



**Protests of 1968:
The Politics of Memory
or the Memory of Politics?**
Protesti 1968: politika sećanja
ili sećanje na politiku?

✉ **VLADIMIR GVOZDEN** › vladimir.gvozden@ff.uns.ac.rs

SLAVICA TERGESTINA
European Slavic Studies Journal

ISSN 1592-0291 (print) & 2283-5482 (online)

VOLUME 24 (2020/I), pp. 94-113
DOI 10.13137/2283-5482/30672

There are many accounts of student protests from 1968 that have been written by the witnesses of events, and there are also many studies conducted by experts in various fields, but the event itself is difficult to place in wider political narratives. However, the event still seems important for several reasons: it was neither expected nor foreseeable; the mobilisation of the protesters was spontaneous and sudden; key issues included anti-imperialism and corruption; meetings, demonstrations, tracts became everyday life of the protesters; and there was a mix of anarchistic liberalism and practical organisation. Hence, the challenge of re-politisation seems to be the main heritage of May '68 as a type of contradictory ferment. Focusing on student protests in Belgrade and their subsequent echoes, this article attempts to shed light on the structural reasons for the discrepancy between the complexity of events and the poverty of experience, or between the politics of memory and the remembrance of politics.

MAY '68, YUGOSLAVIA, THE STUDENT MOVEMENT, THE EVENT, POLITICS

Postoji mnoštvo izvora o studentskim protestima 1968. čiji su autori neposredni svedoci, postoje i mnogobrojni stručni radovi o ovom događaju, ali čini se da se on još uvek teško smešta u širi politički narativ. Međutim, postoji nekoliko aspekata koji ovaj događaj čini i dalje bitnim: kretanja 1968. nisu bila ni očekivana ni predvidljiva; mobilizacija protestanata je bila spontana i trenutna; antiimperijalizam i korupcija su bile važne teme; sastanci, demonstracije, proglosti i leci bili su deo svakodnevice protestanata; protest je bio obeležen mešavinom anarhističkog liberalizma i praktične organizacije. Stoga se čini da je repolitizacija glavni legat koji zbivanja iz 1968. kao protivrečni ferment ostavljaju za sobom. Ovaj članak je pokušaj da se, kroz analizu studentskog protesta u Beogradu i njegovih naknadnih odjeka, pokažu strukturalni razlozi za nesklad između složenosti događaja i siromaštva iskustva, odnosno između politike sećanja i sećanja na politiku.

MAJ '68, JUGOSLAVIJA, STUDENTSKI POKRET, DOGAĐAJ, POLITIKA

There is no lack of information about *May 1968* (to use a seemingly innocent name to designate a long political process), but it seems that stereotypes, silence and uncritical nostalgia prevail in discussions about it. There are many accounts of student protests in 1968 that have been written by witnesses of events, and there are also many studies written by experts in various disciplines, but the events themselves are difficult to move into official historiography and even more difficult to place in wider political narratives. Do we know more about these events today, more than fifty years later, and do we know it better? Or is there always something new when we are faced with the events of 1968? The first question to be posed hence concerns the very status of writing the event. As Julian Bourg notes (27), May 1968 ‘can amount to a historical Rorschach test, upon which one projects a range of perspectives, emotions, and judgments’. A certain relativisation is always involved when we think about 1968. This follows also from the fact that there are no real terms to describe the events of 1968, only ideologically and intellectually simple labels such as *crisis*, *strike*, *rebellion*, *revolution*, *conflict* or *conspiracy*. On the other hand, terms that may be more useful are almost out of use: for example, today nobody would describe the events as a boom of utopian dreams.

However, several aspects seem to make the events relevant even in our time: the movement was neither expected nor foreseeable; mobilisation of the protesters was spontaneous and sudden; anti-imperialism was a major topic; meetings, demonstrations, leaflets entered the everyday life of the protesters, characterising it with a mix of anarchistic liberalism and practical organisation. In the second part of my article, I will focus on student protests in Belgrade and their subsequent echoes in order to show the structural reasons for this discrepancy between the complexity of events and the poverty

of experience, or between the politics of memory and the remembrance of politics.

At the core of the 1968 events is a curious paradox: in January 1968, the United Nations General Assembly designated 1968 as the International Year of Human Rights to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; today, however, 1968 is remembered as the year of protests against the political class all around the world. According to Mark Kurlansky, 1968 is the year that rocked the world, but there are others who would say that nothing really happened. As Hrvoje Klasić points out (49), for most of the population, 1968 was a year like any other, and only intellectuals granted it such enormous importance. The events of 1968 demonstrate a certain resistance to explanation which needs to be explained itself. The nature of the event itself is antinomian, and contradiction is written even into the graffiti that cropped up all over Paris during May '68: graffiti like *Il est interdit d'interdire* (It Is Forbidden to Forbid) and *Soyez réalistes, demandez l'impossible* (Be Realistic, Demand the Impossible) reveal the 'antinomian revolt against norms' (Bourg: 6). Did 1968 change our understanding of the revolution itself? After 1968, did excess and heterogeneity, anti-authoritarian sensibility, certain forms of insolence, moral liberation actually cease to be excessive? There are many views that see May '68, especially its French chapter, more as a cultural than a political phenomenon (see Reader with Wadia: 87). But the question is whether this is only the effect of the kind of culturalised politics that dominates today.

Alain Badiou begins his text on the four dimensions of May 1968 with a clear statement in favour of discontinuity: nothing that was there before has 'any active significance for us' today, he writes; it remains only as '[n]ostalgia and folklore' (Badiou: 43). This is one possible

point of view, and it is not maintained only by Badiou, of course. But he goes on to offer an even more pessimistic assessment: ‘the real hero of ’68 is unfettered neo-liberal capitalism’ (Badiou: 44). This primarily refers to the well-known argument regarding the transformation of lifestyles, the enthronement of individualism, the commodification of pleasure, the triumph of the colourful universe of commodities and consumption. But then there is also something which Badiou calls ‘the libertarian May’ (Badiou: 49). This May is about a transformation of habits, a new understanding of love relationships and individual personal freedom, the May of women’s movement and the emancipation of homosexuals, the May of new theatre and new forms of public expression, and so on. To this Badiou adds one final May 1968: this May ‘was crucial, and it still prescribes what the future will bring’ (Badiou: 51). It is connected to the decade 1968–1978 and then absorbed by the years of François Mitterrand. The first aspect of this period is the rise of the conviction that we are ‘witnessing the end of an old conception of politics’ and seeking a different political conception, somewhat blindly, during the 1970s. This is when the belief there is an agent that carries the potential of emancipation (such as the working class, the proletariat, the people or the students) is shattered and replaced by an obsession with the question: ‘What is politics?’ (Badiou: 52)

But Badiou also proposes a number of optimistic hypotheses. Writing during the presidency of Nicolas Sarkozy, he claims that May 1968 is of interest to a significant portion of the youth, and that we can turn to 1968 as ‘a potential source of inspiration’ in our efforts to truly act (Badiou: 44). And there is, moreover, ‘another, and even more optimistic, hypothesis’ that a different world is possible, that the idea of revolution may be revived. Here, Badiou joins those who argue that May 1968 is an extremely complex event that precludes any uniform

description; hence, his emphasis is on 'heterogeneous multiplicity' (Badiou: 45). On the other hand, the failure of protest opens up the myriad of questions about the technology of power, the working of the police, the role of the media, and so on.

In his article on the Prague Spring, Karel Kosík asks the following question: 'What do Czechs know today about an event like the 1968 Prague Spring?'. (Incidentally, this might be easily translated also as: 'What do we [Serbs, Slovenians, Germans, Italians...] know today about an event like the 1968 student protest?') In Kosík's reading, it seems that, fifty years later, 1968 appears as the symbol of our irresponsibility not only to the past but even more to the present: 'In reality, the Prague Spring is a permanent event. To look at this event means to see the misery of our present.' (Kosík: 141) Thus, it seems to me that our question is really not what 1968 was, but what it is. Bourg even wrote recently that 'much of what matters today still relates to forces unleashed in the 1960s and 1970s, from human rights to terrorism to religious politics to economic disorder to the infinite variations on life and lifestyle around the world' (Bourg: xi). In brief, the idea that 1968 is a kind of event that reveals a 'fundamental sense of possibility' (Bourg: xii) still seems relevant.

In what follows I will address these questions by looking at the student protests that erupted in Belgrade in early June 1968. Of the numerous accounts of these protests I will mainly focus on the following books and articles: Živojin Pavlović's diary *Ispljučak pun krvi* (Spit Full of Blood), which was forbidden in 1984 but published in 1990; Nebojša Popov's seminal book *Društveni sukobi—izazov sociologiji: 'Beogradski jun' 1968* (Social Conflicts—A Challenge to Sociology: The 'Belgrade June' 1968), which was forbidden in 1983 but published in 1990; László Végel's memoir *Szellemi krónika (Hatvannyolc)* (Intellectual Memoir

[Sixty Eight]), which appeared in 1998 and was republished in his book *Hontalan esszék* (Homeless Essays) in 2003, a year after it was translated into Serbian; and Milisav Savić's book *Šezdesetosmaš: priče, reportaže i intervjuji iz Studenta '68* (Sixty-Eighter: Stories, Reports and Interviews from the '68 volume of *Student*), which was published in 2016.

In the post-Yugoslav context, stereotypes, omissions and uncritical nostalgia about the protests of 1968 were influentially challenged by proper discussion only some ten years ago, especially after the fortieth anniversary of the events. For example, in 2008, the Institute for Recent History of Serbia published a valuable edited collection of twenty-four research articles entitled *1968—četrdeset godina kasnije* (1968—Forty Years Later), from which I also take my above diagnosis (see Radić). One of the contributions to this collection shows that the student unrest of June 1968 'was for many years known as a true historiographic taboo in former Yugoslavia' (Zubak: 449); another one argues, that, given the significance of the June 1968 movement, 'it is surprising that the student protests in Yugoslavia are yet to be adequately addressed by (post-)Yugoslav or international scholars' (Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 455). Ten years later, Croatian historian Hrvoje Klasić published a book on Yugoslavia and the world in 1968 that has the potential to change the perception of the events of 1968 in the discipline of history as well as to contribute to public debate. In addition to the texts given above, these two publications have largely shaped our most recent thinking about the relation between the politics of memory and the memory of politics.

The Belgrade events certainly have a methodological character, as Nebojša Popov demonstrates in his book. But again, is there something more than sheer methodological interest or historiographic curiosity? If we try to treat the Belgrade events of June 1968 as just

an example of student protests around the globe, we are surprised to learn that the first impression of the witnesses is that it was spontaneous. Pavlović begins his diary with typical images of everyday life of a peaceful socialist middle class in Belgrade in the long enumeration of small meaningful quasi-events: ‘sparks of programmed freedom, weddings, public holidays, dancing, alcohol, a trip in the “nature”, lamb on the spit, fascistoid brainwashing at the stadium, triumphant seduction of a waitress’ (Pavlović: 19). Pavlović also writes that ‘the majority of young people fit in with the dominant mechanism of life, dreaming of the paradise of the western hemisphere’ (Pavlović: 24). And then, suddenly, chaos: on 3 June 1968, the headline of *Politika*, a major daily newspaper, reported on student riots in New Belgrade. The first impressions of the witnesses are that they do not understand what is going on: ‘We still do not quite understand what happened’, wrote Pavlović in his diary (25). Only a day later, he changed his mind: ‘Something really is happening. Routine habits and established patterns of life are breaking into pieces.’ (Pavlović: 39)

But what actually happened? If we follow the account offered by Popov (36–42) we see that, at the beginning, what happened was banal and unpromising, but not without consequences for a rising prevalence of mass media. The initial conflict arose at a social gathering entitled, as if ironically, *Karavan prijateljstva* (Friendship Caravan). Bad weather conditions forced the organisers to hold the event indoors, in a hall nearby student dormitories in New Belgrade that could accommodate only 400 visitors. Students and other guests were not informed that only brigadiers could enter the hall. When, at about 10 PM, a number of students tried to enter the hall, a fight broke out between students and brigadiers. Police arrived shortly thereafter and engaged in a fight with students and other guests. The mass in front

of the student campus was growing and news came, later unconfirmed, that one student had been killed. Students attacked police officers and plundered a fire truck. Around midnight, about 3000 students gathered. The confiscated fire truck became the platform from which students asked the crowd to gather at the Federal Assembly in Belgrade and submit their requests to the deputies. On their way to the city centre the students were brutally confronted by the police and numerous participants were injured or arrested. Adding insult to injury, media reports immediately blamed the students for the ‘incidents’ (Popov: 38) while portraying the brigadiers as victims of violence and hooliganism (see Pavlović: 25). The next day, the student insurgence became a strike and events escalated until the famous speech given by Tito on 9 June.

The students soon issued a proclamation compiled by the University Board of the Union of Students of the Belgrade University, the Action Board of Demonstrations and the editorial board of the journal *Student*. Despite subsequent malicious and superficial interpretations, student demands seem well informed from today’s perspective. They primarily sought to reduce social inequalities, including the rate of unemployment that forced many workers to emigrate (see Pavlović: 29). In addition, they requested that the arrested students be released from prison and their police files destroyed, and culprits for the brutal behaviour of the police charged. They also requested a meeting with the Presidency of the Federal Assembly to discuss student matters with students and university representatives. Finally, they demanded resignations of the managers and editors-in-chief of Belgrade daily newspapers, Radio Belgrade and the Tanjug news agency.

None of the demands were met. Ironically, though, they marked the beginning of an end of a system of power that failed to break free

from Stalinist methods. To quote the Tito speech that marked the end of demonstrations: ‘And finally, I once again turn to the students: I wish for you to take to learning, for it is exam time, and I wish you a lot of success, because it would be really harmful to lose more time.’ (Quoted in Pavlović: 110) But time for what? And for whom? Who actually lost time here? Today it is clear that ‘the June crisis was a clear sign of the irreparable loss of legitimacy of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. In the long-term perspective, student demonstrations dismantled the myth of a non-confrontational society and eroded the Party’s pretensions to absolute power’ (Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 455).

A paradox traverses the event. Let us say that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was perhaps the only ruling party in the world that, ‘despite some reserve, viewed the global student movement as a fundamental confirmation of its own ideological and political foundations’ (Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 456). This holds true especially for the demands for self-government (*autogestion*) as they were expressed at demonstrations in France. As a result, media reports on demonstrations were rather abundant (undoubtedly a mistake in the technology of power). For example, on 25 May, the *Borba* newspaper published the famous interview Jean-Paul Sartre had conducted with Daniel Cohn-Bendit five days before. The Yugoslav leadership also supported the reforms of Alexander Dubček—whom Tito visited on 9 August, just ten days before the intervention of the Warsaw Pact (see Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 456).

Such political support for global student protests explains the specificity of student press in Yugoslavia. In 1968, Yugoslav student press was transformed from a means of communist propaganda to a separate media sphere that refused to follow the official party line (see Zubak: 420). With a newly independent editorial policy, student press showed

a strong interest in international student turmoil and the related protests against the Vietnam War (see Zubak: 420–21). Critical periodicals included *Pogledi*, which was published by a group of young intellectuals in Zagreb in 1952 and 1953 and was followed by such outlets as *Naše teme* in Zagreb, *Perspektive* in Ljubljana, *Polet* and *Omladinski tjednik* in Zagreb, *Student* and *Susret* in Belgrade, and *Tribuna* and *Mladina* in Ljubljana.

Very little was to be read in Yugoslav student press about the situation at French universities before May 1968. But after the outbreak of the revolt in Paris, numerous reports were published. The most interesting ones came from the scene of action. This is how a correspondent of *Tribuna* got involved in a fight with the police, a journalist of *Mladina* talked directly with student demonstrators, and philosopher Mihailo Marković, a member of the editorial board of *Praxis*, found himself in Paris during May as a participant in a scholarly conference on Karl Marx. *Student* immediately published Marković's impressions, which were full of enthusiasm for the bravery of the students (see Zubak: 427). There, Marković did not believe that the students were capable of creating a new society, but he did see them as 'a catalyst that can ignite unpredictable revolutionary movements in the world' (Marković: 8). *Student* published the programme of the Comité d'action étudiants-écrivains (Students-Writers Action Committee), which *Tribuna* praised as a model for a future programme of the Ljubljana students (see Zubak: 429). From today's perspective it could be said that student press created intellectual conditions for the articulation of a specific type of political rebellion within socialist Yugoslavia. As noted by Marko Zubak, writing about student rebellion in the world can also be seen as a channel through which the 'desire for change in Yugoslavia itself' was reflected (Zubak: 450).

To understand the specificity of the student protest of June 1968, we must look at a specific socio-political figure—the intellectual, especially the philosopher. As shown by Christoph Charle, in the late nineteenth century the notion of the intellectual began to refer to the ambitious elite of well-educated people who sought to use the possibility of publishing in print and in other media to exercise symbolic power and thus compete with other kinds of elite in their effort to control the social and political imaginary (see Charle). One could make the argument that socialism enabled this figure of the intellectual to persist longer in Eastern Europe than in the West. The public sphere in socialist Yugoslavia paradoxically seems more transparent than in successor states because in Yugoslavia access to the public sphere was limited to individual journals and newspapers which, despite their specificities, shared a common, if fragile, hermeneutic horizon. The philosophical journal *Praxis*, published by the Croatian Society for Philosophy from 1964 to 1974, was an important instrument in creating the spirit of rebellion. The journal brought together critical philosophers and sociologists from across Yugoslavia who paid equal attention to the systems of government in both capitalist and socialist societies. These included Gajo Petrović, Milan Kangrga, Danko Grlić, Predrag Vranicki, Svetozar Stojanović, Mihailo Marković, Zagorka Pešić-Golubović, Veljko Korać, Ivan Focht, Vojin Milić and Milan Životić. In addition, through its summer school on the island Korčula, the *Praxis* group maintained contacts with some of the most world-renowned philosophers and Marxists, including Herbert Marcuse, Ágnes Heller, Jürgen Habermas, Erich Fromm, Henri Lefebvre, Zygmunt Baumann, Lucien Goldmann, Leszek Kołakowski, Ernest Mendel and Karel Kosík. Philosophy thus became the so-called liberation science of the 1960s, aimed at humanising social relations and the place of the individual

in production and in daily life (see Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 461). This did not go without tensions between the government and intelligentsia, however, tensions which became increasingly pronounced in late 1967 and early 1968 (see Klasić: 40).

But if the spirit of rebellion was tolerated in student journals and among critical intellectuals, why was the establishment so scared of the students? This may be the question of all questions, yet it seems easy enough to answer. The reach of student journals and the *Praxis* group was rather small, and their political influence limited to a small number of curious intellectuals who could be easily controlled. With thousands of students on the streets, however, it became clear that everything was possible and that the regime could not control the population. The official disappointment in the power technologies was obvious and had serious consequences. The leadership was shocked as the protest 'was the first open rebellion against the consolidation of power in the years after the Second World War' (Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 454). And this shock was backed by the fear of re-politicisation of the youth and the fear of the loss of monopoly on political activism (see Klasić: 71). Duško Radović, famous author of children's books, gave an interview for *Student* in October 1968 in which he spoke about the consequences of the June events in terms of a utopia that found its topos, its place: 'Heroism is the courage to believe in your thoughts. And the revolutionary is anyone for whom nothing is so sacred that it could not be replaced by something better.' (Savić: 75) These words explain the fear of the ruling elite rather well.

On the other side, there are also explanations that take into account the fear of the students themselves. Philippe Bénéton and Jean Touchard (27) ask an interesting question about the students' politics of fear: 'Can the university crisis be explained by the fear of failure and

the risks of public competition?' The rebellion was a conflicted mixture of revolt and revolution, a protest against the flows of civilisation and against a specific regime.

Žarko Puhovski, who was 'certainly the most accomplished theorist within the student press of Zagreb and of entire Yugoslavia' (Zubak: 438), saw three basic elements of the rebellion: disappointment with the old left; aversion to formal politics; and a search for solutions outside the existing system (see Zubak: 438). Film director Dušan Makavejev and sociologist Trivo Inđić supported not only the protest as such but also the students' decision to invent unconventional approaches (see Zubak: 439). Inđić traced the rebellion back to the disappointment of the youth with the political systems of Western welfare societies as well as socialist bureaucratic regimes. László Végel, too, thought that the protests 'declared both capitalism and socialism uncomfortable' (Végel: 253). According to Végel, the student rebellion had a crucial anti-authoritarian legacy which nationalist ideology tried to deny everywhere (Végel: 254). In this sense, the 1968 legacy could be used in the struggle to resist nationalism and populism. According to Pavlović (140), the Yugoslav student movement 'suffered a complete defeat as a revolutionary act, but managed to preserve some validity as a reformist force'.

On the other hand, the events of 1968 can be seen as the root of a new kind of post-conflict society. After 1968, media, soft power, video surveillance, politics of fear and hard-line liberal moralism all contributed to the rise of a new kind of normativity that was a far cry from the famous Parisian graffiti. History may have undone the students' aspirations, but it did not resolve the social tensions to which they reacted. On the contrary, it seems that these tensions are stronger today than they were fifty years ago, as they help deepen social inequalities,

unemployment, media control, the politicisation of fear and the crisis of democracy.

Was the crisis in Belgrade specific to Yugoslavia or was it a part of a wider issue? Was its target a specific government or corruption as such? Given their tendency to correct the system from within, one could argue that the Belgrade protests were an involution, not a revolution. Compared with protests in other countries, the Yugoslav movement owes its specificity to ‘the unique fact that, because of the Yugoslav peculiarity, the students were able to articulate their demands within the framework of official ideology’ (Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 459). Hence, for example, the announcement of students and professors at the Faculty of Philosophy on 4 June, the second day of the protests: ‘We don’t have any special programme. Our programme is the programme of the most progressive forces of our society—the League of Communists and the Constitution. We demand its full realisation.’ (Quoted in Pavlović: 69).

Let us briefly summarise the so-called lessons of the protests in the hope that this will lead us to an intelligible politics of memory: a minor conflict lead to a serious political event; the role of state violence manifested in undue action of the police helped determine the trajectory of the conflict; the dynamic of the protests surprised the protagonists themselves (see Kanzleiter and Stojaković: 453); there was unprecedented solidarity among students, and between students and professors; the politicisation of 1968 featured ‘increasingly strong expressions of solidarity among Yugoslav students with students elsewhere, but also with endangered third-world liberation forces’ (Zubak: 446); in search of concrete policies, the students opposed abstract discussions (see Pavlović: 62); the capture of speech (*prise de parole*) was a notable project, pursued especially at the events held at the Faculty

of Philosophy in Belgrade. Finally, 'overcoming the gap between the theory and the practice of communism was one of the most prominent aspirations of student protesters in Belgrade and Zagreb' (Zubak: 428).

Despite the universality of student demands it remains unclear whether the protests were a rebellion against a particular government or its segments, and whether the target were capitalist elements in socialist economy or the state of corruption. Developing his thesis about the aestheticisation of the protests, Pavlović saw a dilution of the protests in the way in which they were often approached by artists. Indeed, revolution as festival and carnival showed all of its ambivalence during 1968. In the end, it seems that Badiou is right when he argues that the importance of 1968 lies in the feeling that the old political conception came to an end, and it also seems that there has been a blind and cursory search for a new political conception that has yielded deceptive results. Therefore, neither the politics of memory nor the memory of politics, but the challenge of re-politicisation seems to be the main heritage that the events of May and June 1968 leave behind as a kind of antinomian, contradictory ferment. ♡

References

- BADIOU, ALAIN, 2010: May '68 Revisited, 40 Years On. *The Communist Hypothesis*, by Alain Badiou. Trans. David Macey and Steve Corcoran. London: Verso. 43–67.
- BÉNÉTON, PHILIPPE, and JEAN TOUCHARD, 1993: The Interpretations of the Crisis of May/June 1968. Trans. Keith A. Reader. *The May 1968 Events in France: Reproductions and Interpretations*, by Keith A. Reader with Khursheed Wadia. Basingstoke: Macmillan. 20–47.
- BOURG, JULIAN, 2017: *From Revolution to Ethics: May 1968 and Contemporary French Thought*. Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.
- CHARLE, CHRISTOPH, 1996: *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Seuil.
- KANZLEITER, BORIS, and KRUNOSLAV STOJAKOVIĆ, 2008: 1968 u Jugoslaviji—studentski protesti između Istoka i Zapada. 1968—četrdeset godina posle. Ed. Radmila Radić. Belgrade: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije. 453–80.
- KLASIĆ, HRVOJE, 2018: *Jugoslavija i svijet 1968*. Smederevo: Heliks.
- KOSÍK, KAREL, 2007: Događaj (Praško proljeće 1968). Trans. Ante Lešaja. *O dilemama suvremene povijesti*, by Karel Kosík. Zagreb: Razlog. 141–54.
- KURLANSKY, MARK, 2004: *1968: The Year That Rocked the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- MARKOVIĆ, MIHAILO, 1968: Deset dana koji su potresli Francusku. *Student*, no. 19. 8.
- PAVLOVIĆ, ŽIVOJIN, 1990: *Islpljuvak pun krvi: dnevnik '68*. Belgrade: Grafički atelje 'Dereta'.

- POPOV, NEBOJŠA, 2008: *Društveni sukobi—izazov sociologiji: beogradski jun 1968*. Belgrade: Službeni glasnik.
- PUHOVSKI, ŽARKO, 1968: Zlatna mladež Evrope. *Omladinski tjednik*, no. 20. 4.
- RADIĆ, RADMILA (ed.), 2008: *1968—četrdeset godina kasnije*. Belgrade: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije.
- READER, KEITH A., with KHURSHEED WADIA, 1993: *The May 1968 Events in France: Reproductions and Interpretations*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- SAVIĆ, MILISAV, 2008: *Šezdesetosmaš: priče, reportaže, intervjui iz Studenta '68*. Belgrade: Službeni glasnik.
- VÉGEL, LÁSZLÓ, 2002: *Bezdomni eseji*. Trans. Arpad Vicko. Belgrade: Samizdat B92.
- ZUBAK, MARKO, 2008: Pripremanje terena: odjek globalnog studentskog bunta 1968. godine u jugoslavneskom omladinskom i studentskom tisku. *1968—četrdeset godina posle*. Ed. Radmila Radić. Belgrade: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije. 419–52.

Povzetek

O *maju 1968* (če naj uporabimo nedolžno ime daljšega političnega procesa) ne manjka informacij, a razprave v veliki meri obvladujejo stereotipi, molk in nekritična nostalgija. Ne manjka niti poročil prič študentskih protestov iz leta 1968 niti razprav iz najrazličnejših strok, pa vendar dogodke same le težka okvirimo v uradno zgodovinopisje in še težje umestimo v širši politični okvir. Od tod tudi pomanjkanje izrazov za opis dogodkov iz leta 1968, tako da nam preostanejo le ideološko in intelektualno omejeni klišeji, kot so *kriza*, *stavka*, *upor*, *revolucija*, *konflikt* ali *zarota*. Na drugi strani so izrazi, ki utegnejo biti koristnejši, skoraj popolnoma pozabljeni: nihče na primer danes ne bi teh dogodkov obravnaval kot eksplozije utopičnih sanj.

Pa vendar te dogodke marsikaj približuje našemu času: bili niso niti pričakovani niti predvidljivi; mobilizacija protestnic in protestnikov je bila spontana in nenadna; anti-imperializem je bila ena glavnih tem; maj je bil apoteoza mimeografa, kot pravi Keith Reader; sestanki, demonstracije, letaki so postali del protestniškega vsakdana, ki je s tem postal zmes anarhističnega liberalizma in praktičnega organiziranja. Pomen maja je v intuiciji, da je, kot pravi Alain Badiou, čas starih političnih koncepcij minil, pa tudi v tem, da je slepo iskanje nove politične koncepcije obrodilo varljive sadove. Izziv repolitizacije se torej kaže kot osrednja dediščina protislovnega vrenja iz maja 1968. Ob obravnavi študentskih protestov v Jugoslaviji in njihovih odmevov članek osvetljuje strukturne razloge za neujemanje med kompleksnostjo dogodkov in bedo izkustva oziroma med politiko spomina in spominom na politiko.

Vladimir Gvozden

Vladimir Gvozden is Associate Professor in the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Novi Sad, Serbia, and curator of literary programmes in 'Novi Sad 2021—European Capital of Culture'. He was a guest lecturer at the University of Regensburg and the University of Zagreb, as well as a guest researcher at the University of Toronto, the University of Innsbruck and Pompeu Fabra University. His books include Činovi prisvajanja: od teorije ka pragmatici teksta (Acts of Appropriation: From Theory to Pragmatics of Text [Svetovi, 2005]), Srpska putopisna kultura 1914–1940 (Serbian Travel Writing 1914–1940 [Službeni glasnik, 2011]), Književnost i otpor (Literature and Resistance [Adresa, 2015]), Anatomija robe: ogleđ iz kritike političke ekonomije (Anatomy of Commodity: Essay in Critique of Political Economy [with Alpár Losoncz, Adresa, 2016]) and, most recently, Komparativna književnost i kultura (Comparative Literature and Culture [Adresa, 2019]).