

Global Insurgencies since 1968

George Katsiaficas

Eros Effect Foundation

katsiaficas@gmail.com

Abstract

In my view, the global movement's capacity for synchronous international coordination after 1968 has grown by leaps and bounds. Each wave builds upon its predecessors: from the disarmament movement of the early 1980s, to the wave of Asian uprisings from 1986-1992, Eastern European insurgencies, the alterglobalization wave from the Zapatistas to Seattle, and most recently in the concurrent Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street, Indignados, and Greek anarchists, history becomes increasingly endowed with direct action by self-conscious human beings. Our collective intelligence is becoming an ever-more powerful material force. Recent global waves have focused on transformation of the world economic system, not simply on opposing its weapons, wars, debt crises, and ecological devastation. Today there are more people consciously opposed to international capitalism than ever before in history, a potential for action that has yet to be fully realized.

Keywords

insurgencies – popular insurrections – revolution – social movements – uprisings

1 Introduction

Whether murderously repressed in the US or assimilated in France, movements of 1968 imploded and disappeared—or so it seemed. Vast mobilizations

* A longer version of this article will become part of my forthcoming book, *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Oakland: PM Press, 2018).

had momentarily posed threats to the system, challenging police powers, wars and racism, yet emergent dreams of freedom beyond patriarchy and capitalism remain unfulfilled. The vision of free societies governed through direct democracy, of a world without hunger or an arms race, without militarized nation-states and arbitrary authorities is unabashedly optimistic. Yet even discussing such a possibility is a legacy of the global imagination that emerged half a century ago.

Imagination is generally regarded as residing in individual minds, yet I use it in reference to collective actions that embody dreams, aspirations, and desires. Despite enormous cultural differences between France and the US, millions of people during uprisings in 1968 and 1970 shared aspirations for international solidarity and local self-management. In their everyday lives during trying times of heartfelt fears and burning desires, people acted according to very similar revolutionary norms and values.

Traditionally, revolutions are understood as changes in elites that control existing economic and political structures, but the global imagination of 1968 envisioned destruction of unjust power and creation of mechanisms for autonomous self-determination. Decentralization and self-government were on everyone's lips—whether “revolutionary intercommunalism” or “autogestion” (self-management). More than a struggle against inherited injustices and irrational structures, people did not want to take over militarized nation-states, but to destroy them.

Obsolescence of the nation-state was not an idea invented out of thin air. It was presented by the actual development of history. Neither were nation-states originally “invented” by clever folks, nor inspired by fancy ideas. They emerged as products of humanity's transformation of ancient villages, city-states, kingdoms, and empires. As congealed forms of power that consolidated after centuries of European wars and economic changes, nation-states were then imposed by force upon the rest of the world.

Looking at contemporary forms of political congregation from 1968 to the present, we find the free assembly continually coming into being, not on anyone's orders or any organization's dictate, but from autonomously determined needs of human beings. That kind of governance has little to do with elections and representative “democracy” managed by professional politicians. In an interview in 1968, when asked what form of democracy he wanted, German activist and SDS member Klaus Meschkat (2010) responded,

A form of democracy that is not confined to the heads of states, but is accomplished in all arenas—namely a democracy that is really built from the bottom up. You could say, self-management of producers in all

arenas. In the universities, students have seriously demanded democratization of the universities. I believe that such a democratization—including in the factories, the schools, and in all facilities where people work together—is long overdue.

PG. 210, AUTHOR'S TRANSLATION

In its internal organization and vision of freedom, the movement strove for popular participation in all aspects of life, including decisions about war and peace, how to run factories and offices, what to teach in universities, as well as what are acceptable patterns of authority in everyday life. The New Left raised the issue of the goal-determination of the whole organization of society, a questioning which—then as now—lies outside established politics, “democratic” or authoritarian, to say nothing about academic theory.

Participatory democracy was central to the global movement's identity from the non-violent 1955 struggle to desegregate buses in Montgomery, Alabama to the armed 1980 Gwangju Uprising in South Korea. Direct democratic norms spontaneously emerged among Polish workers, Copenhagen's communards in Christiania, San Francisco's Diggers, Yugoslav students, Amsterdam's Provos, and Berkeley's People's Park partisans. As in Gwangju, Asian uprisings contained parallel forms of deliberative democracy during uprisings in 1973 at Thammasat University in Thailand, and in 1990 at both Chiang Kai-shek Square in Taipei and Kathmandu's liberated Patan. Beginning in the late 1970s, Germany's autonomous movement used consensus in general assemblies to make key decisions, and sustained itself over several generations of activism. As they developed through militant actions, the Autonomen transformed themselves from civil Luddism into a force targeting the whole system of capitalist patriarchy. The 1999 Seattle protests against the WTO were largely prepared by direct action networks based upon strict principles of consensual decision-making. In the anti-corporate globalization movement that grew by leaps and bounds after Seattle, social media lubricated proliferation of participatory ethics. The armed Zapatista uprising involves creating participatory democracy in the everyday life of thousands of people. Rather than trying to seize state power directly, they build counterinstitutions and strive to create a “new person.” The Oaxaca Commune of 2006 practiced self-government through open assemblies. Chapters of Black Lives Matter are empowered to take independent initiatives and action, not dictates of a central authority. All of these developments highlight a globally interconnected movement. Given these trajectories, grassroots movements in the twenty-first century will continue to be structured according to a grammar of direct democracy, autonomous self-organization, and international solidarity.

Another dimension of 1968 that remains definitive is an enlarged constituency of revolution—a factor discerned on every continent. Significant participation of the lumpenproletariat among Gwangju’s armed resistance fighters, mobilization of the new working class such as Seoul’s “necktie brigade” in 1987, and committed protests of Nepalese medical professionals, lawyers, and journalists in 1990 provide empirical instances in Asia. Recent movements rapidly assimilated new technologies like fax machines, cell phones, the Internet, and social media. Magazines like *Adbusters* and *Crimethinc* reactivate New Left playfulness, humor, irony, and autonomous artistic expression as opposition tactics.

In the decades since 1968, most noticeable is the growth in size and deepening of vision of globally synchronized insurgencies.

2 Global Uprisings after 1968

After 1968, the global movement’s capacity for synchronous international coordination has grown by leaps and bounds. Not simply a product of social media and technical innovations, internationally coordinated actions emanate from the accumulation of experiences by generations of popular insurgencies. Each wave builds upon victories and defeats of its predecessors. As history becomes increasingly endowed with direct action by self-conscious human beings, our collective intelligence becomes an ever-more powerful material force. We may regard global insurgencies involving millions of human beings acting in concert with each other as a living organism. Born in 1968 as “the whole world was watching,” the infant’s development has continued through subsequent uprisings, and has yet to reach maturity. Learning from previous episodes, recent global waves have focused on transformation of the world economic system, not simply on opposing its weapons, wars, debt crises, and ecological devastation. Today there are more people consciously opposed to international capitalism than ever before in history, a potential for action that has yet to be fully realized.

In 1968, no one understood the power of global mobilizations better than the leadership of Vietnam. In February 1972, four years after the Tet Offensive, they organized a worldwide peace offensive at an international conference in Versailles, France. Delegates of anti-war movements from more than eighty countries formulated an internationally coordinated action calendar set to begin around Easter in Vietnam, followed by a wave of demonstrations from East to West, from Moscow to Paris to New York and finally to San Diego, where

US President Nixon was due to be nominated for reelection at the Republican National Convention.¹

To my amazement, Vietnam's Easter Offensive involved, for the first time, tanks among the insurgents' arsenal. Vietnamese forces had disassembled them, carried them south, and then reassembled them without being spotted by the world's most advanced electronic battlefield. Half a world from Versailles, Vietnamese fighters timed deployment of smuggled tanks precisely for the date agreed upon for the start of the international offensive. They liberated the city of Quang Tri, and named it capital of their Provisional Revolutionary Government. The US response was to destroy the city. Scarcely a building's wall was left standing after Nixon employed more explosive power than that used on Hiroshima or Nagasaki in 1945. Despite horrific brutality inflicted against its land and people, Vietnam prevailed, reunified itself, and today is increasingly prosperous. In 2001, Vo Nguyen Giap, military commander of Vietnamese forces who defeated both the French and Americans, summarized the reasons why the Vietnamese were able to win. The anti-war movement inside the United States was a prominent part of his list. For years, Vietnamese leaders cultivated the US movement until it grew into a force with which they were able to coordinate their battlefield tactics.

In 1972, the Vietnamese centrally orchestrated global actions, but no single organization has been responsible for more recent waves of "conscious spontaneity"—for five subsequent episodes of the international Eros effect.

2.1 *The Disarmament Movement of the Early 1980s*

Beginning in the fall of 1981, Russian and American plans to install medium-range missiles in Europe meant that a nuclear war could have been fought without the Soviet Union or the US being damaged. A key event came on September 13, when US Secretary of State Alexander Haig visited Berlin. Amid a flurry of attacks on American personnel and bases in West Germany, over 7,000 riot police were needed to guard Haig from at least 50,000 demonstrators in West Berlin. In the ensuing turmoil, hundreds were arrested and over 150 police injured.² Less than a month later, on October 10, more than 250,000 people

1 So terrified did Nixon become of approaching protests in San Diego that he sought to deport John Lennon (who had agreed to play there with the Grateful Dead and others) and moved the convention to Miami.

2 I consistently use conservative estimates since I have no intention to appear to be inflating the scope of events in question. At the anti-Haig demonstration, for example, it was estimated by some that at least 80,000 demonstrators were involved, probably a more accurate

in Bonn marched against the missiles. Within two weeks, similar enormous marches occurred in Paris, London, Brussels, and Rome.

The disarmament movement then spread to the United States. In the spring of 1982, during Ground Zero Week, activists organized events in 150 cities and 500 towns, and the Union of Concerned Scientists sponsored teach-ins at 360 campuses drawing an estimated 350,000 observers (*The Guardian* 1982a, 1982b). On June 12, at least 800,000 people (some estimates were as high as one million) converged on New York City to express their support for a nuclear-free world. Nuclear freeze initiatives on the ballot in the fall of 1982 won in eight of nine states and in thirty-six of thirty-nine cities and counties. Besides more than 11 million votes (out of a total of 19 million) that the nuclear freeze received in these initiatives, it was approved in 321 city councils, 446 New England town meetings, 63 county councils, and 11 state legislatures.

Besides helping to spark electoral efforts, European street confrontations and mobilizations contributed to the end of the Cold War.

2.2 *The Wave of East Asian Uprisings from 1986-1992*

Leading up to the 1980s, East Asian dictatorships had been in power for decades and seemed unshakable, yet a wave of revolts soon transformed the region. In six years, eight dictatorships were overthrown in nine places in Asia, as uprisings exploded in the Philippines in 1986, South Korea in 1987, Myanmar in 1988, Tibet and China in 1989, Taiwan, Nepal and Bangladesh in 1990, and Thailand in 1992 (Katsiaficas 2011). These insurgencies threw to the wind the common bias that Asians are happier with authoritarian governments than democracy.

After the 1980 Gwangju massacre in South Korea, the movement suddenly blossomed in 1986, when a massive occupation of public space overthrew dictator Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines. Overnight, “People Power” became activists’ common global identity—cutting across religious, national, and economic divides. East Asia’s string of uprisings from 1980 to 1998 had a huge political impact, overthrowing eight more entrenched regimes. South Korea’s dictator Chun Doo-hwan was disgraced and compelled to grant direct presidential elections before being imprisoned; Taiwan’s forty-year martial law regime was overturned; Burma’s mobilized citizenry overthrew two dictators only to see their successors massacre thousands; Nepal’s monarchy was made constitutional; military ruler Muhammad Ershad in Bangladesh was forced to step down and eventually sent to prison; Army Chief Suchinda Kraprayoon

number than the police estimate of 50,000. German sources include the *Frankfurter Allgemeine* and *Die Tageszeitung*.

in Thailand was forced to vacate the office of prime minister; and Indonesia's longtime dictator Suharto was ousted after three decades in power.

These uprisings ushered in greater liberties and new opportunities for citizen participation—as well as for international capital. They also inspired Eastern Europeans to act.

2.3 *Revolts against Soviet Regimes in Eastern Europe*

We can trace a direct line of key activists who kept alive the dream of the 1968 Prague Spring, and helped spread it to many other countries, including Hungary, the USSR, Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland. Gorbachev himself was directly changed and inspired by Czech activists, who themselves remained engaged in the process of social transformation. If not for the Western European disarmament movement, Gorbachev and other members of the Soviet establishment would never have been prepared to loosen their grip on Eastern European buffer states—their insurance against a new German invasion. After massive protests against the possibility of nuclear war erupted on both sides of what was then called the Iron Curtain, neither buffer states nor short-range missiles were required to provide Soviet leaders with the assurances they needed. Millions of peace advocates taking to the streets helped convince Gorbachev that Western military intervention in Russia was out of the question.

Grassroots movements against Russian domination have a long history. By the 1980s, they had grown into forces nagging Gorbachev and Soviet leaders, but after Asian uprisings brought People Power onto the stage of history, movements in Eastern Europe gained encouragement and inspiration. Without anyone predicting their downfall, Eastern Europe's communist regimes in Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Romania were all overthrown beginning in 1989. The Soviet Union could not remain aloof, and it soon dissolved. The string of uprisings that swept away East Asian dictatorships and East European Soviet regimes in 1989 was “the continuation of 1968” (Arrighi et al. 2001:35).

Although poverty has increased and life expectancy decreased in these countries since the end of Soviet regimes, and despite massive outside interference leading up to the uprisings, people's self-determined will for freedom was the principal factor spurring the movements. Regime openness to change was also a factor. Sadly, this is not the case in the capitalist “democracies.”

2.4 *The Alter-Globalization Wave*

As the promised peace dividend at the end of the Cold War failed to materialize and global capitalism was strengthened, millions of people “spontaneously” chose to challenge giant corporations and their international

institutions—the World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and World Bank.

Without any central group deciding the focus of mobilizations, people themselves chose the global capitalist system as their target. The 1994 Zapatista Uprising was a huge inspiration. On November 30, 1999, Seattle protesters' victory in halting WTO meetings broke new ground when Teamsters and Turtles, workers and ecologists, Lesbian Avengers and Zapatista partisans all converged. The worldwide coordination of protests that day involved actions in dozens of other cities around the world (Laskey 2004). Indymedia were born across the world.

For years thereafter, whenever elite summits took place, tens of thousands of protesters challenged their right to rule. The global movement reached a new level of synchronicity on February 15, 2003, when the US prepared to attack Iraq for the second time. With no central organization, as many as thirty million people around the world took to the streets on February 15, even though the war had yet to start (Sauermaun 2003). People in eight hundred cities and sixty countries mobilized. From Damascus to Athens, Seoul to Sydney, and New York to Buenos Aires, millions constituted a global civil society that *The New York Times* named a "Second Superpower." In London 1.4 million took to the streets in the biggest demonstration in that city's two thousand years of history, and three million people appeared on the streets of Rome (Harvey 2014:116).³

2.5 *The Arab Spring, Spanish Indignados, Greek Anarchists, and Occupy Wall Street*

In 2011, thousands of Spanish Indignados occupied major city squares, and used direct democracy to fight back against the government's austerity programs. In more than a dozen countries, movements simultaneously appeared. Greek anarchists burned much of downtown Athens to protest their government's acceptance of German-imposed sanctions. After the suicide of vegetable vendor Mohamed Bouazizi, a chain reaction of uprisings spread from Tunisia to Egypt, and then to Yemen, Bahrain, Syria, and Libya. In 14 months, major protests took place in 14 countries in the region. Millions of people went into the streets. Their increasingly sophisticated use of social media (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, SMS) and the cross-border speed with which the revolt spread offer a glimpse of People Power's potential in the twenty-first century. Disaster was the outcome in Syria, Libya and elsewhere as world powers and entrenched

3 Harvey's valuable contribution does not seem to comprehend the synchronicity of global protest waves, focused as he is on urban dynamics.

regimes obstinately waged war. In Egypt, divisions between Islamists and democrats abetted the military and its US enablers in installing an even worse dictator than Mubarak.

From humble beginnings in New York on September 17, 2011, Occupy Wall Street took control of public space in more than 1,000 cities. To illustrate the global interconnection seemingly disparate events, American protesters and Egyptian veterans of Tahrir Square exchanged gifts of pizza deliveries.

These five global uprisings reveal patterns astonishingly similar to the global eruption of the Eros effect in 1968 (Del Gandio and Thompson 2017). Most recently, social media has facilitated synchronicity, but movements have been accumulating the capacity for international simultaneity since 1968. The global movement’s mobilizations have changed from unconsciously synchronized to a form of “conscious spontaneity” as indicated in Table 1.

Each wave built from its predecessors’ victories and defeats. International harmonization from people’s intuitive identification with each other in all these cases is noteworthy.

We should expect that future global upsurges will surpass previous waves in cascading global resonance for two reasons: growing grassroots consciousness of the power of street protests and increasing global reach of the world system’s impact on millions of people’s everyday lives. If the past is any indication, future insurgencies will be increasingly marked by their sudden emergence

TABLE 1 *Global insurgencies after 1968*

Insurgency	Years	Key Events	Slogan	Organizations/Inspiration	Outcome
Disarmament Movement	1981-1982	Greenham Common occupation; militant anti-military protests	Peace	Women for Life on Earth; German Autonomes	Russian and US missiles not deployed; expected peace dividend vanishes
Asian Uprisings	1986-1992	Philippines uprising; Tiananmen Square	People Power	1980 Gwangju Uprising; Reform the Armed Forces	8 regimes overthrown in 6 years
Eastern European Regime Changes	1989-1991	Gorbachev announcement; Chernobyl	Peaceful Revolution	Solidarność; Leipzig Monday demonstrations	Eight Soviet regimes overthrown; increasing poverty
Alterglobalization Movements	1998-2003	1999 Seattle; Genoa 2001; Feb. 15, 2003	Another World is Possible	1994 Zapatista Uprising; Direct Action Network	WTO meetings halted and subsequent failure; elite summits confronted
Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street, Indignados	2011-2012	Tunisian revolution; 14 countries in 14 months	Out With Them All; We are the 99%	Egyptian occupation of Tahrir Square; Spanish <i>Indignados</i> , Greek anarchists	Conversation changed to include the 1%; Great Power military intervention and wars in Syria and Libya

and proliferation, and encounter the problem of sustainability apparent in Occupy Wall Street, which grew almost overnight but quickly dissipated.

3 Lessons for the Future

As Marx famously said, we do not make history under conditions we select, “but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past.” It is no accident, therefore, that a decade after Huey P. Newton articulated his vision of “revolutionary intercommunalism,” anarchist thinker Murray Bookchin arrived at a similar conclusion—although he named it “libertarian municipalism.” Historical conditions have created the possibility of reduced governmental powers and increased power to the people. We already see emergent communal forms in the Gwangju Uprising, in Oaxaca’s Commune, and seizures of Taksim and Tahrir Squares. No single vanguard party leads the way forward, but many vanguards, such as Zapatistas, Lesbian Avengers, Occupy Wall Streeters, Indignados, Greek anarchists and Tunisian pirates.

In the 1960s, the Provos, the Orange Free State, and Kabouters in Holland, the Situationists in France, Subversive Aktion in Germany, and the Diggers and Yippies in the United States were successful movement organizations modeled more on aesthetic avant garde groups than on Left parties. Seeking to transform the grammar of people’s existence and to change the aesthetic form of life, Yippies threw money onto the floor of the New York Stock Exchange, a Dadaist action that not only succeeded in halting trading as brokers scurried for dollar bills, but also brought wide publicity to young people’s rejection of the rat race. By running a pig for US President in 1968, Yippies forever changed politicians’ images, not only in the United States. As Stew Albert recalled, the Yippies bathed in the global counterculture of the 1960s, “We turned the streets and its objects into unbounded outdoor props for the creation of T.V. images” (Albert 1999). The Yippies and Provos are but two examples of hundreds of playful episodes of autonomously organized resistance to the forces of seriousness and domination (Shepherd 2011).

Direct actions might be more appropriate vehicles than political parties for transformation of contemporary societies. During May 1968, a small group of older activists suddenly occupied the Sorbonne, creating a central meeting place for the movement that became a haven for dissident workers. The liberated Sorbonne became a direct democratic forum where people from different occupations and classes spoke freely. Soon millions of workers were on strike and France was on the brink of revolution. Exemplary actions by avant-garde groups can be powerful catalysts for instigating larger shifts and movements.

Militant street confrontations can be a crucible for psychic reworking of needs and desires, a living theater with enormous transformative value. After the 2001 Genoa protests against the G-8 (where 200,000 people gathered), one Black Bloc participant told me their experiences “changed me more in a few days than in the preceding years of meetings.” Another person called it the “most important experience” of their life. If we accept that consumer culture is a form of cultural colonization, then the Black Bloc’s destruction of McDonald’s, Nike outlets, and banks are a form of decolonization—a freeing of space from corporate control and creation of autonomous zones not controlled by the police. As Fanon long ago discovered, revolutionary force plays an essential role in decolonization movements (Marcuse 1972:53-55).⁴ The controlled militancy of the Black Bloc is not only a psychic reworking of individuals in the streets, it is also a moment of opposition to the system as a whole. By making concrete people’s desires to be free, decades of deadening consumerism and debilitating comfort can be thrown off overnight.

All models inherited from the past need to be questioned today, including the Black Bloc as well as syndicalists’ notion of the centrality of the working class. Proletarian dogmatism divides the 99%. The working class has been widely expanded with the enlarged reproduction of capital and the rise of enormous bureaucracies, the expansion of education, and the importance of information to economic development. The universities exist today at the center of production, and as such are critically important to capitalism—as well as to revolutionary movements. The precariat grows by leaps and bounds in the twenty-first century.

No one sector of the population has the capacity to transform society. Building a hegemonic block capable of transforming the entire society requires rethinking our past experiences. African-Americans played a vanguard role in the 1960s, but they alone were not enough. Latinos’ 1960s activism was often unrecognized, and they were left out of subsequent commemorations decades later as well (Muñoz Jr. 1989/2007:14-16). The 2006 Census recorded Latinos as 14.8 percent of US population, more than African Americans. As Carlos Muñoz concluded after a lifetime of activism, “We are not islands unto ourselves. Latino/a liberation is not possible without making possible liberation of all people of all colors, including the millions of whites who are not part of the structure of power” (Ibid:233). Native Americans, too, are often overlooked, although recent mobilizations at the Standing Rock Sioux reservation indicate their ability to act with unity and to catalyze larger forces. What has

4 Following Marcuse, we must always distinguish between the system’s violence that kills tens of thousands daily and the movement’s militancy.

only recently been named “the 99%” has long been known as the *minjung* in South Korea. Everyone except the owners of the huge corporations that dominate the economy, the generals in the military, and very few at the top united in *minjung* actions and overthrew an entrenched dictatorship.

The New Left in the United States began in a script dictated by reactions to genocide and injustices perpetrated by the system. In the midst of an escalating spiral of repression and resistance, both the Black and anti-war movements reached violent and spectacular culminations. But in 1970, the movement transcended rebellion and went to the next level: Puerto Ricans ran Lincoln Hospital for the good of the community; students and faculty opened campuses for the needs of all; and in Philadelphia, a multicultural assembly of thousands wrote down their vision for a new society.

Karl Marx expected the dull discipline of factory life to help shape the emancipatory proletariat. We can observe today that the material conditions of consumer society, including its spectacles, like the Olympics and World Cup (despite the nationalist wrappings in which they are packaged), help craft an international identity of humanity. Around the world, people identify more closely with each other than ever before. Diffusion of uprisings via the Eros effect is one robust indication of such a universal identity, as is diffusion of tactical innovations across borders. People today continue to become increasingly intersectional in their identities, as formerly hard-line divisions of race, gender, and class blur and blend, revealing natural spectrums of identity that bridge formerly imposed and strictly enforced border lines—a signpost that we are awakening to the opportunity for global unity like never before.

While humanity, like Nature (and the Universe as a whole, according to modern physics), moves indelibly toward intermingling and interdependence, the patriarchal Establishment’s impetus to isolate people into easily manageable segments of a societal machine continues to pervade ever-deepening aspects of life. The internalization of the imposed value system (which includes misogyny and body-shame, disciplinary “power-over” relationships with oneself, believing one is separate from Nature, the global epidemic of racism, depression and suicide) is one of the weapons used against us, so each person self-maintains inner prisons that perpetuate cycles of domination and colonization. Decolonization and healing of each individual’s body, psyche, and spirit are more crucial than ever before and are steps toward the creation of liberated spaces, families, communities, and beyond. Another legacy of the global imagination of 1968 is the subsequent reemergence of healing arts and indigenous wisdom traditions that have everywhere been persecuted in attempt to annihilate the natural intelligence and birthright of every human to be connected, healthy, and empowered.

That major new upheavals will occur is certain; their outcomes remain unclear. New explosions could very well precipitate massive right-wing responses. If there is any chance of the aesthetic transformation of the established world system, such a possibility does not rest on any individual or organization. The self-activity of popular movements, the spontaneous emergence of an escalating spiral of actions, strikes, sit-ins, and insurrectionary councils (the Eros effect), cannot be brought into existence by conspiracies or acts of will. Neither can these forms of struggle be predicted in advance of their appearance, resting as they do upon the accumulation of political knowledge of our species' history.

References

- Albert, Stew. 1999. Interview, December 3, Portland, Oregon.
- Arrighi, Giovanni, Terence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 2001. "1989: The Continuation of 1968." Pg. 35 in *After the Fall: 1989 and the Future of Freedom*. Edited by George Katsiaficas. New York: Routledge.
- Del Gandio, Jason and AK Thompson (Ed). 2017. *Spontaneous Combustion: The eros effect and global revolution*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Harvey, David. 2013. *Rebel Cities*. London: Verso. Pg. 116.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2011. *Asia's Unknown Uprisings*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Laskey, Mark. 2004. "The Globalization of Resistance." in *Confronting Capitalism: Dispatches from a Global Movement*. Edited by Eddie Yuen, Daniel Burton-Rose, and George Katsiaficas. New York: Soft Skull Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1972. *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. Boston: Beacon Press. Pp. 53-55.
- Meschkat, Klaus. 2010. *Konfrontationen: Streitschriften und Analysen 1958 bis 2010*. Hannover: Offizen. Pg. 210 (author's translation).
- Muñoz Jr., Carlos. 1989/2007. *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*. London: Verso Books. Pp. 14-16, 233.
- Sauermann, Barbara (Ed). 2003. *2/15: The Day the World Said NO to War*. Oakland: AK Press.
- Shepherd, Benjamin. 2011. *Play, Creativity, and Social Movements: If I Can't Dance, It's Not My Revolution*. New York: Routledge.
- The Guardian*. 1982a (April 28) Pg. 5.
- The Guardian*. 1982b (November 10) Pg. 7.