this, Vicente Rubio-Pueyo came up with the idea of video-recording the interviews, and we embarked on a parallel project of creating what we see as an open archive of memories, thus continuing the research into the Mexican '68 in another way: assembling an archive of voices and memories of '68 that were not always the same, opening the space of the word toward other zones, taking the form of the assembly to the practice of memory. With the help of Ángel Luis Lara and Luis Hernández Navarro, we embarked on a series of conversations, editing them as video interviews with the help of Lur Elaizola and Yolanda Pividal. This took the shape of a virtual archive (https://www.mexico68conversaciones.com/) that we called *Mexico '68: Model for Assembly; Archive of Memories from the Margins*, borrowing from Julio Cortázar's experimental novel published in 1968, and also following the title used by Héctor Aguilar Camín.[4] As we embarked on the process of listening to different people, new ideas and suggestions planted the seeds that would help me continue the process of writing this book. In part, I could not have continued without this other side of the process, the *conversation* and the act of poring over the words of those who had made fundamental contributions but who had not written their "book about '68," as others had done. The work of gathering voices coincided with the unexpected emergence of #YoSoy132, which brought up '68 as an inspiring reference, making similar demands for opening the language of information, for a change in the script, and denouncing the political monopoly of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI, Institutional Revolutionary Party) and the Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN, National Action Party). Comrades from 132 traveled to New York as part of this collective feeling that the new movements opened, making dialogue and different assessments possible.

My return to a more systematic process of writing this book in 2013 (two years after the beginning of OWS and once the movement had lost the intensity of its first two years) during the course of a Princeton graduate seminar about '68 was a way of demanding that I think about various times and problems simultaneously, but now with the pleasant feeling of patience that the distance

of time provides. This allowed me to see in a more nuanced way the relevance of these historical instances that, like '68, are able to gather many peoples, groups, and sectors, as well as the need to insist on the form of elaborating their memories from polyphony and the desire for connectivity. We live in an age in which the necrological apparatuses of the state, the *narcos*, the war machines, insist on continuing to punctuate the circuits for demanding justice, democracy, and equality with an accumulation of corpses. Nevertheless, sometimes it seems that we pass from one demand to the next, from one necrologic to another, *losing sight of the need for struggles to construct a common language, a historicity that enables exiting the unusual presentism with which neoliberalism punctuates life.* In this sense, bringing to the present the memory of moments that were so profound in their demand for another form of politics, another way of participating from within the everyday and from within the social fabric, from dialogue and cooperation, continues to be relevant. To attempt to cross the horizon of fixed identities with which a certain politics maintains controllable order implies reflecting on the encounter between different people as an essential element of the political. Here *equality* is not the demand of a small group but rather *a demand for the reconfiguration of the stage that makes the political possible.* On this stage, words and images exist as elements with which we narrate the possibility of change, the historicity of the present in constant dialogue with the past, the relationships of learning that we establish, almost without thinking, between pasts and presents, times and places, which all of a sudden connect and generate critical constellations.

Acknowledgments

A book is the result of a long process of conversations. I would like to thank friends and colleagues who invited me to share fragments of this project at different stages, to participate in conferences and share work in progress: Jens Andermann, Elixabete Ansa, Gavin Arnall, Manuela Badilla, Bruno Bosteels, Oscar Cabezas, Ivonne del Valle, Eugenio Di Stephano, Claudia Feld, Gabriel Giorgi, Erin E. Goodman, Erin Graff Zivin, Merilee S. Grindle, Katherine Hite, Pablo La Parra, Jacques Lezra, Vania Markarian, Lidia Mateo, Graciela Montaldo, Alberto Moreiras, Cristina Moreiras, Jaime Ortega, Jennifer Rodríguez, Marcelo Rodríguez, Raúl Rodríguez Freire, Rafael Rojas, Ana Sabau, Emilio Sauri, Marcelo Starcembaum, José Luis Villacañas, Esther Whitfield, Gareth Williams; and the graduate students in Comparative Literature and in Spanish and Portuguese at Princeton, New York University, Cornell, and the University of Illinois–Chicago. Special gratitude goes to the graduate students who participated in the "1968 and the present" graduate seminar at Princeton in 2013, where the main lines of this project were discussed; to the editors of the series Radical Américas, Bruno and Geo, for encouraging me to participate; and to Courtney Berger, for her invaluable comments and guidance through the publishing process.

Most of the book relies on the conversations that built onto the project of *Mexico '68: Model for Assembly*. Immense gratitude to the generosity of Angel Luis Lara and Luis Hernández Navarro, for thinking aloud about people who would become key to the project. The thinking process would not have been possible without the generosity and openness of those who shared their memories and reflections on 1968: Jesús Martín del Campo, Martín Dozal, Guadalupe Ferrer, Alberto Híjar, Gladys López Hernández, Óscar Menéndez, Fernanda Navarro, Esmeralda Reynoso, Ramón Vela, and Juan Villoro. Their words and memories opened many itineraries and made me come up with the imaginary lines that mapped different constellations.

The research was carried out with the support of my colleagues in Comparative Literature and Spanish and Portuguese, and with grants from Princeton Latin American Studies, the David A. Gardner Grant, and the University Committee on Research on the Humanities and Social Sciences. Its English

version was possible thanks to the patient work of editing and translation at different stages by Andrew Ascherl, Patricia Draper, Audrey Hall, Ruth Halvey, and Margarita Rosario.

Thanks to all the *compañerxs* from many spaces in New York City (Making Worlds, 16beaver, Free University, Socio-Praxis at Sunset Park, Critical Resistance) that since and after Occupy made Revueltas's ideas on cognitive democracy, which inspired this project, be experienced in many forms; gratitude to Ayreen Anastas, David Andersson, Pablo Benson, Ina Bransome, Sara Burke, Maria Byck, Isabel Cadenas-Cañón, George Caffentzis, Jim Constanzo, Silvia Federici, René Gabri, Sofia Galisá, Malav Kanuga, Jesal Kapadia, Janet Koenig, Kara Lynch, Brian Mac Carthy, Janet Mangia, Luis Moreno-Caballud, Marina Sitrin, Conor Tomás Reed, Maleni Romero-Córdoba, Chris Rude, Begonia Santa Cecilia, Antonio Serna, Kristin Soerianata, Babak Tofighi, Brian Welton, Marlene Ramos, and Marcos Wasem, among many others.

This book is for Vicente—who made it possible through a sustained encouragement and reminder that it was worth doing it, through conversations, ideas, and the intensity of sharing and building different "commons" dreams—and for our little explorer and *libertador de rutinas*, *el peque* Simón.

Early versions of parts of chapters 2 and 4 were published in *Efectos de imagen: ¿Qué fue y qué es el cine militante?* (Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2014), edited by Elixabete Ansa Goicoechea and Óscar Ariel Cabezas, and in *Reflections on Memory and Democracy*, edited by Merilee S. Grindle and Erin E. Goodman (Cambridge, MA: David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University, 2016).

Introduction

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 (nonunified, 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 afterlife 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 Bensaïd'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 offstage.[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 Mendiolea, 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 postgraduate 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 Gilabert, 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 quotidianity" 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 communiqués 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-elaborates 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 *Ovarimony* 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]

Notes

Preface

1 Roberto Bolaño, *Amulet*, trans. Chris Andrews (New York: New Directions, 2008), 32; originally published as *Amuleto* (Barcelona: Anagrama, 1999).
2 Bolaño, *Amulet*, 33, 55.
3 José Revueltas, "Las palabras prisioneras," *México 68: Juventud y revolución* (Mexico City: Era, 1978), 245–47.
4 Susana Draper and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo, *México 68: Modelo para armar; Archivo de memorias desde los márgenes*; Héctor Aguilar Camín, "68, modelo para armar," in *Pensar el 68*, edited by Héctor Aguilar Camín and Hermann Bellinghausen (Mexico City: Cal y Arena, 1988), 13–14; Julio Cortázar, *62. Modelo para armar* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1968).

Introduction

1 See Eric Hobsbawm, "1968: A Retrospective," *Marxism Today* 22, no. 5 (1978): 130–38; George Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968* (Boston: South End Press, 1999); and Luisa Passerini, *Autobiography of a Generation: Italy, 1968*, trans. Lisa Erdberg (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996).
2 Daniel Bensaïd and Henri Weber, *Mai 1968: Une répétition générale* (Paris: F. Maspero, 1968).
3 Giovanni Arrighi, Terrence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Antisystemic Movements* (London: Verso, 2012).
4 John Holloway, *Change the World without Taking Power* (London: Pluto, 2002).
5 See Kostis Kornetis, "Introduction: 1968–2008: The Inheritance of Utopia," *Historein* 9 (2009): 7–20. In Mexico, '68 became a political referent for understanding #YoSoy132: see Oswaldo Zavala, "Del '68 al 132," *Proceso*, July 13, 2012, http://www.proceso.com.mx/314002/314002-del-68-al-132; Georgina Howard, "El 68 es un pendiente que retoma el YoSoy132," *Reporte indigno*, October 3, 2011, http://m.reporteindigo.com/reporte/mexico/el-68-es-un-pendiente-que-retoma-el-yosoy132; Daniel Casillas, "Siguen vigentes demandas del 68 ahora con #YoSoy132," *Animal político*, October 3, 2012, http://www.animalpolitico.com/2012/10/siguen-vigentes-demandas-del-68-ahora-con-yosoy132-comite-68/; Óscar Martín Álvarez Jiménez, "Del movimiento del 68 al YoSoy 132," *Zócalo*, October 15, 2012, http://www.zocalo.com.mx/seccion/opinion-articulo/del-movimiento-del-68-al-yo-soy-132; Itzel Castañares, "Del 68 al YoSOY 132, caras de los movimientos," *24 horas*, October 7, 2012,

http://www.24-horas.mx/del-68-al-yosoy132-caras-de-los-movimientos-estudiantiles-video/.

6 Daniel Sherman et al., "Introduction," in *The Long 1968: Revisions and New Perspectives*, ed. Daniel Sherman et al. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 16–17; Elaine Carey, "The Streets Speak, 1968 and Today," in *Protests in the Streets: 1968 across the Globe*, ed. Elaine Carey (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2016), 120–32.

7 Katherine Hite, *Politics and the Art of Commemoration: Memorials to Struggle in Latin America and Spain* (London: Routledge, 2013), 1–2.

8 Kostis Kornetis explores this point in greater detail in " 'Everything Links'? Temporality, Territoriality and Cultural Transfer in the '68 Protest Movements," *Historein* 9 (2009): 34–45. Regarding the analysis of various aspects of the new movements mentioned above, see Marina Sitrin and Dario Azzelini, *They Can't Represent Us! Reinventing Democracy from Greece to Occupy* (London: Verso, 2014); Michael Gould-Wartofsky, *The Occupiers: The Making of the 99 Percent Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Luis Moreno-Caballud, *Cultures of Anyone: Studies on Cultural Democratization in the Spanish Neoliberal Ciruit* (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2015); Raúl Diego Rivera Hernández, *Del Internet a las calles: #YoSoy132, una opción alternativa de hacer política* (Raleigh, NC: Editorial A Contracorriente, 2016).

9 Kristin Ross, *May '68 and Its Afterlives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 1–2.

10 Bruno Bosteels, "Mexico 1968: The Revolution of Shame," *Radical Philosophy* 149 (May–June 2008): 11, emphasis mine.

11 Alain Badiou, "May 68 Revisited, 40 Years On," in *The Communist Hypothesis* (London: Verso, 2010), 62–63.

12 Luisa Passerini, "The Problematic Intellectual Repercussions of '68: Reflections in a Jump-cut Style," *Historein* 9 (2009): 24.

13 See Andreas Huyssen's analysis in *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), along with various texts on consumption and memory in Latin America found in Ksenija Bilbija and Leigh Payne, eds., *Accounting for Violence: Marketing Memory in Latin America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

14 Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett, eds., *The Third World in the Global Sixties* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013). There are lessons to be learned from a whole genre of creation in the 1960s—lessons that make the sharp division now in fashion (Global South vs. Global North) sound a bit problematic. I think, for instance, of Agnes Varda's collaboration with the Black Panthers in California, which resulted in the censored film *The Black Panthers*, in which she learns to question what it means to be a woman artist, thus cultivating a feminist gaze; or Jean Genet's clandestine visit to the United States to raise money for the Panthers.

15 Karen Dubinsky et al., "Introduction: The Global Sixties," in *New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness*, ed. Karen Dubinsky et al. (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2009), 2.

16 Kornetis, " 'Everything Links'?," 34.

17 Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left*, 3.

18 Within the field of Latin American studies, the national-international character of 1968 and the 1960s has been studied from many angles. Some studies address the internationalism of the sixties by focusing on specific local processes—here I refer to Andrea Giunta's *Avant-Garde, Internationalism, and Politics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), Vania Markarian's *Uruguay 1968: Student Activism from Global Counterculture to Molotov Cocktails* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016), and Eric Zolov's *Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). Others map out the Latin American landscape by connecting various regional sites and events, as Diana Sorensen does in *A Turbulent Decade Remembered: Scenes from the Latin American Sixties* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

19 It is worth emphasizing the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist lens that enables us to see each "national" history in an entirely different light. As Fredric Jameson demonstrates, there is a whole "beginning" to '68 rooted in the so-called Third World and its struggles for freedom. Likewise, we must acknowledge this same phenomenon in great centers of culture and consumption such as France (i.e., fighting over Algeria) and the United States (i.e., the civil rights movement). See Fredric Jameson, "Periodizing the 60s," in *The 60s without Apology*, ed. Sohnya Sayres et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), 178–209.

20 Along with Ross's statements on the connection between the French '68 and decolonization, Rancière states that "'68 was not a youth revolt. '68 did not represent the emergence of a new way of life. '68 was an event inscribed within a certain type of political memory, and that memory was bound up with decolonization. The 'German Jew' of '68 would have been unthinkable were it not for a certain mode of including the Other. *And that mode of inclusion was inscribed within the after-effects of mobilization against the Algerian War.* It was bound up with the way in which the figure of the colonized and their War of liberation replaced the figure of the proletarian as the form that allowed a wrong to be universalized and as a way of espousing the cause of the Other." Jacques Rancière, "Democracy Means Equality: Jacques Rancière Interviewed by *Passages*," *Radical Philosophy* 82 (March/April 1997): 33, emphasis mine.

21 Topilejo is a town located twenty-one kilometers south of the UNAM campus where, at the very beginning of the movement, on September 3, 1968, a bus accident occurred due to poor road conditions and vehicle malfunction. Learning of the ten dead and thirty-four wounded, the people of Topilejo—mostly from rural settings—began to organize a demonstration. Student brigades came to the neighborhood to stand in solidarity with the protesters, who demanded improvement in the conditions of the roads and public transport vehicles, compensation for the families of the dead, and economic assistance for the medical treatment of the wounded. As Sergio Zermeño observes, they organized three different types of brigades to provide political, technical, and direct action support. Sergio Zermeño, *México: Una democracia utópica; El movimiento estudiantil del 68* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1978), 226–32. The resulting cooperation between the student movement and the people exceeded a mere list of demands—which, by the way, were awarded. Many of the slogans stemming from this encounter emphasize how important this moment was to the

imaginary of the movement: "Let's make two, three, many Topilejos." In 2008 *La Jornada* published a series of testimonies of the experience: "Topilejo, primer territorio libre de México" by Antonio Vera Martínez and "Las campanas de Topilejo convocan al pueblo" by Lourdes Edith Rudiño. Interviews with townspeople who participated were recorded in "Testimonios del 68 Topilejo," YouTube, January 28, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pqM77CUSCzA.

22 For an analysis of the Olympic Games, see Luis Castañeda, *Spectacular Mexico: Design, Propaganda, and the 1968 Olympics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); and Celeste González de Bustamante, "Olympic Dreams and Tlatelolco Nightmares: Imagining and Imaging Modernity in Television," *Mexican Studies / Estudios Mexicanos* 26, no. 1 (2010): 1–30; for an analysis of the movement and the preparation for the Olympic Games, see Elaine Carey, "Mexico's 1968 Olympic Dream," in *Protests in the Streets: 1968 across the Globe*, ed. Elaine Carey (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2016), 91–119. For a creative work that sets the massacre alongside the Olympics, see Brian Holmes, "1968 Olympic Dreams and Tlatelolco Nightmares: Imagining and Imaging Modernity on Television," November 18, 2015, https://prezi.com/47wxztjx0cr6/1968-olympic-dreams-and-tlatelolco-nightmares-imagining-and/. For an unusual perspective on how the student movement appropriated the creative design of the Olympics, see the compilation by Grupo Mira, *The Graphics of 68: Honoring the Student Movement* (Mexico City: Ediciones Zurda, 1993).

23 Ross, *May '68 and Its Afterlives*, 2–3.

24 Ross, *May '68 and Its Afterlives*, 6.

25 Samuel Steinberg, *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco: Afterimages of Mexico, 1968* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2016), 9.

26 See Francisco Medina, "El 68 un cambio social y no democrático: Esmeralda Reynoso," *almomento noticias*, October 10, 2013, http://www.almomento.mx/el-68-un-cambio-social-y-no-democratico-esmeralda-reynoso/.

27 He states, "What Ayotzinapa reveals is more radical: it is not that the transition was truncated, but that there had not been a transition at all," going through the aperture of the PRI and the emergence of PAN as reforms instead of a form of democratization. Rafael Lemus, "Ayotzinapa, la multitud y el antiguo régimen," *Política común* 7 (2015), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/pc/12322227.0007.010/—ayotzinapa-la-multitud-y-el-antiguo-regimen?rgn=main;view=fulltext. Translations throughout the book are mine unless otherwise noted.

28 Bruno Bosteels, *Marx and Freud in Latin America: Politics, Psychoanalysis, and Religion in Times of Terror* (New York: Verso, 2012), 163, emphasis mine.

29 Passerini draws attention to similar issues when she states, "My definition of 1968 poses a general problem of temporality, or rather of the series of temporal sequences in which 1968 is situated," pointing to the brevity of the events, the life of the movements, and the cultural changes that they provoked and still mark the present. Luisa Passerini, *Memory and Utopia: The Primacy of Intersubjectivity* (London: Routledge, 2007), 55.

30 Elizabeth Jelin, *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*, trans. Judy Rein and Marcial Godoy-Anativia (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 4–5.

31 Eugenia Allier Montaño, "Presentes-pasados del 68 mexicano," *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 71, no. 2 (2009): 302. I also refer to Allier-Montaño's further development of the analysis of how the memories and accounts of 1968 varied throughout the decades ("Memory and History of Mexico '68," *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies,* Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe 102 (2016): 7–25. See also Vania Markarian's analysis of how narratives have transformed over time: "Debating Tlatelolco: Thirty Years of Public Debates about the Mexican Student Movement of 1968," in *Taking Back the Academy! History of Activism, History as Activism*, ed. Jim Downs and Jennifer Manion (New York: Routledge, 2004), 25–34. Steinberg's recent book *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco* examines the legacy of Tlatelolco in greater depth over time and through different media.

32 Elena Poniatowska, *Massacre in Mexico*, trans. Helen R. Lane (New York: Viking Press, 1975); Allier Montaño, "Presentes-pasados," 311.

33 Esmeralda Reynoso, interview with Susana Draper and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo*, México 68: Modelo para armar; Archivo de memorias desde los márgenes,* 2015, https://www.mexico68conversaciones.com/.

34 José Ramón Ruisánchez Serra explains how the voices that predominate in the tour are those of well-known people in the cultural sphere yet again telling their version of events. Besides noting the silencing of voices that have not been adopted by the establishment, Ruisánchez Serra highlights the absence of more contemporary views that have disputed the construction of this kind of monument. José Ramón Ruisánchez Serra, "Reading '68: The Tlatelolco Memorial and Gentrification in Mexico City," in *Accounting for Violence: Marketing Memory in Latin America*, ed. Leigh A. Payne and Ksenija Bilbija (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 179–206.

35 Daniel Bensaïd, *Marx for Our Times: Adventures and Misadventures of a Critique* (New York: Verso, 2002), 10.

36 Aguilar Camín, "68, modelo para armar," 13.

37 For instance, it seems odd how "Tlatelolco" is often used as a kind of shorthand for the Mexican '68 movement in the recent wave of studies about the sixties in the Global South. In this context, Claire Brewster argues that on the international level, the Tlatelolco massacre receives the most emphasis, diverting relevance away from the movement that preceded and followed it. Claire Brewster, "The Student Movement of 1968 and the Mexican Press: The Cases of *Excélsior* and *Siempre!*," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 21, no. 2 (2002): 150.

38 Esteban Ascencio, ed., *1968: Más allá del mito* (Mexico City: Ediciones del Milenio, 1998), 9.

39 Bosteels, "Mexico 1968."

40 Gareth Williams, *The Mexican Exception: Sovereignty, Police, and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 133.

41 Steinberg, *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco*, 25.

42 Gastón Martínez, "Todo el mundo era protagonista," in Ascencio, *1968: Más allá del mito*, 99.

43 David Vega, "Una vida del Politécnico: entrevista con Hermann Bellinghausen," in Aguilar Camín and Bellinghausen, *Pensar el 68*, 43.

44 Pablo Gómez Alvarez, "Las enseñanzas: entrevista con Víctor Avilés," in Aguilar Camín and Bellinghausen, *Pensar el 68*, 216.

45 Deborah Cohen and Lessie Jo Frazier, " 'No sólo cocinábamos . . .': Historia inédita de la otra mitad del 68," in *La transición interrumpida: México 1968–1998*, ed. Ilán Semo (Mexico City: Departamento de Historia, Universidad Iberoamericana, 1993), 75–105.

46 Gloria Tirado Villegas, *La otra historia: Voces de mujeres del 68, Puebla* (Puebla: Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Instituto Poblano de la Mujer, 2004), 13.

47 Blanche Petrich, "Entrevista a Ana Ignacia Rodríguez, *La Nacha*," *La Jornada*, July 22, 2002, http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2002/07/22/009n1pol.php?origen=politica.html.

48 Paco Ignacio Taibo II, *'68*, trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2004); Eduardo Valle, *Escritos sobre el movimiento del 68* (Sinaloa: Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, 1984).

49 Sally Alexander, *Becoming a Woman: And Other Essays in 19th and 20th Century Feminist Theory* (London: Virago, 1994), 19; Passerini, *Memory and Utopia*, 9.

50 Reynoso, interview with Susana Draper and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo, *México 68: Modelo para armar*.

51 Taibo, *'68*, 51, emphasis mine.

52 In interviews with Guadalupe Ferrer, Esmeralda Reynoso, and Gladys López Hernández, it should be noted how, for each of them, equality in everyday practices felt like a singular characteristic of the moment (all the interviews are part of *México 68: Modelo para armar*, https://www.mexico68conversaciones.com).

53 In *The Political Thought of Jacques Rancière: Creating Equality* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), Todd May distinguishes between passive and active equality in order to emphasize the difference.

54 Among a long list of titles narrating this passage, I refer here to bell hooks, *Feminism Is for Everybody* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000); Nancy Fraser, *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis* (New York: Verso, 2013); Nancy Fraser and Axel Honnett, *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political Philosophical Exchange*, trans. Joel Golb (New York: Verso, 2003).

55 Judith Butler, *Notes toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 5.

56 If we track the key works that have been published nearly every decade as if to mark the anniversary of the event, it is alarming to observe the powerful, almost exclusively masculine presence in the field of speaking and making the movement legible. In the 1970s: Raúl Álvarez Garín, *Los procesos de México 1968: Acusaciones y defensa* (Mexico City: Editorial Estudiantes, 1970), Luis González de Alba, *Los días y los años* (Mexico City: Era, 1971); Elena Poniatowska, *La noche de Tlatelolco: Testimonios de historia oral* (Mexico City: Era, 1971); José Revueltas, *México 68: Juventud y revolución* (Mexico City: Era, 1978); Sergio Zermeño, *México: Una democracia utópica; El movimiento estudiantil de 1968* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1978). In the 1980s: Eduardo Valle, *Escritos sobre el movimiento del 68* (1984); Héctor Aguilar Camín and Hermann Belling-

hausen, eds., *Pensar el 68* (1988); Gilberto Guevara Niebla, *La democracia en la calle: crónica del movimiento estudiantil mexicano* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1988); Heberto Castillo, *Si te agarran, te van a matar* (Mexico City: Océano, 1983); Leopoldo Ayala, *Nuestra Verdad: Memorial popular del movimiento estudiantil popular y el dos de octubre de 1968* (Mexico City: Porrúa, 1989). In the 1990s: Raúl Álvarez Garín, *La estela de Tlatelolco: Una reconstrucción histórica del movimiento estudiantil del 68* (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1998); Sergio Aguayo, *1968: Los archivos de la violencia* (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1998); Esteban Ascencio, *1968: Más allá del mito* (1998); Paco Ignacio Taibo II, *'68* (1991); Roberta Avendaño, *De la libertad y el encierro* (Mexico City: La idea dorada, 1998); Julio Scherer García and Carlos Monsiváis, *Parte de guerra, Tlatelolco 1968: Documentos del general Marcelino García Barragán; Los hechos y la historia* (Mexico City: Nuevo Siglo/Aguilar, 1999). In the first decade of the twenty-first century: Gilberto Guevara Niebla, *La libertad nunca se olvida: Memoria del 68* (Mexico City: Cal y Arena, 2004), and *1968: Largo camino a la democracia* (Mexico City: Cal y Arena, 2008); Gladys López Hernández, *Ovarimonio: ¿Yo guerrillera?* (Mexico City: Itaca, 2013).

57 I take the line from his song "Samba da Bênção." Vinícius de Moraes, Odete Lara, and Baden Powell. *Vinicius De Moraes.* [S.l.]: Folha de S. Paulo, 2008.

58 Heidrun Hozfeind, "Entrevista a Mercedes Perelló," *México 68: Entrevistas con activistas del movimiento estudiantil.* http://www.mexico68.net/files/mex68spanishrz.pdf.

59 I use the notion of climate that Amador Fernández-Savater proposes to explain the movements that emerged in 2011 in their displacement of the forms of naming traditional politics. A climate implies an environment that is progressively modified and in which a multiplicity of projects, expectations, and desires coexist and are linked under the umbrella or sign of a name (15-M, Occupy Wall Street, etc.) instead of following the logic of a "party" or a specific petition (a project with a beginning and an end). Amador Fernández-Savater, "How to Organize a Climate?," *Making Worlds: A Commons Coalition*, https://makingworlds.wikispaces.com/How+to+Organize+a+Climate.

60 For a discussion of the popular character of the movement, see Zermeño, *México: Una democracia utópica*; and Ayala, *Nuestra verdad*.

61 Zermeño, *México: Una democracia utópica*, 51.

62 César Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía: Análisis del imaginario sociopolítico en el movimiento estudiantil de México, 1968* (Mexico City: Porrúa, 1993).

63 Luis Villoro, *Tres retos de la sociedad por venir: Justicia, democracia, pluralidad* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 2009).

64 Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía*, 138.

65 Adolfo Gilly, "1968: La ruptura en los bordes," *Nexos*, November 1, 1993, http://www.nexos.com.mx/?p=6916.

66 Álvarez Garín, *La estela de Tlatelolco*, 30.

67 Guevara Niebla, *La democracia en la calle*, 49. The student movements began years before in Puebla, Morelia, Sonora, and Tabasco as more localized struggles that elicited acts of solidarity from the rest of the student population.

68 Also contained in the petition is a denunciation of the harsh repression of the 1958 railroad workers' strike, where the state put an end to the struggle for union independence (up to that point, the struggle had been co-opted by the PRI), and of the repression of the peasant struggle, whose critical event was the assassination of the peasant leader Rubén Jaramillo and his family in Morelos.

69 Zermeño, *México: Una democracia utópica*, 35.

70 Álvarez Garín, *La estela de Tlatelolco*, 47.

71 Álvarez Garín, *La estela de Tlatelolco*, 77.

72 Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía*, 184–85.

73 Esmeralda Reynoso, interview with Susana Draper and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo, *México 68: Modelo para armar*.

74 Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía*, 170.

75 On this point, besides Gilabert and Zermeño, see Enrique de la Garza, Tomás Ejea Mendoza, and Luis Fernando Macías García, *El otro movimiento estudiantil* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana–Azcapotzalco, 2014).

76 Guevara Niebla, *La democracia en la calle*, 57.

77 For a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which authority cuts across political, cultural, and subjective boundaries, see Zolov, *Refried Elvis*.

78 Carlos Monsiváis, "1968: Dramatis Personae," in *México: Una democracia utópica; El movimiento estudiantil del 68*, by Sergio Zermeño (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1978), xviii. For a fresh and detailed characterization of 1968, I refer to Monsiváis's classic *El 68: La tradición de la resistencia* (Mexico City: Era, 2008).

79 Guevara Niebla, *La democracia en la calle*, 47–48.

80 Williams, *The Mexican Exception*, 12.

81 Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, quoted in Jorge Volpi, *La imaginación y el poder: Una historia intelectual de 1968* (Mexico City: Era, 1998), 234.

82 Volpi, *La imaginación y el poder,* 238–39.

83 Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, trans. Julie Rose (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 29.

84 Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía,* 173, 175. In relation to the relevance of words, see also Monsiváis, *El 68: La tradición de la resistencia*.

85 José Revueltas, "Las palabras prisioneras," in *México 68*, 246, emphasis mine.

86 José Revueltas, *El apando* (Mexico City: Era, 1978); José Revueltas, *El tiempo y el número,* in José Revueltas, *Las cenizas* (Mexico City: Era, 1988), 127–54.

87 Óscar Menéndez, *Historia de un documento / Histoire d 'un document* (Mexico City: Ediciones Pentagrama, 2004).

88 Fernanda Navarro, *Existencia, encuentro y azar* (Mexico City: Universidad Michoacana, Secretaría de Difusión Cultural, Editorial Universitaria, 1995).

89 Roberta Avendaño, *De la libertad y el encierro* (Mexico City: La idea dorada, 1998).

90 Glady López Hernández coins the term *ovarimony* to refer to a testimony postulated from a site marked by gender. *Ovarimonio: ¿Yo guerrillera?* (Mexico City: Itaca, 2013).

91 Michelle Zancarini-Fournel, *Le moment 68: Une histoire contestée* (Paris, Seuil, 2008).