


Historein

Vol 9 (2009)

Historising: 1968 and the Long Sixties



Utopia in Practise: The Discovery of Performativity in Sixties' Protest, Arts and Sciences

Martin Klimke, Joachim Scharloth

doi: [10.12681/historein.21](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.21)

Copyright © 2012, Martin Klimke, Joachim Scharloth



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Klimke, M., & Scharloth, J. (2010). Utopia in Practise: The Discovery of Performativity in Sixties' Protest, Arts and Sciences. *Historein*, 9, 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.21>

*Utopia in Practice:
The Discovery of
Performativity in
Sixties' Protest, Arts
and Sciences*

*The emergence of performativity
in the academy and the arts*

The idea of performativity first appeared in the speech act theory of John Langshaw Austin. In 1955, Harvard University invited the Oxford-based British philosopher to give the annual William James lectures. In this series of lectures, Austin attacked the philosophical view predominant at that time that utterances chiefly serve to state facts and thus can be deemed true or false according to the truth or falsity of the facts they state.¹ In contrast, he argued that sentences which can be evaluated for their truth content – “constative” utterances – only form a small and special part on one end of the scale of utterance types. At the other end, Austin identified utterances that do not state any facts but with which the speaker performs an action – “performative” utterances.

Performative utterances like “I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth”, Austin maintained, do not describe anything but create reality when certain conditions are fulfilled. These sentences are not true or false, but become “infelicitous” or “unhappy” when the connection between them and the social order of which they are a part is out of sync. When performed successfully, performative utterances set conditions for determining the appropriateness of future action. Calling a ship that has been baptised “Queen Elizabeth” “Maria Stuart” would thus be considered inappropriate. Moreover, performative utterances are self-referential: They do not refer to anything beyond themselves but create what they are

Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth

German Historical Institute,
Washington, DC/University of Zurich

talking about in the act of being said. Even though Austin himself deconstructed the prototypical distinction between performative and constative utterances in the course of his lectures, his identification of performative utterances was a real breakthrough for modern linguistics and philosophy which has inspired theorists from all disciplines since.

In October 1959, only four years after Austin gave these lectures, performativity made its debut in performance art as well. Alan Kaprow, a former student of Columbia University's art history programme, conducted the first of "18 Happenings in 6 parts" at the Reuben Gallery on Fourth Avenue in New York.² Kaprow had divided the gallery space into three rooms with transparent plastic walls. The admission tickets directed visitors to take specified seats in each room at particular times and strictly choreographed their movements; they witnessed, among other events, a girl squeezing oranges, an artist lighting matches and painting, and an orchestra of toy instruments. Unlike standard theatre, these happenings abandoned any traditional narrative, involved the audience in the creative process, and tried to create a situation in which traditional modes of perception and of creating meaning were rendered invalid. It is from these performances that the now-famous term "happening" is derived: used originally to indicate a very determined, rehearsed and diverse production, the word has come to mean a spontaneous, undirected occurrence.

"Happening" and "performance" became buzzwords in the international vocabulary of the Sixties. These new kinds of performances distinguish themselves from traditional theatre by abandoning the dichotomy of stage and audience and, at the same time, by abolishing the sharp distinction between the symbolic and the concrete. Their actions are never solely symbolic. Their use of the body, the materiality, the temporality and the spatiality has qualities that semiotic categories cannot adequately describe. As Kaprow later wrote, "A happening, unlike a stage play, may occur at a supermarket, driving along a highway, under a pile of rags, and in a friend's kitchen, either at once or sequentially . . . It is art but seems closer to life."³

Speech act theory and performance art thus shared the insight that symbolic actions – performative actions in everyday life as well as artistic performances – have the potential to create or undermine social reality. This insight quickly spread among scientists and theorists all over the world and made the 1960s the decade of the discovery of performativity.

Performativity in the social sciences

A further example of the triumphant course of this idea is its application in the social sciences, especially in a then booming field: ethnomethodology. Harold Garfinkel's 1967 book *Studies in Ethnomethodology* remains a milestone in the adoption of performativity theory. Garfinkel sought to study how people make sense of their everyday surroundings, display this un-

derstanding to others, and produce the mutually shared social order in which they live. He assumed that there is a self-generating order in concrete activities that members of society achieve through actual, coordinated, procedural practices or methods. In his study on a male-to-female transsexual named Agnes, Garfinkel theorised that gender is a “situated accomplishment”.⁴ Agnes did not experience her gender visibility as routine or taken for granted but employed tacit means to secure and guarantee her rights and obligations as a normal adult female; thus Garfinkel was able to document how members of a society regularly employ such means to establish their gender identities.

To access the methods people use to create a mutually understood social order, Garfinkel developed his famous breaching experiments, wherein an experimenter violates commonly accepted social rules to analyse how people react.⁵ Stronger reactions, Garfinkel supposed, point to stronger rules. Examples of such breaching experiments included

- standing very, very close to a person while otherwise maintaining an innocent conversation;
- saying hello to terminate a conversation;
- mistaking customers for clerks and waiters intentionally;
- having adult children return to their parental homes and act like lodgers;
- and tipping friends, parents or strangers for small favours.

Such breaches of convention create troublesome events, which help to reveal the ordinary practices used to achieve stability. Like happenings, breaching experiments are a type of performance that involve the audience and break traditional rules to generate reflexivity about methods of making sense.

Another social scientist who took up the idea of performativity was anthropologist Victor Turner. Whereas Garfinkel used breaching experiments to scientifically analyse the everyday methods of creating a mutually understood reality, Turner developed a “performative anthropology” to create a new *mode* for understanding different cultures. Having worked on the transformative effects of ritual performance for years, he aimed to unify ethnographic texts with praxis. In the early 1970s, he had an opportunity to do so when Richard Schechner, professor of performance studies at New York University, invited him to conduct summer workshops with students of anthropology and drama there. Re-enacting rituals of the central African Ndembu tribe, he and his group utilised the concepts and techniques of the Western theatrical tradition to gain access to the lived experience of “the other”.⁶ They sought to translate the native culture to overcome the limits of understanding and “thick description”.⁷

Garfinkel’s and Turner’s scholarship represent two applications of performativity theory with different effects: The first promotes reflexivity about the social order by questioning common forms of perception and interpretation. The second allows for new modes of experience on the side of the performer. Both effects were essential to the ways the social movements of the 1960s employed performative practices, particularly as exemplified in the thought of Rudi Dutschke, the most prominent spokesperson of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund (German Socialist Student League, SDS), a leading organisation in the West German student protests of the late 1960s.

Protest performances in the 1960s

In 1969, the German federal ministry of the interior concluded in an official report that the student protesters in West Germany had borrowed and further developed US forms of direct action, copying the names of these actions such as “go-in” and “sit-in”. As the ministry argued, “The course of the [student] riots, most of all in Berlin, has shown that systematic forms of demonstrations, especially the technique of ‘limited rule-breaking’, are a particularly effective tool for emotionalising the masses and arousing a ‘social-revolutionary’ consciousness.”⁸

This report sums up the transnational attraction of performative protest techniques during the 1960s. Activists across the world were, of course, inspired by a variety of cultural practices, as well as artistic and political movements, that they frequently adopted for use in their own political context. But performative practices were a particularly rich source of inspiration. The theoretical notions advanced by Austin, Kaprow, Garfinkel and Turner thus found direct implementation in the actions of the protest movements of the 1960s. Although previous protest actions had often contained performative elements, it was new for such elements to derive from a conscious application of theory and to be placed in a larger avant-gardist tradition.⁹

Also new was the increasingly globalised media landscape of the 1960s, which magnified the impact of these nonconformist actions. As the media system gradually shifted to more visual codes with the spread of television, images of the African-American civil rights movement, for example, gained a worldwide reach.¹⁰ Yet the non-violent protests conducted by students sitting down at a segregated lunch-counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, in February 1960, or by the Freedom Riders on interstate buses in May 1961, or by civil rights marchers in 1965 in Selma, Alabama, were all, to use Garfinkel’s terms, breaching experiments, designed to expose and stir up a system of apartheid in the heart of the so-called free West. The violent response they provoked from local authorities and angry citizens revealed how deeply ingrained racial inequality was in American society. The protests also initiated a process of national reflection and political action to mend these deficiencies at a legal level through the civil rights legislation of 1964/65. The iconography, protest methods, and ethics of the civil rights movement thus had an impact far beyond America’s borders and played a crucial role in politicising Western activists. Foreign observers were especially fascinated by the idea of direct action with its roots in the essay on civil disobedience by Henry David Thoreau and its application by Mahatma Gandhi in India. Furthermore, the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley in 1964 and the emerging anti-war and teach-in movement the year after proved that these performative direct actions could also be implemented on campus and put other political issues onto the public agenda; in fact, they were able to excite and mobilise large numbers of people in an active, participatory process.

It is therefore no surprise that these political strategies soon made their way across the Atlantic, becoming re-contextualised in different cultural and political frameworks. Artist groups such as the Situationist International (SI) or the Dutch Provos began to draw on these methods, further fostering their transnational pollination.¹¹ Dieter Kunzelmann, for example, a member of the SI and one of the leading protagonists of the counter-cultural group Kommune I in the Federal Republic in the late 1960s, played a crucial role in infusing the student movement with

these anti-authoritarian methods.¹² The first detailed introduction to the concept of direct action among student activists, however, was provided Michael Vester, the vice-president and international secretary of the German SDS. Vester had studied in the US, from 1961 to 1962, where he worked extensively with the American SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) and its most active members, Al Haber and Tom Hayden, helping the group formulate its Port Huron Statement, a comprehensive manifesto of its ideals at the beginning of the decade.¹³ After his return, Vester introduced the German SDS to the theories of the American New Left, and demanded the implementation of “direct action” as practiced by the Free Speech and anti-war movement. For him, this political strategy was vital to the German SDS’s efforts to defeat the impending emergency laws that threatened to disempower parliament in the case of a vaguely defined state of emergency.

Vester’s call for a more action-oriented strategy helped push aside more traditional political approaches, eventually enabling the anti-authoritarian faction around Rudi Dutschke to rise to prominence in the German SDS. More and more German SDS members saw the American scene and protest techniques as a source of inspiration in 1965/66. The sit-in at the Free University of Berlin on 22 June 1966 is a particularly good example of this. Just as their peers in Berkeley had done two years before, West Berlin students now made the connection between the university’s problems and the shortcomings of society at large. In consequence, direct actions now became a staple ingredient in the German SDS’s protest repertoire. The new SDS president Reimut Reiche, for example, made it clear that US forms of direct action, and especially the university revolt at Berkeley, functioned as role models. In his view, the “political forms of struggle in civil disobedience” developed at Berkeley were techniques which the West German SDS now needed to learn and apply itself.¹⁴

However, the SDS, and especially the anti-authoritarian faction around Rudi Dutschke, did not simply adopt American methods but adapted them to fit their own blend of revolutionary theories, which was strongly influenced by Situationist ideas, the minority theory of Herbert Marcuse, a voluntaristic concept of revolution advocated by Georg Lukács, as well as Che Guevara’s foco theory.

The idea behind SI, whose tactics were inspired by Dadaism, Surrealism and the Lettristic International, was to disturb the routine of social relations by devising “spectacular” actions to alter conventional meanings. In other words, one should deprive common actions of their traditionally assigned functions by placing them in different contexts, thereby attributing new significance to them. This “détournement” (misappropriation) was designed to provoke a process of critical questioning by participants and audience alike in order to create a new consciousness.¹⁵ As a member of Subversive Aktion, the German branch of the Situationist International, Dutschke studied these ideas and tactics, which had a formative influence on him. From the start, Dutschke had sought a way to translate the analysis of modern society’s organisational patterns provided by critical theorists Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer into political action.¹⁶ These avant-gardist strategies now equipped him with the insights and action repertoire to realise this goal.

From Marcuse, Dutschke adopted the idea that society completely manipulated workers, re-

pressing their revolutionary potential.¹⁷ Therefore, society's minorities and marginalised presented the only conceivable potential forces for social change in such a "one-dimensional" society.¹⁸

In Dutschke's interpretation, however, students and intellectuals could help these forces to break out of their repression since they were equally outside of society and protected by their status. The task of the avant-gardist intellectual or student was to politicise the masses by raising awareness of their oppression.¹⁹ To achieve this emancipation outside traditional Marxist models, Dutschke redefined the subject-object relationship, first by helping to cultivate a revolutionary situation through education and information, and second, by gaining theoretical knowledge and a sense of purpose through direct political action.²⁰ Following the ideas of Hungarian philosopher George Lukács, Dutschke advocated a voluntaristic concept of revolution, in which revolutionary consciousness is created through action.²¹ In other words, the experience of political praxis provided the complement necessary to transcend the repressive mechanisms of society and develop a revolutionary theory.²² This insight, combined with the action repertoire provided by Situationism, became an essential part of Dutschke's revolutionary agenda.

In contrast to both Lukács and Marcuse, Dutschke considered the national liberation movements of the Third World the new revolutionary agents. From his perspective, these movements were part of an international class struggle that had long replaced the Cold War in its political and military intensity and caused a shift from the bloc confrontations of East and West to the North-South divide.²³ These movements, and particularly the theories of Frantz Fanon on liberating features of violence in colonial situations and Che Guevara's foco theory, whose premise was that small, devoted groups can create the conditions for revolutionary situation and incite it, equipped Dutschke with techniques to create revolutionary consciousness that he considered transferable to the situation in West Germany.²⁴

In practical terms, Dutschke perceived the task of student revolutionaries as being to further polarise society and to foster revolutionary consciousness by breaching society's rules through direct action.²⁵ Social conventions were, in Dutschke's eyes, illegitimate instruments of control by the established powers that needed to be overcome. As he argued, "the established conventions of this unreasonable democracy are not our rules; the starting point for the politicisation of the student body has to be our conscious transgression of these established rules."²⁶

In the physical, performative confrontation with the authorities, individuals were to experience the restraining powers of society as they manifested themselves in the violence used against demonstrators, for example. This process was supposed to work as a political eye-opener that not only liberated people by illuminating the underlying violence of the system, but also transformed them from authoritarian, capitalist personalities to more human characters. This was the prerequisite for any revolutionary struggle.²⁷

Dutschke's rather abstract theories hit home on 2 June 1967, when student protestor Benno Ohnesorg was shot dead on the streets of West Berlin by a plainclothes policeman during a demonstration against the visit of the Persian shah. In the subsequent shift of the West German

student movement from protest to resistance, direct action became the rallying cry for dealing with this traumatic incident. English-language manuals on direct action translated into German became required reading for West German activists, and the West German SDS called for the establishment of direct action centres at every major university. As Dutschke argued,

[D]ealing rationally with conflicts in our society implies action as a constitutive measure, since education without action quickly becomes mere consumption, just as action without any rational assessment of the problem can turn into irrationality. I call on all West German students to immediately set up action centres in the universities of the Federal Republic: for an expanding politicisation in the university and the city through education and direct action, whether it be against the emergency legislation, the [right-wing] NPD, for Vietnam or hopefully soon Latin America as well.²⁸

The impulse for direct action that was supposed to go through the Federal Republic in the following months was now inextricably bound to Dutschke's anti-authoritarian policy of creating consciousness through physical confrontations on the streets.²⁹

Some, however, disagreed with this strategy. In a memorable denunciation during a congress in Hannover after the funeral of Benno Ohnesorg, the Frankfurt philosopher Jürgen Habermas called Dutschke's voluntaristic strategy "leftist fascism", provoking a storm of outrage among congress participants that eventually led him to apologise for his remarks. Despite such criticism, Dutschke's theoretical notion continued to shape the dynamic of events. Together with Hans-Jürgen Krahl, the theoretical mastermind of the Frankfurt SDS, Dutschke presented his long-term strategy in September 1967 at the SDS federal convention. Separating their action-oriented political strategy from traditional methods, they argued that when the inherent brutality of the political system of the First World was experienced through direct action on the streets, demonstrators would be able to see the similarities to the situation in the Third World both intellectually and through the senses; as a consequence, direct action would create international solidarity.³⁰ Krahl and Dutschke demanded that the SDS move toward a "propaganda of action" in the metropolis, complementing the "propaganda of bullets" modelled on Che Guevara's actions in the Third World. The image of the urban guerrilla, protected by the university as his operational basis, thus became the most radical extension of the performative concept of direct action and its integration into the political strategies of the German SDS.

Although the idea of an urban guerrilla in the Federal Republic was part of the discussions on direct action in the West German student movement, it cannot be constructed as a direct link to the terrorism that shattered West Germany in the 1970s.³¹ Dutschke himself had always rejected political murder in the First World as inhuman; he believed it played into the hands of the counter-revolution.³² For Dutschke, the role of a revolutionary in West Germany was not to incite armed conflict, but to participate in consciousness-raising efforts of the voluntaristic avant-garde to mobilise a majority.³³ In a long march through the institutions of society, this elite was to gradually undermine the system and transform it into a direct democracy with politically active citizens: "The continuous updating and concretisation of the objectively existing opportunities for conflict by means of *direct actions* changes the structural basis and the productive force

of consciousness, which is crucial for any transformation. [*These direct actions*] create the condition for a qualitatively new, more humane society."³⁴

Direct action, according to Dutschke, thus provided the necessary "revolutionising of the revolutionaries" to win over greater majorities of the population for long-term, fundamental social and political change.³⁵ As he argued in May 1968, "As these direct actions transform us internally, they are political. Politics without any internal change of the people who participate in it is the manipulation of elites . . . All the confrontations with the police during the demonstrations, the frustrations and increasing aggressions expanding internally and externally that typically result from them, should be understood as a continuous process of learning, as an uninterrupted attempt to transform one's own character structures."³⁶ It is this legacy of performative and direct actions – though at times misappropriated – that had the most profound impact on West German society and politics in the 1970/80s.³⁷

Conclusion

The theoretical discovery of performativity and the practice of methods of direct action in the 1960s were responsible for the introduction of "prefigurative politics". Historian Wini Breines coined this term to denote "the effort to create and prefigure in lived action and behaviour the desired society, the emphasis on means and not ends, the spontaneous and utopian experiments that developed in the midst of action while working toward the ultimate goal of a free and democratic society."³⁸ In the second half of the 1960s, this understanding of politics became a characteristic feature of many protest actions across the world. In West Germany, even earlier critics such as Jürgen Habermas stopped denouncing the protest movements as a "fake revolution" and began to praise them for taking aim at the political alienation of broad segments of the population.³⁹

With their performative forms of protest, the social movements of the late 1960s rocked the self-evident factualness of the traditional social order, transforming it into an object of reflection.⁴⁰ The direct actions they employed created new ways of perceiving social inequality and power relationships and anticipated a new and utopian social order. The performative sit-ins and other, more ordinary breaching experiments in our daily cultures and interactions thus ultimately paved the way for a far greater social and cultural change, including a boost in participatory democracy and civil society, than many of the "political" demands of the student movement ever did.

NOTES

- 1 John Langshaw Austin, *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, ed. J. O. Urmson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962. For a short introduction, cf. Marina Sbisa,

- “Speech Act Theory”, in Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen (eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995, pp. 495–506.
- 2 For a comprehensive account on Kaprow’s influence on performance art, cf. Philip Ursprung, *Grenzen der Kunst. Allan Kaprow und das Happening, Robert Smithson und die Land Art*, Munich: Silke Schreiber, 2003, and Jeff Kelly, *Childsplay. The Art of Allan Kaprow*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004. For a systematic discussion of the aesthetics of performance art, cf. Erika Fischer-Lichte, *Ästhetik des Performativen*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 2004.
 - 3 H. Harvard Arnason and Marla Prather, *History of Modern Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Photography*, New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998, p. 489.
 - 4 Harold Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967, p. 121.
 - 5 Patrick Baert, *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Polity, 1998, p. 86f.
 - 6 Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*, New York: PAJ, 1982, p. 84. For a critical reconstruction of Turner’s work, cf. Bennetta Jules-Rosette, “Decentering Ethnography: Victor Turner’s Vision of Anthropology”, in: *Journal of Religion in Africa* 24:2 (1994): 160–181.
 - 7 Clifford Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture”, in: Idem, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York: Basic Books, 1973, pp. 3–30.
 - 8 Bundesministerium des Innern (ed.), *Zum Thema. Hier. Die Studentenunruhen*, Bonn: Heider, 1969, p. 49.
 - 9 For an earlier history of student protest or social activism, see, for example, Mark Edelman Boren, *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*, New York: Routledge, 2001; Francesca Polletta, *Freedom is an Endless Meeting. Democracy in American Social Movements*, Chicago: Chicago UP, 2002, pp. 26–44.
 - 10 See the groundbreaking study by Kathrin Fahlenbrach, *Protest-Inszenierungen: Visuelle Kommunikation und kollektive Identitäten in Protestbewegungen*, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2002.
 - 11 Niek Pas, “Subcultural Movements: The Provos”, in Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (eds), *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956–77*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, pp. 13–22; Thomas Hecken and Agata Grzenia, “Situationism,” in: Klimke/Scharloth, *1968 in Europe*, pp. 23–32.
 - 12 One the role of Kunzelmann see, for example, Wolfgang Kraushaar, *1968 als Mythos, Chiffre und Zäsur*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2000, p. 302; Dieter Kunzelmann, *Leisten Sie keinen Widerstand!: Bilder aus meinem Leben*, Berlin: Transit, 1998, passim.
 - 13 “Sit-In, Teach-In, Go-In: Die transnationale Zirkulation kultureller Praktiken in den 1960er Jahren”, in Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (eds), *1968. Ein Handbuch zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 2007, pp. 119–135. See also Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2009.
 - 14 Reimut Reiche, “Studentenrevolten in Berkeley und Berlin”, in *neue kritik* 38–39 (1966): 27.
 - 15 Christopher Gray, *Leaving the 20th Century: The Incomplete Work of the Situationist International*, London: Rebel, 1998; Tom McDonough (ed.), *Guy Debord and the Situationist International: Texts and Documents*, Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2002.
 - 16 See, for example, Rudi Dutschke, “Diskussion: Das Verhältnis von Theorie und Praxis”, based on a letter of 4 July 1964, subsequently edited and published in *Anschlag* 1, cited in Böckelmann/Nagel, *Subversive Aktion*, p. 195.

- 17 This outsider theory ("*Randgruppentheorie*") and the term "Great Refusal," on which Dutschke draws later, were proclaimed by Marcuse in probably his most influential book, the *One-Dimensional Man*. See Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, Boston: Beacon, 1964, pp. 256–257.
- 18 Dutschke took his Marcuse quote from Herbert Marcuse, "Freiheit: von oder zu", in *Westdeutscher Rundfunk* (December 1964): 6, cited in: Rudi Dutschke, *Diskussionsbeitrag*, p. 323.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Rudi Dutschke, "Diskussion: Das Verhältnis von Theorie und Praxis", p. 191f. See also Rudi Dutschke, "Die Widersprüche des Spätkapitalismus, die antiautoritären Studenten und ihr Verhältnis zur Dritten Welt," in: Bergmann, *Rebellion der Studenten*, p. 39f.
- 21 See George Lukács, "Die Verdinglichung und das Bewußtsein des Proletariats", in Idem, *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein. Studien über marxistische Dialektik*, Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1968, p. 355. For a detailed analysis by Dutschke, see idem, *Die Widersprüche des Spätkapitalismus*, p. 47f.
- 22 See also Rudi Dutschke, *Diskussionsbeitrag*, p. 321f.
- 23 Hans Magnus Enzensberger, "Europäische Peripherie", in: *Kursbuch 2* (1965): 154–173.
- 24 Dutschke was able to read the unpublished manuscript of the German translation of Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* due to his acquaintance with SDS member Traugott König. See Frantz Fanon, "Von der Gewalt", trans. Traugott König, in *Kursbuch 2* (1965): 1–55; Ulrich Chaussy, *Die drei Leben des Rudi Dutschke*, Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1983, pp. 103ff.
- 25 "The task of leftist student leagues consists precisely in further politicising one of the two sides in order to make it possible to strengthen the consciousness of large parts of the student body through action and enlightenment . . . The 'sit-ins' are campaigns that enable the activist unit in the anti-authoritarian camp to prevent 'talks' outside the circle of the conscious public of the university." In Rudi Dutschke, "Demokratie, Universität und Gesellschaft", (May 1967), cited in Jürgen Miermeister, ed., *Geschichte ist machbar: Texte über das herrschende Falsche und die Radikalität des Friedens*, Berlin: Wagenbach, 1980, pp. 70f.
- 26 Rudi Dutschke, "Redebeitrag auf dem Kongreß in Hannover am 9. Juni 1967", in Miermeister, *Geschichte ist machbar*, p. 78.
- 27 "Now it has just been demonstrated that these active confrontations with the police and, thus, also with the Senate and the policies of the West Berlin Senate, that we completed that elementary learning process in these altercations for acquiring the skill for the political struggle, for the class struggle, for ourselves. Without this process of educating and enlightening ourselves in practice, in the actively militant altercation with the system, the politicisation of single persons, of individuals, is not possible." In Rudi Dutschke, "Vom Antisemitismus zum Antikommunismus", cited in Bergmann, *Rebellion der Studenten*, p. 75.
- 28 Rudi Dutschke, *Redebeitrag auf dem Kongreß in Hannover*, p. 80; Ekkehart Krippendorff, *Anleitung zum Handeln. Taktik direkter Aktionen*, Berlin: Voltaire Verlag/Oberbaumprsse, 1967. The publication is the direct translation of a *Manual for Direct Action* as it was used in the civil rights movement.
- 29 "The lesson of June 2 can only be that we [must] mobilise the most capable forces of the anti-authoritarian camp in the future for the all-around direction and organisation, etc., of the confrontation in the street. Battle committees joined by common experiences and personal friendship must take over the leadership of the demonstration, not regulators or functionaries." In Rudi Dutschke, "Vom Antisemitis-

- mus zum Antikommunismus”, cited in: Bergmann, *Rebellion der Studenten*, pp. 81f.
- 30 “The revolutionary consciousness groups, which can produce a level of enlightening counter signals using perceptually manifest actions on the basis of their specific position within the structure of the institutions, use a method of political struggle that fundamentally distinguishes them from traditional forms of political confrontation. The agitation in the action, the experience –through the senses – of organised lone warriors in the confrontation with the executive power of the state, constitute the mobilising factors in the broadening of the radical opposition and tend to make a consciousness process possible for acting minorities within the passive and suffering masses, to whom the abstract violence of the system can become a sensual certainty by means of visible, irregular actions.” In Rudi Dutschke and Hans-Jürgen Krahl, “Organisationsreferat auf der 22. Delegiertenkonferenz des SDS, 5. September 1967,” in: Miermeister, *Rudi Dutschke*, p. 94.
- 31 On the question of continuities and breaks from the student movement to the terrorism of the 1970s with respect to theories and practices of violence, see also Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, “Transformation by Subversion?: The New Left and the Question of Violence”, in: Belinda Davis, Martin Klimke, Carla MacDougall and Wilfried Mausbach (eds), *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Intercultural Identities in 1960/70s West Germany and the United States*, New York: Berghahn, forthcoming 2010).
- 32 Interview with Rudi Dutschke, “Wir fordern die Enteignung Axel Springers. Ein Gespräch”, *Der Spiegel* 29 (10 July 1967), cited in: Gretchen Dutschke (ed.), *Rudi Dutschke: Die Revolte*, Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1983, p. 34.
- 33 See also Karl, *Revolutionär ohne Revolution*, p. 148.
- 34 “The uninterrupted actualisation and concretisation of the objectively existing possibilities for conflict through direct actions change the structural basis and the productive power of consciousness, which is so decisive for change; they generate the conditions necessary for a qualitatively new, more humane society.” *Oberbaum Blatt* 5 (12 July 1967): 6, cited in Karl, *Revolutionär ohne Revolution*, p. 142.
- 35 Rudi Dutschke, “Die geschichtlichen Bedingungen für den internationalen Emanzipationskampf”, in: SDS Westberlin and Internationales Nachrichten- und Forschungsinstitut (INFI) (eds), *Der Kampf des vietnamesischen Volkes und die Globalstrategie des Imperialismus, Internationaler Vietnam-Kongreß 17./18. Februar 1968, Westberlin*, Berlin: Peter von Maikowski, 1968, p. 124; See also Bergmann, *Rebellion der Studenten*, p. 93.
- 36 Bergmann, *Rebellion der Studenten*, p. 76f.
- 37 On the complicated legacy and the roots of 1970s terrorism, see also Sara Hakemi, “Das terroris-tische Manifest: Die RAF im Kontext avantgardistischer and und neo-avantgardistischer Diskurse”, in: Klimke/Scharloth, 1968. *Ein Handbuch*, pp. 278–284.
- 38 Wini Breines, *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal*, xiv.
- 39 Jürgen Habermas, “Die Scheinrevolution und ihre Kinder”, in Idem, *Protestbewegung und Hochschul-reform*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1969, p. 191.
- 40 For an empirical analysis of performative protest actions in the West German 1968 movement, cf. Joachim Scharloth, “Kommunikationsguerilla 1968. Strategien der Subversion symbolischer Ordnung in der Studentenbewegung”, in Beate Kutschke (ed.), *Musikulturen in der Revolte*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008, pp. 187–196, and Joachim Scharloth, “1968 und die Unordnung in der Sprache. Kommunikationsstrukturelle und sozialstilistische Untersuchungen”, in Steffen Pappert (ed.), *Die (Un)Ordnung des Diskurses*, Leipzig: FSR Germanistik, 2007, pp. 11–36.