CHAPTER 3: SOURCES OF AUTONOMOUS POLITICS IN GERMANY

Largely forgotten in both the popular media as well as in scholarly accounts of the end of the Cold War is the peace movement. Millions of people in Europe and the U.S. protested the irrationality of nuclear weapons, particularly the instability introduced along with medium range missiles (Pershings and SS-20s) that made a nuclear war possible in which Europe would have been devastated but the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. spared direct attack.[1] In the fall of 1981, hundreds of thousands of people participated in marches with distinctly anti-American overtones in Paris, London, Brussels, Bonn and Rome.[2] The upsurge in Europe erupted very suddenly and gained momentum quickly. Caught by surprise, U.S. policymakers had few clues where this movement came from. If its origins were in the liberal policies of the governing Social Democrats, as European conservatives maintained, it would not have contained such a strong dosage of skepticism toward all political parties.

Politicians and intellectuals contributed, but peace initiatives in Europe were linked to a militant extraparliamentary youth movement. Through their attacks on nuclear power and weapons and their defense of squatted houses, a new generation of radicals helped to delegitimate the authority of national governments and NATO at a time when the post-war division of Europe into hostile zones of East and West had yet to lose its rationale in the minds of many Europeans. Within West Germany, the youth movement, at times violent and tempestuous, became a driving force that made peaceful marching an acceptable course for many people who otherwise might not have risked getting involved. As a movement, these activists cared little about established forms of politics, but their actions caused the mayor of Hamburg to resign and precipitated the downfall of the national Social Democratic government in Bonn and the city government in West Berlin. At the end of 1979, widespread disenchantment with the policies of the two major parties -- both the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD) supported nuclear power and NATO missiles at that time -- gave rise to the ecologist and anti-militarist Green Party which won a number of local and national elections soon after its founding. The left-wing of the governing SPD was long courted by the Greens, and the growing influence of ecology together with the outburst of direct confrontations with the nuclear power industry and the atomic military worked together -- despite the absence of any formal ties or professed allegiances between the militants and the ecologist politicians -- to help spark heated debates in the highest circles within the government. In 1982, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt was forced to resign, but he had long threatened to do so if groups in his Social Democratic Party did not cease their opposition to American missiles. He issued a stern warning to his party not to consider the possibility of aligning themselves with the Greens.[3] In posing the milieu of blue-collar, industrial workers against that of "new social movements," he miscalculated the significance of the impetus from below, and his government fell.

A more historically significant effect of the popular movement was the initiation of a process of questioning the rationality of the Cold War. As is today clear, the division of Europe into two warring zones, although accepted by most people for nearly forty years, had become politically unnecessary and ecologically destructive, and it posed an all-too-frightening potentially catastrophe. "The people make history," little more than an empty rhetorical device for political leaders holding the reins of power, clarifies the driving force behind the Cold War's end. For a few years, governments were perceived as the problem: In the language of the European Nuclear Disarmament Appeal of 1980 (signed by millions of people), its signatories should not be "loyal to East or West but to each other." The construction of a transnational civil society unanchored in any state or political party proceeded slowly at first. Long before nuclear disarmament developed massive support or Gorbachev considered *perestroika* and *glasnost*, grass-roots citizens' initiatives against nuclear power and other megaprojects of the giant state-industrial behemoth galvanized locally-based opposition movements, sometimes across national

borders. As bottom-up initiatives proliferated, Gorbachev was encouraged to act by the electoral successes of the Greens, and Western leaders were compelled to respond because of the pressure of the peace movement. Moreover, while the massive peace movement had a militant wing, it was essentially a single-issue movement backed by mainly middle-class people using traditional tactics.

As I discuss in this chapter, the autonomous women's movement, the movement against nuclear power and youthful squatters all became springboards for more generalized resistance involving militant tactics. As citizens initiatives and new social movements followed their own internal logics, the radical Autonomen were created and expressed fundamental opposition to the existing world system. Unlike many specialists in European affairs, those of us involved in these movements were not surprised by the hundreds of thousands of people who subsequently marched in the streets of Europe. In this chapter, I recall the history of how localized struggles against nuclear power plants and isolated squats helped create the possibility for the massive mobilizations against NATO plans to deploy new nuclear weapons.

No doubt the Allies made a wise decision at the end of World War 2 when they chose to rehabilitate rather than humiliate Germany through another Versailles treaty. Not only was it hoped that the emergence of a new Hitler would thereby be precluded, but a buffer against Soviet expansionism would be created. With a few minor adjustments to the U.S. constitution (like the deliberate exclusion of a strong executive and the creation of a system of proportional representation designed to insure the inclusion of small parties in the government), American-style democracy, complete with the promise of affluent consumerism for a comfortable majority, was adapted to and adopted by a compliant West German citizenry. Part of the new social contract tacitly agreed to by all but a few protesters after the founding of the Bundesrepublik (Federal Republic of Germany, hereafter FRG) was to support the new democratic state.

During the 1960s, as nearly everywhere else in the world, opposition crystallized based upon the norms, values and actions of young people. The most important German New Left group was SDS, *Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund* (German Socialist Student Federation), a unique blend of dissident refugees from Communist East Germany, left-liberal student activists and a few nascent bohemian counterculturalists. Originally the youth wing of the SPD, SDS became fiercely independent of political parties after two fell out. During campaigns for an open university, freedom of the press and peace in Vietnam, SDS grew in national importance. The country's two major parties, the CDU and the SPD, ruled together in a "grand coalition," so opposition was necessarily confined to the streets. In conjunction with a variety of groups, SDS participated in a loosely-aligned extraparliamentary opposition (*Ausserparlamentarische Opposition* or "APO"). The APO included SDS, a few trade unions, and religious groups active in the peace movement, whose Easter marchers mobilized hundreds of thousands of people.[4] As the first massive opposition to the Cold War consensus in West Germany, it took up the long-abandoned revolutionary tradition of the German working-class, a heritage betrayed at the outbreak of World War 1 when Social Democrats voted to support the Kaiser's war.

The sixties in Germany produced an extreme reaction to the Nazi past. Young Germans questioned why their parents' generation had participated in the horror of Nazism. When they realized that many ex-Nazis were part of system whose police were attacking their demonstrations, sometimes with deadly force, many lost all faith in the political order's democratic potential and initiated an armed struggle designed to overthrow it. Weakened by the male chauvinism of its members,[5] German SDS eventually succumbed to dogmatic Maoist and adventurist Guevarist forces within the organization, and after it dissolved, it spawned an assortment of "Marxist-Leninist" parties and cadre groups, whose appearance signalled the end of the first phase of the APO. Besides providing recruits for new communist parties (whose members altogether totaled approximately 15,000 in the mid-1970s),[6] the

APO's dissolution also sent many people into the SPD, which acquired about 100,000 new members from 1969-1973.[7] A variety of independent activists continued the "long march through the institutions," a strategy originally charted by SDS leader Rudy Dutschke that called for radicals to enter the existing system in order to demonstrate its practical incompatibility with a free society while simultaneously winning as many reforms as possible. Hundreds of activists went into German factories to organize, and in 1969 and again in 1973 (coincidentally also when Italian labor unrest peaked), waves of wildcat strikes rolled through industry. Alongside German laborers, these struggles involved immigrant Turkish workers in automobile plants, women working on assembly lines, and, for first time in half a century, workers in the chemical industry. In 1970, negotiated wage increases averaged 10.6%, highest in the history of FRG.[8] In 1973, 275,000 workers in at least 335 factories struck for better working conditions and higher wages.[9] For the first time, Volkswagen workers went on strike. Only after numerous police attacks, headlines in **Der Spiegel** blaming a Turkish invasion for the unrest, and mammoth wage increases (totaling almost 30% from 1969 to 1973) did things quiet down. Hundreds of radical activists were quickly dismissed from their union positions and lost their jobs.[10] In 1974, public employees struck for the first time. As economic crisis set in during the mid-1970s, however, German unions were able to discipline the workforce and win it Europe's highest standard of living.

Finally, a tendency of the New Left that grew after SDS dissolved was the antiauthoritarian counterculture. At the end of the 1960s, the German New Left discovered Rock 'n Roll around the same time that the Kreuzberg Hash Rebels came into existence, and guerrilla groups like the RAF and the June 2 Movement began their armed attacks and bombings. Needless to say, these developments transformed a highly intellectual movement whose everyday life had reflected the cultural conformity of the society from which it had developed. As I discuss in the next section, feminists became increasingly autonomous of German society. Currents of sexual liberation and cultural revolution clashed with the dogmatic ideology of cadre groups and stern disapproval of parents and authorities.

The counterculture became a source of political activism that had little to do with the Left or mainstream concerns.[11] At the beginning of the 1970s, activists organized the first squats in Munich, Cologne, Hamburg and Göttingen. In Frankfurt, squatters struggles in the early 1970s were especially strong, and the city became the center of the "*Spontis*" (spontaneitists who engaged in direct actions and street fights without belonging to formal organizations). In Bremen, Göttingen, Munich, Marburg, Kassel and Berlin, regionally-organized Sponti groups were active.[12] Like the Metropolitan Indians in Italy, Spontis loved to poke fun at their more serious "comrades" and used irony rather than rationality to make their point. In 1978, Spontis in Münster helped elect a pig to a university office, and in Ulm, a dog was nominated to the Academic Senate.[13] Reacting to the holier-than-thou position assumed by many Leftists vis-a-vis the general population, Sponti spokesperson, Humphrey Tse Tung, was quoted widely as saying, "The revolutionary must swim among the masses like a fish on a bicycle." Regarding the dying German forests, Spontis quipped: "Acidity makes jovial -- the forest laughs itself dead."

During the early 1970s, feminism and the anti-nuclear power movement slowly awakened alongside thousands of *Bürgerinitiativen* (citizen's initiatives or independent grass-roots groups that arose to protest local issues like pollution problems, rising fares for public transportation, or the need for playgrounds and parks). From about 1000 such groups in 1972, the number grew to over 4000 by 1975, when it was estimated they involved anywhere from 60,000 to 160,000 people.[14] By 1982, another estimate claimed the BBU (*Bundesverband Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz* or Federal Alliance of Environmentalist Citizen's Initiatives) represented over 1000 groups with a total membership between 300,000 and 500,000.[15] As these new groups formed, eventually they constituted a movement far larger than anything in the 1960s, during the same period of time that all but a few New Leftists,

particularly the old membership of SDS, became integrated into German society.

German SDS never had more than 2000 members,[16] and even though the New Left created quite a stir in West Germany, it never attracted the widespread participation so essential to the larger movements in France or the United States.[17] For the most part, members of the New Left became part of the university "establishment" and filled other professional positions. The most public examples of New Leftists who were not absorbed into the middle class were imprisoned members of guerrilla groups, some of whom were incarcerated in sunless, constantly videotaped isolation cells. Solidarity with these prisoners became an important rallying point within the movement, despite severe legal sanctions against writing or even publicly speaking in favor of "terrorists."

During the 1970s, the government's counteroffensive against "terrorists" and remnants of the New Left busy with the "long march through the institutions" led to widespread repression of public employees, teachers and anyone who protested, making it difficult to find ways to dissent publicly. In 1972, Willy Brandt initiated a Ministerial Decree aimed at curtailing "radicals" employed in the public service was enacted. Known as the *Berufsverbot* by its critics and *Radikalenerlass* by self-described neutral observers, the decree resulted in loyalty checks on 3.5 million persons and the rejection of 2,250 civil service applicants. While only 256 civil servants were dismissed, the decree had a chilling effect. By criminalizing such mundane actions as signing petitions and speaking openly against government policy, the decree went beyond its intended effect. Although more members of extreme right-wing groups were employed in the public sector in 1972, the Left became the target of government officials entrusted with carrying out the terms of the new law. About half of the right-wingers employed by the government were in the military, compared with a similar percentage of Leftists in the post office. One observer noted that the historically vital "anti-Left syndrome encourages rightist groups to become active against the Left, a development that is only too reminiscent of the Weimar period."[18] According to a Mannheim survey, 84% of university students there refrained from regularly checking leftist materials out of public libraries for fear of being blacklisted.[19] So many people were concerned that the FRG was self-destructing that when the *Sozialistisches Büro* organized an anti-repression conference in June 1976, 20,000 people attended.[20]

In 1977 (when the revolt in Italy reached a boiling point), West Germany suffered through its "German Autumn," a time of both armed attacks on the country's elite and intense political repression. For some time, the hard core of the guerrillas -- then called the Baader-Meinhof group, today RAF -- had been robbing banks, setting off fires in department stores, killing local officials, and outrunning police in high-speed chases on the Autobahns. On September 5, the RAF kidnapped one of the country's leading industrialists, Hanns-Martin Schleyer (who they insisted had been an SS man during World War 2). As police checkpoints appeared around the country during the six weeks the RAF held Schleyer before they killed him, the fascist state that many Germans feared would rise like a phoenix from the ashes of Nazism appeared to be real.

Overwhelmed by the deadly force brought to bear by the state, Spontis helped intervene by organizing a giant convention they called *Tunix* (Do Nothing). In the deadly serious atmosphere of an apparent police state that was the German Autumn, the Sponti response was to turn utopian. They called on all "freaks" to "sail off to Tunix beach...beneath the cobblestones of the country."[21] Using the conference against repression in Bologna as a model, organizers drew an estimated 20,000 young people to Berlin in February 1978. The strong and vibrant turnout surprised even the conference organizers. As freaks participated in theaters of the absurd and other happenings, looming in the background were the twin ogres of Italian repression and the German Autumn. By the time *Tunix* ended, many people felt they had gone beyond the reality of repression, and the subsequent activation

of thousands of people spelled an end to the repressive atmosphere that had so endangered German democracy.

More than anything else, what fired the imagination of the new activist impulse at the end of the 1970s, was the autonomous movement in Italy. Discussing the existence of "autonomous groups" in Germany after *Tunix*, one theorist, Johannes Agnoli warned that the Frankfurt *Spontis*, like the West German Left in general, felt so isolated and powerlessness that they identified too strongly with the Metropolitan Indians and Italian *Autonomia*. In the same year, a book about the Metropolitan Indians was published in Germany, and some of them travelled the country seeking to spark similar formations.[22] We can trace the trajectory of the autonomous movement from Italy first to Zurich and Amsterdam, then to German cities, especially Berlin and Hamburg, and finally, in the summer of 1981, to British cities.[23]

In Switzerland, a massive struggle for an autonomous youth center broke out in Zurich in May 1980, transforming that city's conservative social landscape. In many European cities after 1968, struggles for autonomous youth centers in many cities had been waged, but the contest in Zurich was so intense and assumed such innovative and imaginative forms that it became the point of origin for subsequent actions.[24] Using a combination of tactics including nude marches and "roller commando" demonstrations, a radical youth movement opposed to the complacency of middle-class culture challenged Swiss society to make the lives of its youth more fulfilling. Their struggle for an autonomous youth center was, in their own words, to create a place "where new forms of living together can be found and our own culture developed" as a step toward a "society in which humanity, freedom of opinion, and the unfolding of human personality can be made real."[25] The movement in Zurich originally formed around circles of proletarian youth. Upset with the high cost of concerts and having nowhere to hang out, bands of youth stormed concerts. Eventually they wanted their own space for concerts, and they created "Rock as Revolt" modelled on the English Rock Against Racism and German Rock Against the Right. The Swiss group did not see racism or fascism as their main problem, but the generally boring and alienated conditions of their everyday lives.[26] Beginning with a small protest against the lavish renovation of the opera house, a Dadaist movement erupted, turning the city upside down. They alternately won support from the city's government for their youth center and fought police and drug dealers for control of it. Using slogans like, "Turn the government into cucumber salad," and "We are the cultural corpses of the city," the movement expressed its desire to transcend the "death culture" of work and consumerism and to overturn the whole society, not just the state and institutions.[27] But the authorities would not allow them their own space. At the end of 1980 (when the squatters' movement was first consolidating itself in Berlin), more than 1100 youth faced criminal charges in Zurich, and thousands of people at general assemblies debated the movement's next steps. In 18 months, there were more than 60 confrontations with the police and over 2500 arrests.[28] Despite Swiss prosperity (there were more jobs available than workers willing to take them), a cultural crisis was evident in statistics like the suicide rate for young men (it more than doubled from 1970 to 1980).[29] The lack of free space was compounded by a painfully stark housing crisis. Rent increases sparked by inflation were resisted by a wave of occupations of vacant buildings, and a shantytown named "Chaotikon" was built on one of Zurich's fashionable lakeside parks to dramatize (and partially solve) the problems young people had in finding a place to live. Chaotikon was cleared out and destroyed by riot police only one week after it was built, but it was repeated reconstructed, like the autonomous youth center that was temporarily won, lost and won again. The movement spread to Basel, Bern, and Lausanne. In 1981, two people were killed by police, and the polarization of Swiss life reached unexpected extremes. In 1982, the youth center was finally demolished in Zurich. Hard drugs had helped sap the movement's strength,

turning imaginative action into quiet resignation. Nonetheless, but the myth and reality of the struggle in Zurich became a model for others.

From Italy via Zurich, the idea of an autonomous movement was carried to Hamburg and Berlin, where, merged with the practice of Dutch squatters, the Autonomen were consolidated. Not a concept that fell from the sky, autonomous politics developed from many sources, all of which stemmed from practical experience in struggles to transform the social order. As I discuss in the remainder of this chapter, it would take years of popular direct actions in Germany before the Autonomen would appear, and several sources flowed together to create them: the autonomous women's movement, the anti-nuclear movement, squatters, and the alternative movement.

Like the counterculture, feminism transcended national boundaries and played a significant role in transforming German social movements. The women's movement in Germany zealously maintained its autonomy from the rest of the Left, setting an example for emergent movements. Although groups from the militant anti-nuclear power movement around Hamburg used the term "autonomous" to describe themselves very early in the 1970s, they might as well have used the word "independent" since they were not using the term to link their identity to the idea of an autonomous movement.[30] The feminist movement that appeared in Germany was the main source of continuity between the 1960s and the 1970s, although as I discuss below, feminists initially negated the strident style of SDS. As in Italy, women injected a "politics of the first person" into movement discourse, and in so doing, they realized an enduring meaning for the concept of autonomy.

The Autonomous Women's Movement

As the APO and popular upsurge of the 1960s faded, feminism in Germany went from the margins of a student revolt to become an enduring movement that affected German society far more profoundly than any post-war social movement. In 1988, twenty years after the appearance of militant feminism, Alice Schwarzer, one of the autonomous women's movement's most important spokespersons, declared "We feminists have made a cultural revolution! The only real one since 1945."[31] Although her optimism may have been exaggerated, her point was not incorrect.

The direct impact of feminism was clear enough in the new found political power enjoyed by women, as well as in new opportunities in other domains previously reserved for men. Most importantly, in the transvaluation of the subtle and overt demeaning of women that centuries of patriarchy had produced, everyday life had been transformed for millions of women. Indirectly, the women's movement prefigured what would later become the Autonomen. Feminists were the ones who made "autonomy" their central defining point, and they passed it along to the next generations of activists. Their counterinstitutions were visionary and like their illegal occupations of vacant houses that were then fixed up *(Instandbesetzungen)*, subsequently became examples for larger movements. Before others did so, they began to work with immigrant Turkish women, and well before the Greens developed the slogan that they were "neither Left nor Right but in front," the women's movement had labelled Left and Right patriarchal concepts having little to do with feminism.

On September 13, 1968, a critical date in the history of the German New Left and of German feminism, Helke Sander, a member of the Berlin Action Council for Women's Liberation, gave an impassioned speech at the national meeting of SDS in Frankfurt calling on her male comrades in SDS to remove "the blinders you have over your eyes" and take note of their own sexism.[32] As expected by some, the meeting returned to business as usual as soon as she finished speaking. But when SDS theoretician Hans-Jürgen Krahl was in the middle of his speech (having nothing to do with the feminist appeal for support), another female delegate from Berlin screamed at him: "Comrade Krahl, you are

objectively a counterrevolutionary and an agent of the class enemy!" She then hurled several tomatoes in the direction of the podium, one of which hit Krahl squarely in the face.

Many of the women in SDS were embarrassed by the action, but the deeds of the Berlin Action Council for Women's Liberation electrified feminists and are considered to be the beginning of the autonomous women's movement. Although they had formed while organizing among mothers with young children trying to cope with the scandalous lack of daycare (Kinderladen), the Berlin Action Council's roots in the anti-authoritarian New Left defined their overly critical understanding of motherhood. In January 1968, they wrote: "The function of the mother is to internalize forms of domination and treat them as love." As many of these women were compelled to bring children to meetings and interrupt their own participation while their male comrades gave speeches about the "repressive nature of monogamy" and the need to negate (Aufheben) the "fixation of the children on their parents," women's self-critical comments were transformed into a mothers' movement around the issue of daycare. While their subservience in SDS was initially ignored by their male counterparts, after they successfully organized kindergarten teachers, their groups began to be taken over by men.[33]

Initially women saw their withdrawal from mixed groups as temporary "to bring us to the point where we can come to our own self-understanding without hindsight and compromises. Only then will we be capable to unite with other groups in a meaningful fashion."[34] Like their male counterparts in the New Left, they believed the class struggle was primary and women's liberation a "secondary contradiction." As women mobilized, crass male domination propelled militant feminists into ever more radical theory and practice. In November 1968, a group of SDS women from Frankfurt attempted to read a prepared statement at an SPD celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of women's right to vote, but they were physically prevented from doing so by SPD officials. They then formed a "Broad's Council" and prepared a now legendary leaflet for the next national SDS meeting a few weeks later. Entitled "Free the socialist eminences from their bourgeois dicks!" the leaflet pictured six mounted penises with the corresponding names of male leaders of SDS beneath them and a reclining female figure with an ax in her hand.

Nothing energized and was more important to the new movement than the campaign to liberalize the abortion laws. Statutes criminalizing abortion had been on the books since 1871,[35] and at the turn of the century intermittent struggles had failed to win significant reform. The specific statute that the second wave of feminists sought to repeal was ¶218 in the Basic Laws that outlawed abortion. On March 8, 1969, international women's day, the first of many demonstrations for deletion of ¶218 took place. The number of illegal abortions in West Germany was estimated at anywhere from half a million to a million (although the government's figure was only 1005 for 1969). In the same year, a poll showed that 71% of German women (and 56% of the entire population) were against ¶218. As demonstrations and public pressure mounted, a shock wave hit Germany on June 2, 1971 when 374 women publicly declared "I have had an abortion" in **Stern,** one of the country's main magazines. Initiated by Alice Schwarzer (who copied the action from the Women's Liberation Front in Paris where 343 French women had published a similar declaration two months earlier), this public confession made abortion rights the country's number one issue. Within two months of the **Stern** article, more than 2345 more women signed on, 973 men admitted their "complicity" and 86,100 solidarity signatures were gathered.[36]

Women's movements in the U.S., Holland and Denmark were similarly engaged in feminist campaigns, and the international diffusion of action and thought was a noteworthy feature of this period. Forging connections with women's movements in other countries, feminism in Germany helped negate national chauvinist tendencies. At a time when anti-Americanism was a growing force among Leftists, women translated and read numerous texts from the U.S. They also rediscovered the existence of a first

wave of German feminism, a vibrant movement dating to the mid-nineteenth century whose history had largely been hidden.

As the campaign to decriminalize abortion gathered momentum, 450 women from 40 groups came together in Frankfurt on March 11 and 12, 1972 for the first national women's congress. In plenaries and four working groups, women accelerated their pace of activity. The working group on families developed concrete demands including: division of domestic chores between men and women, equal pay for equal work, an end to traditional roles in the family, a year with pay for mothers and fathers, unconditional 24-hour kindergartens, and large dwellings at cheap rents to counter the isolation of the nuclear family. Working group "Action 218" prepared a new offensive against ¶218. Between 20 and 30 of the 40 groups participating in the conference had originally been formed to legalize abortion, and the working group served to coordinate their future activities. The conference as a whole resolved that the women's question would no longer be subsumed beneath the question of class and to expand their autonomous organizations. Declaring their opposition to becoming an isolated "women's island," they promised to "struggle against the existing system."[37]

After the national congress, action groups against ¶218 intensified their efforts. In Frankfurt, over 100 women staged a "Go-In" at the cathedral during Sunday services to protest the church's anti-abortion policies. With the slogan "The unborn are protected, the born are exploited," the women shouted down the priest from reading the latest church letter on abortion. Feminists also stormed a disco having a "Miss Disco" competition and threw pigs' tails at the jury. At another "Go-in," this time at the meetings of the mainstream medical association, women handed out leaflets and threw red-stained tampons at the doctors, a majority of whom declared their support for the government and made a statement that they would not perform abortions even if they were legalized. In Köln, a two day tribunal against opponents of abortion was held.

In Berlin, less confrontational actions were planned. Articulating a new style they called "feminist realism," three women artists organized an exhibition entitled "From Women -- For Women -- With Women."

picture here

These artists developed a medium to portray clearly what they perceived to be the position of women, but even that tranquil act was too much for the city officials who promptly withdrew their funding, forcing cancellation. Nonetheless the women hung their work at movement meetings and on billboards. Bread _ Roses, a Berlin feminist organization, produced the first Women's Handbook containing information on birth control and abortion. They declared the need for women to understand their own bodies rather than relying on male doctors' expertise. Self-help groups formed to teach women how to do self-exams. That same year, from within the "Homosexual Action Center of West Berlin" emerged the first public lesbian group.

Feminist euphoria was everywhere in 1973. In February, hundreds of women met in Munich and planned a new set of national actions. After the Munich gathering, consciousness-raising groups adopted from the U.S. spread throughout the country, symptoms of an inward turn in the movement. Alongside the first appearance of divisions within the movement between socialist feminism and radical feminism,[38] women's groups coalesced in the strategy of creating women's centers, self-managed autonomous spaces in which men were not allowed. While there were more than 100 active feminist group and a few thousand activists in Germany, in only two cities (Berlin and Frankfurt) were there such

centers. All over the country, women began to create them. In one such struggle on January 17, 1974 in Heidelberg, women occupied a house that had stood empty for a year. Using money collected from their supporters to fix it up, they worked on it for six days. In the middle of the night, the police broke down the door and arrested them all. In their court appearance, one of the women spoke for the group:

> We women are generally not self-reliant and are regarded as helpless. And so it is that we have never learned to step forth and take matters into our own hands...Our experiences have shown that groups that deal with apparently private problems like family, raising children and sexuality are in the position to activate women, to open their horizons, to activate them to change their situation...that's why we need public space available to every woman...to free our time and energy.[39]

By the spring of 1974, a dozen autonomously financed (and managed) centers were open, and by the end of the year, there were 17.[40] These centers were a place where the old organizational forms were put in question and non-hierarchical and decentralized action points created. In these group contexts: "...the solitary woman experiences differences and other women that radiate more security and formulate autonomous goals. Every solitary woman brings with her desires for emancipation, and the group can start making demands for emancipation very quickly -- with the result that the solitary woman in a discussion group soon feels she is living a lie (because of the discrepancy between reality and demand)."[41] Isolated housewives and students went from the margins to the center of German social life, reformulating their identities in the process of creating a vibrant set of autonomous women's institutions: women's bars, women's newspapers and magazines, women's presses, bookstores, film festivals, and women's rock bands (like the "Flying Lesbians").

Although at least eight different women's political parties were founded in West Germany after 1950, none was able to become a forum for women's movement. There was never a centralized organization like NOW in the U.S. yet Germany's feminists prided themselves on being the "best organized of all."[42] Within the women's centers, differences emerged, particularly between Leftist bureaucrats and anarchists. Conflicts between "weak and strong" personalities were the topic of many discussions, as was frustration at constantly having to return to a zeropoint when new women had to be oriented, particularly around the reasons why men were not allowed. Nonetheless, the centers thrived, organizing the campaign against ¶218 and initiating other projects as well, notably an annual feminist summer university in Berlin.[43]

On March 16, 1974, a national day of protest, thousands of women went into the streets. Using street theater and puppet parades, they sought to pressure the governing Social Democrats to end their ambivalence on abortion. "Action Last Attempt," born from a small group from the Berlin Women's Center had several parts: In **Der Spiegel,** 329 doctors risked losing their professional licenses by admitting having helped women have illegal abortions. Two days later, the television news magazine **Panorama** scheduled a sensational program: Fourteen doctors were going to perform an illegal abortion using the vacuum method (widely practiced outside Germany but hardly known inside the country). Shortly before it was to be aired, the program was banned, and all that viewers saw during prime time was a blank screen. The ugly hand of censorship reappeared in Germany.

These actions brought thousands of new women into the women's centers, people who read about the centers in the wake of the **Panorama** scandal and sought advice and shelter as well as ways to get involved in the movement. In April 1974, when the Bundestag passed a new law permitting abortions in the first trimester, it seemed the movement had won a victory. Thousands of women danced all night at a party in Berlin in May, but on June 21, the Supreme Court suspended the new law.

Pressure mounted from all sides and finally, on February 25, 1975, the court finally declared the new law unconstitutional. A week later, the Red Zoras, a feminist guerrilla group, bombed the court's chambers in Karlsruhe. Numerous police searches were unable to locate anyone tied to the Red Zoras, but they disrupted networks of activists against ¶218. A year later, a new law was enacted that remained in effect for over a decade: If a women underwent counseling, she would be able to have an abortion.

The struggle to decriminalize abortion was exemplary in its organizational forms and militance. After decades of invisibility, women suddenly gained a massive following and made their agenda a national issue. They were exemplary in another less positive way as well: The fate of millions of women was decided by a handful of male judges, an all too painful reminder of who held power. As one woman put it: "...once again it was not whether to abort or not, but how one could abort: namely that it was not the responsibility of the woman, but the guardianship of men -- doctors, psychologists, judges. The real function of the law, namely the intimidation and tutelage of women, was preserved."[44] Difficult as it was for the movement to be unable to change the laws despite majority support and militant confrontations, it was only the most blatant example of female subordination to patriarchal power. Is it any wonder that women reacted by creating their own autonomous domains?

Berlin was clearly the avant garde city for the German autonomous women's movement. Berlin's Republican Club, an informal New Left discussion group, was where women first came together to discuss women's issues.[45] The first women's center was in Berlin's Hornstrasse; the first women's bar (the Blocksberg) opened there; and the first self-help groups originated within the Berlin Women's Health Center. In 1976, the Berlin feminist magazine **Schwarze Botin** considered the women's movement "the only group in this moment at all capable of performing a radical and critical critique of society that...is anticapitalist, but primarily antiphallic and antipatriarchal."[46] As the women's movement turned into the "women's projects movement," the concept of autonomy was made real: Taken together, the projects created a "countermilieu" in which women would be free to build their own forms of life without having to deal with men.

Limits on feminist utopianism intervened in the mid-1970s, as violence against women escalated in response to the movement's strident actions and contestation of power relations in everyday life, and the issue of violence against women became the central action point of feminists around the world. In Portugal, 200 women who took to the streets to demonstrate against pornography and the oppression of women were attacked by a crowd of over 5000 men who screamed. "Burn them! Women only in bed!"[47] In Spain, women had to celebrate clandestinely on International Women's Day. In 1977, the case of Italian Claudia Caputi and Italian feminists marches also had a significant impact in Germany.[48] Statistics showed that a woman was raped every 15 minutes in Germany, yet there was no social consciousness about violence against women, no shelters for battered women and children. After the first such shelter was founded in Berlin, within two years, dozens of others had been created in the rest of Germany.[49] On April 30, 1977, feminists took to the streets to "take back the night," the first of what became an annual Walpurgis night march against pornography and rape. As we saw in the previous chapter on Italy, male activists were surprisingly callous to their sisters. When the leftist magazine *konkret* had a cover story on feminism featuring a man's hand holding a woman's breast, its doors were plastered shut by a group of women. This instance illuminates a continuing problem in the Left. While the Left was mobilizing against increasing repression from the government (something feminist group also faced), women were also repressed in everyday life by men. As one group tried to explain it:

From childhood on our capabilities are throttled. We have a permanent Berufsverbot.
Our identities have been stolen, from early on we learn to find ourselves through men

only. Our bodies are permanent sites (*freiwild*) for glances, for fondling and for comments. The streets are for us enemy territory. We don't feel safe alone in the streets at night. For us there's always a curfew.[50]

Discussions focused on the colonized soul of women, of lives that were barraged with male violence and repression, and the need for autonomy continually resurfaced. The concept of autonomy had several meanings for feminists. On an individual level, women were concerned with their personal autonomy. As Alice Schwarzer put it: "A women has no existence as an autonomous being -- only in relation to a man."[51] But individual autonomy, the most common way the term is understood in our society, because it refers to individual distance-taking, is often linked to male behavior. For the women's movement, autonomy referred to the need for female collective autonomy -- for women to have shelter from male violence and male dynamics, for spaces of women's own making and designs. Within the movement, local groups used the term in yet another sense: to refer to their independence within a nonhierarchical framework that did not create a division between leaders and followers. Finally, and most importantly, the meaning of the term autonomy was political, and referred to the feminist movement's independence from established political parties. As Ann Anders summarized: "The first principle of autonomy is the lack of any hierarchy and alignment with state, party or any other rigid political-social structures."[52] Another activist summarized the many meanings of autonomy:

> Above all, autonomy of the women's movement means its self-organization, separation from the male-dominated Left and men generally. Moreover it refers to the relationship of the movement to the government and its institutions, which because they are recognized as patriarchal and system stabilizing, are rejected, resulting in a complete detachment from state and institutional connections. Within the movement, autonomy means primarily decentralization, autonomy of every single group. In existing groups, it means the self-determination of working structures and content, within which hoped for antihierarchical structures allow affected individuals the widest possible space for their autonomous development.[53]

Besides helping illuminate the multifaceted meaning of autonomy, these definitions illustrate the continuity between the autonomous women's movement and the extraparliamentary opposition of the 1960s. Both formations were deeply suspicious of the cooptive consequences of entering into the established system. By definition, being autonomous for both feminists and the APO meant refusing to go into these institutions in order to change them. On the one side, the women's movement was on the offensive against ¶218, but simultaneously it created its own counterinstitutions "out of the extraparliamentary Left, that began in 1968 to build alternative structures, to live in group houses and to have its own presses and meeting places."[54] These two dimensions, opposition to the domination of the existing system and construction of liberated spaces within it, define the universe of discourse of autonomous movements.

In comparison to its counterpart in the U.S., the German women's movement emphasized autonomy rather than equality.[55] After the U.S. movement was able to win abortion rights, its energies became focused within the established political arena. One result was that liberal feminists led thousands of activists into pouring millions of hours into an unsuccessful campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment. Despite de jure equal rights in Germany, the failure of German feminists to obtain commensurate abortion rights preconditioned their greater emphasis on autonomy. No central organization exists there and liberal feminists have little influence. Identified primarily with radical feminists, the autonomous women's movement refers to local projects, a network of bookstores and

presses, women's centers and publications.

Courage, the first national women's magazine, was founded in 1976 with a press run of 5,000. Although it began as a West Berlin magazine, it soon was circulated throughout West Germany and by November 1978, had a circulation of 70,000.[56] In February 1977, Alice Schwarzer and a group of radical feminists that included many professional journalists, published **Emma** with a first issue of 300,000, and it regularly printed 100,000 copies. Both magazines were controlled by non-profit feminist groups and produced exclusively by women. Having two feminist magazines with different perspectives helped stimulate probing exchanges and sharp polemics among women. While the debates sometimes resulted in personal attacks[57] their years-long duration provided thousands of activists with ongoing forums for political education and discussion. Two key issues German feminists have continually returned to over the last quarter century are "women's work" in the home and motherhood. Deep divisions opened in the movement as responses varied to the dilemma of unpaid domestic drudgery and the confinement of women to the home.

In 1973, Alice Schwarzer published her book, *Women's Work -- Women's Liberation*, and a few months later, a German translation appeared of the classic text by Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James.[58] If the personal is political, as these theorists maintained, then the unpaid domestic labor performed by women (estimated at various times to be in the billions of hours) should be considered part of the economy -- counted in the calculation of GDP and compensated in dollars. They insisted that if women were to be paid for what is now unpaid work, the division between the world of paid work and unpaid labor would be rendered meaningless. This would then lead to a complete revaluation of women's role, an end to their relegation to the home and the private sphere where they serve as unnoticed appendages to men. Other feminists, however, had a different perspective. They believed that enacting a system of remuneration for household work would only further institutionalize women within these spheres, thereby reproducing barriers to their entrance into other institutions -- politics, corporations, universities. Since the ghettoization of women is the material product of a patriarchal division of labor that privileges men in terms of career and jobs, they believed sharing the burden of domestic chores and child-raising responsibilities was the only way to overthrow this patriarchal structural imperative.[59] Radical feminists complained that wages for housework glorified the place of women in the home rather than seeking to involve men in household chores.

The Left generally tried to organize women at the site of production, "at the side of the working class," where women were consistently underpaid.[60] As one woman expressed the relationship between these two dynamics: "Above all, unpaid housework turned up again as underpaid work outside the home: since women's work is worth nothing in the home, it is worth less outside the home."[61] Hannelore Mabry called the double and triple burden of women "patriarchal surplus value." Noting the Left and unions' antipathy -- at best ambivalence toward women's issues in the past -- Mabry maintained: "Women and mothers did not split the labor movement, but rather male workers have from the beginning betrayed and plundered women and mothers -- *because for them too, the patriarchal right of the mighty prevailed!*"[62]

As the debate over wages for housework receded, a new dispute emerged in the form of debates about the "new motherhood" and equal rights. Radical feminists argued that "equal rights (more women in politics, etc.) are blind demands insofar as they do question the underlying issue of whether we should accept the structures of manly domains, whether we should become part of manly politics and science."[63] They understood motherhood as something that society expected of women, and they sought to revise the definition of a full life for women as not necessarily including having children. They simultaneously regarded the conditions of motherhood (overworked, living on the margins) as

oppressive. These ideas were contradicted by a text in **Courage** that contained notions like "natural wish for children" of all women that came deep from within the belly, a naturally given "peaceful mother-child relationship," and a "psychically/physically anchored preparedness of mothers to be victims."[64] Taken with New Age ideas, some women began celebrating "women's intuition" and found Tarot cards to be a way to divine the future.[65] This inward turn in the movement signalled "a new femininity" and celebration of motherhood that verified the feelings of some women that their femininity -- including their motherly intentions (or actuality) -- was not to be denied. These developments raised objections and bitter responses (particularly from lesbians who saw it as an "acceptance of heterosexuality within the women's movement").[66]

Since the birth rate in Germany was lower than the death rate, all political parties, the CDU most strongly, were doing what they could to encourage women to become mothers. Some feminists supported the mothers' centers that were then being created with government money to help new mothers learn new skills, earn money and put their children in play groups. They argued that mothers' feelings of self-worth have been cracked and called on women to validate mothers and support them. **Courage** called for at least one year off at full pay for mothers, guaranteed return of mothers to their jobs, creation of jobs to which mothers could bring their children, higher payments for non-working mothers and more publications about breast feeding. Insofar as these ideas overlapped with some of those discussed by the government, they were subjected to relentless criticisms by radicals.

In contrast to the position of a genetically-defined female nature (a position called "essentialist" in the U.S.), radical feminists sought to raise the possibility that male and female traits are products of social-historical forces that have molded our identities in particular ways. As early as 1975, Alice Schwarzer had articulated this position in what became a classic text of German feminism, *The "little" Difference and its great Consequences*. In it she posed a future where:

> Gender would no longer be destiny. Women and men would no longer be forced into role behavior, and the masculine mystique would be as superfluous as the femininity complex. Sex-specific divisions of labor and exploitation would be suspended. Only biological motherhood would be women's affair; social motherhood would be men's affair just as much as women's. People would communicate with each other in unlimited ways, sexually and otherwise, according to their individual needs at any given time and regardless of age, race and gender. (There would be no class system in this liberated society.)[67]

According to this logic, what has been culturally determined can be remade, in contrast to the absolutely unchangeable character of naturally given inner nature. Even naturally given abilities like breast feeding were deconstructed and critically examined by radical feminists. They perceived the government's support for mothers as little more than a liberal version of Hitler's limitation of women to the 3K's (kitchen, children and church). They saw the new femininity as "part of the counterrevolt coming out of our own ranks" and posited the possibility of a "third way in which "we would no longer be reduced, no longer cut in half. A way that would allow us to be strong *and* weak, emotional and rational, vulnerable and daring."[68]

In 1979, at the fourth Berlin summer university for women, the theme was: "Autonomy or Institution: the Passion and Power of Women." For the first time, there were long discussions about the peace movement and a public demand was made on the SPD to oppose the new American missiles or face a vote boycott. At the same time, the long-standing debate about motherhood and pay for domestic work continued. A new element was injected by Vera Slupic. Using irony to accentuate her

point, she called for wages for lesbians, since they also worked around the home. Slupic also turned her critical eye on lesbians.[69] As the women's movement felt increasingly isolated, its projects taken over by government monies or turned into established ongoing businesses whose subversive cutting edge seemed blunted, many women felt disenfranchised by the turn toward motherhood and a new femininity. As many women turned further inward, limiting themselves to their private spheres of lovers and close friends, radicals felt the slogan "The personal is political" had been turned on its head -- to the point where the political was irrelevant, not included even in the women's movement's own publications where the new interest in sadomasochism took up more space than the missile crisis.

Even in this context, few women felt the need for a centralized organization. Indeed, one activist wrote in 1981 that: "The autonomous groups have enabled women to focus on creative, cooperative work structures. They have also prevented women from getting caught up in the wheels of cooptation and compromise."[70] Many politically oriented women became active in the Greens, but they were often disappointed. At the party's 1980 Baden-Württemberg state convention, a platform including abortion rights was narrowly defeated. Women were determined to swing the Greens around and by 1983 an exclusively female leadership, the so-called "Feminat," held all four major leadership in the party from 1984-5. They led an offensive against those in the support unable to support repeal of ¶218.[71] Within the party, women won the right to vote separately on issue related to them, and in the case where they were not with the party majority, their vote functioned as kind of veto. A strict 50% quota was established for all electoral slates, and the party sponsored national meetings for female members only to discuss problems of the autonomous women's movement as well those within the Greens. The first of these conferences drew 1000 women. Women pressured the trade unions to sanction autonomous mobilizations of women, they compelled the second largest union in Germany (ÖTV -- Public Services, Transport and Communications Union) to advocate repeal of ¶218 in 1983, and their votes helped dislodge conservative governments in state and local elections.

As some women began to get involved anew in mixed groups, signalling a new phase of feminism -- one where the autonomous women's organizations and the newly forged self-confidence of women provided a background from which women could draw strength and participate within mixed groups.[72] As feminism went from an obscure margin to mainstream movement, millions of women internalized a new consciousness, transforming the political culture of West Germany. All political parties had to incorporate women's issues into their programs. Within the radical movement, women took part in house occupations for women only, and within mixed squats, others organized women's evenings.[73] The autonomy of feminism gave women a power base at the same time as it provided a political concept that galvanized other "new social movements" (squatters, peace activists, alternatives and the anti-nuclear power movement).

The Anti-Nuclear Movement

In contrast to Italy, which Aurelio Pecci (president of the prestigious Club of Rome that sponsored studies like *The Limits to Growth*) considered "not well behaved enough for nuclear technology,"[74] German order and stability meant that nuclear power was intensively developed after World War 2. In 1976, when Italy was suffering through its chronic political instability, an article published in the London-based magazine *New Left Review* maintained that Germany was "the last stable fortress of reaction in Europe."[75] A few years later, the movement against nuclear power became increasingly militant, and Germany provided a textbook example of the volatility of social movements in the industrialized core of the world system.

The "economic miracle" in Germany after World War II was predicated upon capital-intensive

industries like steel and automobiles. Economic development played a major role in the country's physical reconstruction and also in its psychological rehabilitation. As one journalist put it:

> There was no way to express German national feeling after the war. This would have been interpreted as a Nazi attitude. West Germans instead constructed their new national identity around economic growth and power. Nothing better symbolized this than the nuclear industry. Nuclear power is the sacred cow of a new German nationalism. If you are against it, the establishment considers you anti-German -- a traitor.[76]

Post-war West Germany enjoyed unprecedented economic growth for nearly three decades. In 1945, no one expected that the country, devastated by war and occupied by the Allies, would become one of the world's leading economic powers. As a critical part of the Cold War, the FRG received huge amounts of American aid. After the building of the Berlin wall, subsidies to West Berlin were increased dramatically and the city was made into a showcase in the fight against Communism. Political stability in West Germany was based on economic prosperity. In 1973, per capita economic output was more than double that of Italy, and exports per capita were triple those of Japan.[77] Only about the size of the state of Oregon, West Germany became the world's leading net exporter.

Of all industrialized countries, Germany had the highest percentage of factory wagers, yet compared with Italy, German workers never joined the movement en masse, and in notable cases, they opposed the anti-nuclear movement. Traditional issues of the workers' movement--wages, benefits and working conditions--had long since became negotiable within the welfare state's institutional apparatus, and union bureaucracies were substantially identical to established political parties. Indeed, in Germany and Italy, they often overlapped and were indistinguishable. With the integration of the SPD into the governing elite and workers sitting on corporate boards of directors under the FRG's codetermination system, a smoothly functioning institutional apparatus was the envy (or fear) of much of the world.

In the mid-1970s, although the economic miracle turned into economic crisis, the majority of the country had never had it so good. Despite the gradual breakdown of the historic accord between capital and labor, German workers remained relatively quiet (a continuing dynamic in the 1990s indicated partially by the fact that the Autonomen, unlike *Autonomia* in Italy, have never been able to attract widespread participation by workers). From the perspective of radical autonomists, there was a fundamental problem with unions: The workers should decide for themselves what kind of goods they should produce and society they live in rather than leaving such decisions up to their unions and to whomever happens to sit in the seats of power. In the early 1980s, some unionized workers showed signs of movement. Even though the national executive committee of the German Federation of Trade Unions forbade its members to participate in the 1981 peace march in Bonn, for example, over 300 locals endorsed the march, and large contingents of predominantly young unionists were present among the 250,000 demonstrators. Within the anti-nuclear movement, a coalition of farmers, students, and youth was increasingly joined by some workers and middle-class people, especially residents of small towns in the vicinity of nuclear power stations. In the 1980s, many students were active, but the movement was no longer primarily campus-based as it had been in the 1960s.

The anti-nuclear power movement initially developed as an antidote to the lack of democracy in the country's political decision-making process. Although Germany spent billions of marks on nuclear research and development beginning in 1956, only in 1975 did the Interior Ministry finally present an overview of nuclear policy to the *Bundestag* (Germany's parliament). Six months passed before the policy was first discussed, and when it finally came before the country's elected representatives, only 50

of the 518 members of parliament even bothered to be present.[78] The country's political class may not have been concerned, but many Germans were. Beginning in 1972, opposition emerged among the local population to a proposed nuclear plant in Wyhl (in the area where Germany, France and Switzerland border each other).[79] In February 1975, the day after construction began, hundreds of protestors occupied the construction site, but they were brutally dispersed by the police. A few days later, 28,000 people demonstrated against the facility, and many protesters stayed on in the encampment. Hundreds of people built huts from felled trees on the construction site and established a "people's college" dedicated to stopping the nuclear plant. When the police failed to clear them out, they spent the next 11 months organizing national (and international) opposition to nuclear power, and Wyhl became a global symbol of resistance. (After a film about Wyhl was shown in New England, for example, people organized the first meetings of the Clamshell Alliance, a group which went on to lead years of resistance to the Seabrook nuclear power plant in New Hampshire.) At the "peoples's college," more than 50 diverse courses were offered, including some taught by respected pro-nuclear scientists.

One effect of the movement was to make public the anti-democratic character of the government's nuclear policies. Immediately after Wyhl was occupied, the prime minister of Baden-Württemberg (governor of the state) smugly announced: "There can be no doubt that Wyhl will be constructed." His declaration was quickly followed by revelations in the media that the state's minister of economics was also the acting vice-chairman of the utility company's board of directors. Such an interlocking relationship between a high government official and the nuclear industry was not unique: In Lower Saxony, government officials conducted secret negotiations with the nuclear industry *for more than a year* before publicly applying for the construction permit of a plant in Esensham. In Brokdorf near Hamburg, although 75% of those questioned opposed the construction of a nuclear power plant, plans for its construction went forward.

Beginning in 1974, protesters had targeted the proposed fast breeder reactor at Kalkar. On September 24, 1977, an estimated 70,000 Europeans converged on Kalkar to demonstrate their opposition to it. Twenty thousand of the protestors never made it to the demonstration because the police blocked highways and stopped and searched trains, altogether checking over 147,000 identity cards that day.[80] In the midst of the repressive atmosphere of the German Autumn, these popular movements appeared to many people as the last chance to defeat nuclear Nazism and to save any remnant of democracy in Germany. The desperation felt by many turned into bitter confrontations. In northern Germany, resistance to nuclear power went far beyond the mild-mannered protests at Wyhl and were often labelled a "civil war" because of the intensity of the fighting. Describing the situation at Brokdorf, Markovits and Gorski commented:

> Before construction began, "Fort Brokdorf" emerged -- complete with moat, fence, and barbed wire -- in order to prevent a repetition of the Wyhl occupation. Four days, some 30,000 to 45,000 protestors appeared for a rally...Following the obligatory speeches, 2,000 demonstrators pressed through the police lines, bridged the moat, tore down a segment of the wall under the barrage of water cannons and occupied a section of the construction site.[81]

Generally speaking, when thousands of people protest so vehemently, they represent a far larger base of discontented people and indicate the future direction in which public opinion will swing. This was clearly the case in the FRG. Although the SPD had missed the anti-nuclear boat in 1977, grassroots protests shook up the country and gradually brought a majority (including the SPD) into the anti-nuclear camp.[82] Although it would take a decade of protests and the nuclear catastrophe at

Chernobyl to cement the new consensus against fission power, the modest beginnings at Wyhl, Kalkar and Brokdorf produced major policy changes. In 1977, even some trade unionists defied their own organizations and created an autonomous anti-nuclear group, Action-Circle for Life.[83]

The first victories won by the anti-nuclear movement were in the courts. In the climate of public scrutiny of nuclear power caused by the direct-action movement, an administrative court found the Wyhl reactor design to be flawed and banned its construction in March 1977. Similar administrative rulings delayed construction of nuclear installations at Grohnde, Kalkar, Mühlbach-Karlich, and Brokdorf. Significantly, the court withdrew the Brokdorf construction license on the grounds that the issue of disposal of the highly toxic nuclear waste had not been adequately addressed. To many people, the administrative decisions seemed like a response to the decisive resistance mounted by the anti-nuclear movement.

The country became bitterly divided over the issue of nuclear power. In Dortmund, 40,000 trade union members (many from corporations engaged in building the power plants) marched in favor of nuclear power in October 1977 as part of a campaign directed by a public relations company aimed at preventing the ruling Social Democrats from voting for a temporary moratorium on nuclear power.[84] On the other side, one activist, Hartmut Grundler, burned himself to death the day before the Social Democrats were to decide their energy policy to dramatize his opposition to their waffling. Finally, in November, the SPD voted to accept the pro-nuclear trade-union position, but with the proviso that the problem of waste disposal would be dealt with before any further expansion of nuclear power.

Building a nuclear dump site then became the top priority of the nuclear industry. When Gorleben (in the most eastern part of West Germany that jutted into what was then East Germany) was chosen as its location, stopping the Gorleben project became a unifying focus for the well-developed and experienced anti-nuclear movement. Gorleben was supposed to be the largest industrial complex in West Germany, and opposition to it quickly generated a huge movement. The mobilization against the construction at Gorleben was initiated in 1977 by local farmers, and on March 31, 1979, they drove hundreds of tractors and marched more than 100,000 strong on the nearby city of Hannover.[85] After the accident at Three Mile Island in the U.S., construction was temporarily halted, but when it began again, anti-nuclear activists from all parts of the country (and many other nations as well) gathered together as Wendlanders. For one month, from May 3 to June 6, 1980, five thousand activists staged a live-in on the grounds where the German nuclear industry had already begun constructing a huge underground waste disposal site for radioactive by-products from reactors in Germany and other countries served by the transnational German nuclear industry. A city was built from the already felled trees--a wonderfully diverse collection of houses--and dubbed the "Free Republic of Wendland" (a name taken from the region's traditional title). Local farmers, about 90% of whom were against the nuclear dump yard, provided the thousands of resident-activists with food and materials to help build their "republic." Passports were issued bearing the name of the new republic, imaginative illegal underground radio shows were broadcast, and newspapers were printed and distributed throughout the country. Speaking personally, Gorleben was one of the few times I felt at home in German public life. Unlike normal everyday life, I did not feel an outsider. No one approached me as a Turk nor reproached me for being an American. Indeed, national identities were temporarily suspended since we were all citizens of the Free Republic of Wendland and owed allegiance to no governments. We became human beings in some essential meaning of the term, sharing food and living outside the system of monetary exchange. An erotic dimension was created that simply could not be found in normal interaction.

photo here

Wendlanders lived together not only to build a confrontation but also to create a space for autonomous self-government through political discussion. Nearly everyone joyfully participated in the heated debates, whose main topic was how best to prepare for the inevitable police assault. At the same moment, there was wide discussion of the future direction of the movement. Wendland was a time and space of openness, of sharing and friendliness. It contrasted sharply with an everyday life in Germany characterized by the hierarchy of patriarchal families, the uniformity of small town life, the authoritarianism of the modernized Prussian bureaucracy and the competition of corporate culture. After seemingly endless discussions, the Wendlanders democratically agreed on a tactic of passive, non-violent resistance to the police, a tactic which served its short-term purpose remarkably well.

On June 3, 1980, when the largest deployment of police in Germany since Hitler--some 8000 strong--violently attacked the sitting Wendlanders (as well as numerous reporters and photographers), thousands of people around the country were outraged. Once the site was cleared of people, the huts were razed and barbed-wire fences erected around the construction zone. But the police brutality against nonviolent demonstrators did not slow the movement or intimidate people, it radicalized thousands of people who had lived at the Free Republic of Wendland and their growing ranks of supporters. That same day, well-organized, peaceful protest marches occurred in over 25 cities. In 6 cities, churches were nonviolently occupied by small groups of protestors. More than 15,000 people gathered at Savigny Platz and marched in Berlin, and at the end of the march, speakers from the "Free Republic of Wendland" called for the occupation of parks and empty buildings as a base to continue the struggle. Although only a few people immediately did so (and were soon cleared out by the police), the Gorleben struggle had created a radical core of resistance which had a national membership. A motley assortment including ecologists, feminists, students, alienated youth and farmers galvanized themselves into an extraparliamentary cultural-political movement of resistance not only to nuclear power but to the system which relied on it.

The changed character of the movement became obvious on February 28, 1981 at Brokdorf. Building the Brokdorf plant had been delayed after bitter confrontations in 1976, but when construction began again at the beginning of February 1981, it took less than a month for the movement to respond. Although the state government and Federal Constitutional Court prohibited demonstrations, over 100,000 protestors converged on police barricades around the construction site of the nuclear power station. About 20,000 police and soldiers were mobilized to protect the construction site. At and around Brokdorf, however, the assembled forces of law and order were unable to beat-up passive, nonviolent resistors as at Gorleben. This time, the police themselves were under attack. Their heavily fortified bridges over icy streams were quickly cleared by fool-hardy demonstrators who first braved the waters in extremely cold weather and went on to beat back the "bulls"--as police are sometimes referred to in Germany. Even though many of the buses carrying demonstrators had been stopped by police miles away from Hamburg and concentric rings of police defense guarded the approaches to the construction site, thousands of people managed to converge on the last circle of fences around the Brokdorf construction and attack it with sticks, rocks and Molotov cocktails. The police responded with massive blasts of tear gas fired from within the construction compound, and (in a tactic modeled on United States search-and-destroy missions in Indochina) groups of 20-30 police were sporadically dropped from 35 helicopters, beat back demonstrators until a counterattack was organized, and then relifted to safety in the skies. By the end of the day, the construction site itself was still intact, but a new level of resistance had been reached by the movement against nuclear power. The passive, nonviolence

of the Gorleben had given way to massive active confrontation.

For many people, it was all but impossible to embrace tactics of active resistance or violent confrontation, of doing more than risking arrest and accepting the violence of the police. Even for many people who were heavily involved in *Bürgerinitiativen*, non-violent tactics like voting or attending peaceful marches was as far as their consciences (or fears) permitted them to venture from their patterns of political participation. Based upon the teachings of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, pacificism should have been a welcome phenomenon in Germany, where militarism is so near the core of cultural identity. Instead, NATO Generals and German politicians echoed each other's deep concerns that post-war prosperity and permissiveness had produced a generation incapable of resisting Russian aggression.

The dialectical tension between pacifism and its militarist opposite was at the core of both inner movement discussions and dynamics of the world system during this period of time. From 1981 to 1983, anti-nuclear weapons marches involved millions of Europeans. For a century, German pacifists had been opposing war, and as late as 1968, they had helped organize huge Easter marches for nuclear disarmament. After the demise of 1960s protests, the first sign of a renewed peace movement came from a women's group in 1975, and as church groups joined in, mobilizations against nuclear weapons exceeded anyone's expectations: 300,000 marched in October 1981 in Bonn; 400,000 people protested when President Reagan addressed the Bundestag the following summer. At rejuvenated Easter marches, 500,000 people turned out in 1982 and more than 650,000 in 1983.[86]

The new peace movement combined many levels of organization and action. Besides a Communist-dominated coalition and a variety of committees linked to churches and political parties, radical activists organize their own independent coalition in 1982. While all these groups united, for example, in a national petition campaign that gathered more than two million signatures, the uneasy alliance between vastly dissimilar activist formations became unmanageable in the summer of 1983 when hundreds of rock-throwing demonstrators attacked the limousine carrying then Vice President George Bush in Krefeld. For many people in the peace movement, the legacy of German militarism was seen as responsible for such confrontational currents.

As their militant actions became attacked even by their allies, radicals became increasingly autonomous -- some would say isolated -- from mainstream protesters and came to constitute their own source of collective identity. As a tactic, militant confrontation may have helped make peaceful marches seem a more acceptable course of action for many people who were afraid to be photographed at a peace rally, but violence also helped the government make its case that protests were dangerous and counterproductive. Radicals from the peace movement merged with similar tendencies in movements against nuclear power, resurgent militarism, and the expansion of Frankfurt's airport.

During late October and early November 1981, an action similar to Gorleben (resistance village and police invasion) occurred near Frankfurt as thousands of people attempted to stop a new runway from being built at the international airport. This time, however, when the police attacked the massed protestors in their *Hüttendorf* (village of huts), a majority fought back. They had lived in their structures since May 1980 and built a remarkable movement based in the local towns most affected by the runway.[87] Early in the morning on November 2, police brutally cleared out the sleeping inhabitants of the huts, indiscriminately beating women, children and senior citizens as they fled through the forest. Despite the police savagery, people tried to rebuild the huts the next day, and for two straight weeks, a spontaneous movement involving tens of thousands of people at all hours of the day and night refused to accept Startbahn West's construction. Besides small groups practicing "active non-violence" by disrupting train stations, sponsoring strikes at school, and occupying offices, there were huge mobilizations. On November 7, 40,000 people demonstrated at the building site, and a week later,

150,000 people assembled in Wiesbaden at the state capital to deliver over 220,000 signatures calling for a popular referendum.[88] People simply refused to stay home. Risking police violence, they continually reconstructed the *Hüttendorf* only to experience further brutality on November 25 and January 26.[89] Every Sunday for the next six years (until the shooting deaths of two policemen on November 2, 1987), hundreds -- sometimes thousands of people -- took a "Sunday walk" along the runway to dramatize their opposition. Despite having to witness a defeat after over two decades of actions against the runway, activists from the Startbahn West struggles played critical roles in the peace movement and later in the successful campaign to shut down a nuclear reprocessing facility at Wackersdorf, and the local Greens made tremendous headway in the state parliament.

In other parts of the country, comparable radical groups emerged. In 1980, hundreds of helmeted demonstrators attacked the annual induction ceremonies of the *Bundeswehr* (the army of West Germany) at the soccer stadium in Bremen. Part of the stadium and many empty buses which had been used to transport the new recruits to their induction were set in flames by Molotov cocktails. Similar ceremonies were laid siege to in Bonn and Hannover, part of the wave of militant demonstrations against NATO plans to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles. The radicalization of so many people in various parts of the country grew out of a militant squatters movement that had occupied hundreds of houses in inner cities. These collectives infused the radical movement with its cutting edge and provided a core of thousands of activists capable of focusing the diverse energies of the radical movement. Nowhere were the group houses more important than in West Berlin, center of the punk scene, feminism and anti-authoritarian revolt that had suddenly become internationally visible through the peace movement.

Müslis and Mollis: From the New Left to the Punk Left

In 1980, the dependence of local politics and economics on the world constellation of power was nowhere more clear than in Berlin. Then a divided city with occupation troops from the U.S., Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union in control, Berlin was home to hundreds of thousands of immigrant workers and their families from Turkey, the Middle East and southern Europe. The "economic miracle" of post-war West Berlin--the city's Gross National Product increased tenfold from 1950 to 1973--owed much to national and international assistance and to the foreign workers who travelled far from home to take jobs that were too hard, too monotonous, too dangerous, too dirty, or too low-paid for Germans to have even considered. In 1981, West Berlin had the fifth largest Turkish population of any city in the world, and according to government statistics, more than two million foreign workers and their families resided in West Germany, a country with a population of 61.4 million.

By 1975, the economic miracle seemed to have a hollow ring to it as a deep recession set in. Many foreign workers went home as the number of unemployed in Germany topped one million for the first time since 1954.[90] In 1980, unemployment rose to include about two million Germans. West Berlin was particularly hard hit, not only as a result of the international economic downturn, but by a series of financial scandals as well. The magazine **Der Spiegel** put it succinctly: "The city is being made poorer because financial capital is plundering the government's bank account." The Berlin construction industry operated with a profit rate around 120%, but greedy developers and their politician friends were the subjects of three major scandals. At the same time, a housing crisis of immense proportion was touched off by an informal capital strike by big landlords after the passage of rent control and tough protection laws for tenants which coincided with the beginning of the recession in 1974. The construction of new housing had peaked in 1973 because it was extremely profitable for landlords to abandon their buildings and thereby becoming eligible for low-interest city loans to build condominiums for the upper-middle class. As a minimum number of people without a place to live, 17,000 people were registered with the

local housing authority as cases of "extreme emergency," but well over 50,000 Berliners were looking desperately for a place to live, even though estimates showed that there were between 7000 and 17,000 empty houses and apartments,[91] and an additional 40,000 apartments were expected to be cleared out for renovation or destruction. Under these conditions, is it surprising that people without places to live simply moved into some of the scores of abandoned buildings?

The movement spontaneously constructed a base in Kreuzberg. Adjacent to the wall separating East and West Berlin, Kreuzberg long had a sizeable Turkish population and countercultural scene. Hundreds of abandoned buildings along the wall were an invitation for squatters, and beginning in the late 1970s, organized groups of 50 or more people successfully seized many buildings. At its high point, the squatters movement in Berlin controlled 165 houses, each containing more than a dozen people. They restored abandoned buildings to liveable conditions, giving birth to a new word ("Instandbesetzen" or Rehab-Squat). When their actions were construed as an attack on private property, the squatters responded: "It is better to occupy for restoration than to own for destruction." In March 1980, they formed a squatters' council (*Besetzerrat*) that met weekly. In the 1980s, thousands of adherents of an "alternative scene" established themselves in Kreuzberg, and by the end of the decade, they comprised approximately 30,000 of Kreuzberg's 145,000 residents. One estimate guessed Kreuzberg's composition as 50,000 "normal" Berliners, 30-40,000 from the alternative scene, and 40,000 Turks.[92]

For decades, young Germans had moved to Berlin. Since the city was not formally a part of West Germany (but governed by the Allies), young German men who lived in Berlin were exempt from their mandatory military service. The city's radical tradition and comparatively liberal nature also attracted many youth, as did the Free University and the Technical University, two of Germany's best and largest universities. Out of the congruence of these various conditions, a radical Berlin "youth" scene appeared, largely composed of people who were either unwilling or unable to become integrated into their middle class German society. The city government estimated this strata of marginalized youth as comprising at least 150,000 people in all of Berlin, and they expressed concern that many of them were not only opposed to the established parties, to the government, to nuclear power and weapons but also that they were unable to accept as legitimate the middle class values of their parents.[93] According to another government study, 20 percent of the squatters in Berlin in 1980 were marginalized people looking for an alternative lifestyle and the other 80 percent were evenly divided between students and poorly paid industrial apprentices. Although viewed as a problem by government officials, the squatters actually fixed up their buildings and the neighborhoods they lived in. They helped turn sections of Kreuzberg from largely deserted ghost towns and "no-man's lands" alongside the "Iron Curtain" into vibrant multicultural enclaves.

The squatters movement began where the APO had left off--from the fusion of a cultural-politics. But this time punk rock became the music of the movement. Punk was part of the breaking free of established routine and the constraints imposed by the cultural order. After mainstream rock n' roll had become big money, punk was fresh. Because it was a marginal phenomenon, bands played for their friends at private parties, not in amphitheaters filled with masses. Punk music was a means of unleashing aggressive reaction against the dominant circumstances of conformity and consumerism.[94] If there was something hard-core about punk, the most hard core of the new generation of activists felt duty-bound to defend imprisoned guerrillas. Rather than being rejected as sterile and counterproductive, the commando tactics which contributed to the New Left's demise were supplanted by anarchy and disorder as the specters raised by the movement's militant fringe. "No power to anyone," a popular slogan in 1981, sharply contradicted all brands of established politics, whether the young social democrats who ran for student government or the cadre of the new communist parties. The

black leather jackets worn by many people at demonstrations and the black flags carried by others signalled less an ideological anarchism than a style of dress and behavior -- symbols of a way of life which made contempt for the established institutions and their U.S. "protectors" into a virtue on an equal footing with disdain for the "socialist" governments in Eastern Europe. Black became the color of the political void -- of the withdrawal of allegiance to parties, governments and nations. Nude marches and an unwillingness to communicate with politicians were facets of this phase of the movement, causing order-addicted German authorities more than a little consternation. When Hamburg Mayor Ulrich Klose invited the staff members of the city's high school newspaper to City Hall, five of the students came and stayed only long enough to reveal circled "A's" painted on their bare behinds.

Such flagrant violations of the social code testified to the delegitimation already suffered by the nation's institutions, but a nihilistic moment of the opposition was reproduced within the movement. When a virtuous contempt for the social order was carried over into activist circles, it becomes highly destructive, especially when there were many deep divisions within the multifarious new movement. Of all the internal differences, the most commonly named one was between punks and hippies, or as it was known in Germany, between *Mollis* (people who might throw Molotovs) and *Müslis* (a reference to a breakfast cereal like Swiss Familia, a little softer than granola). Generally speaking the "Müsli Left" referred to long-haired, ecology-oriented activists who were into passive non-violence, large-scale educational projects, communal living and the development of a harmonious, liberated sensibility in relation to all life. The Müsli Left was considered "soft" in contrast to the Punk Left's cultural rebellion and professed affinity with violent confrontations, a politics quickly dubbed the "hard line." To generalize once again, the Müslis gravitated to the country (especially the area around Wendland where scores of organic farms sprang up); the punks were inner-city dwellers. Punks were harder, colder, dressed in black, and male-centered while Müslis were warmer, rainbow, and female-oriented. These two strands were intimately woven together in the movement's political-culture.

The squatters defied simple classification: From rockers with working-class roots to feminists, recent immigrants from Turkey to the elderly, students to single mothers, and born-again Christians to ideological anarchists, they were more a motley collection than a self-defined collectivity of mainly students like the New Left. As living behind barricades became a way of life for many squatters, the illegality of their everyday lives radicalized their attitude toward the state and hardened their own feeling of self-importance.

When they moved against the squatters, German authorities adopted a course of action which sought to criminalize and punish hundreds of people whose only "crime" was having nowhere to live and moving into a vacant house. This hard-line approach further radicalized large numbers of young people, pushing many into desperate acts of resistance to perceived injustice. Beginning in December 1980, police attacks on squatted houses in West Berlin touched off an escalating spiral of mass arrests, street fighting and further occupations. Over 100 persons were arrested and more than twice that number injured there when barricade building and heavy street fighting lasted through the cold night of Friday, December 12th. The squatters' movement quickly spread throughout West Germany and collided head-on with Bavarian order.

The conservative Christian Democratic government in southern Germany had long been critical of the attempts to "compromise" with the squatters by their scandal-ridden Social Democratic colleagues in Berlin, and they showed their own method of governing when 141 young people attending a film about squatters in an occupied house in Nürnberg were rounded up by police after the building was surrounded. Even though many of those arrested were under 16 years old and guilty of nothing more than going to a movie, they were held incommunicado for 72 hours or more, and in many cases,

the police refused to tell concerned parents whether or not their missing children were under arrest. The resulting outrage among generally conservative middle-class Germans became the prime story of the nation's television and newspapers, but it did not stop the Christian Democrats from bringing criminal charges against some arrested minors and defending the largest mass arrest in Germany since World War II. As the number of house occupations continued to climb, police in southern Germany surrounded another squatted house, the "Black Forest House" in Freiburg, and again conducted mass arrests.

The Freiburg squatters called for a national day of solidarity demonstrations against the police attacks, and on Friday, March 13, 1981, rallies and demonstrations were held in every major city in West Germany as well as in many other towns which had not seen a political protest for more than a decade. The biggest demonstration in the history of Freiburg--21,000 people--was a festive affair; more than 1000 showed up in Bremen and Tübingen; and more than 2000 people marched in Stuttgart. In Hamburg, a peaceful demonstration of 5000 people was viciously attacked by police with dogs. On the same day, street fighting and trashing broke out in many cities. On "Black Friday," as that day was dubbed in Berlin, the downtown Kurfürstendamm (which caters to the shopping whims of chic, mainly upper-class customers) was heavily trashed, as it had been many times before. Unlike previous confrontations, the number of people in the streets reached 15,000--possibly 20,000--rather than the usual 2-3000 militants. There was a nude march at the same time as organized, small groups of marauders attacked at least 39 buildings. They even set the Reichstag on fire--an ill-conceived attempt to replicate its 1933 destruction-through-arson which touched off the Nazi reign of terror. (Although George Dimitrov and other Communists were blamed for the arson in 1933, it has long been suspected that the fire was set by the Nazis themselves as a pretext for seizing power.)

Die Tageszeitung (Taz), the independent radical newspaper daily, estimated that the widespread violence and massive participation in the squatters' movement of Friday the 13th greatly exceeded any high points of the late 1960s. Indeed, the defense of Kreuzberg was coordinated by the squatters' council whose members developed elaborate plans for points at which barricades should be erected to hinder most effectively the police ability to cross canals and main thoroughfares leading into the neighborhood. After the street fighting of December 12, 1980, the Taz celebrated the barricades in the spirit of the barricades of 1848, 1919, 1929 and 1967. But on Black Friday, the newspaper's office in Berlin was raided by police and its new issue confiscated from kiosks throughout the country. To top it off, criminal charges were brought against its editors. For some, the political scenario became more reminiscent of the Nazi terror of 1933 than the democratic movement's temporary victory in 1848.

The December barricades and savage street fighting in Berlin set off a political whirlwind. The city's housing crisis was brought into the limelight of the nation's media, scandals rocked the city government, and what to do about the squatters became one of the major political questions in the country. Faced by the strong resistance of the squatters' movement to police attacks, the governing Social Democrats in Berlin put forth a plan to allow the squatters to remain in their occupied houses on the condition that they pay a minimal rent. This offer of compromise brought the Social Democrats under heavy criticism from conservatives, who accused them of condoning illegal occupations of vacant buildings. Within the squatters' movement, the compromise proposal drew the usual yawns but it also caused a few sharp debates between those who saw it as a way of simply integrating the movement into the system and others who welcomed the opportunity for a short-term solution to their individual housing problem. Although a few groups of squatters collectively decided to begin paying rent, the vast majority did not.

As the number and frequency of occupations continued to grow, the police were instructed to

raid only those houses occupied by activists who were suspected of being part of the leadership of the squatters' movement, particularly organizers of demonstrations or publishers of radical periodicals. A few people from each house overrun by the police were then criminally charged under Paragraph 129: membership in a criminal organization, a legal statute carrying a possible life sentence which previously had only been used to prosecute suspected "terrorists." The government attempted to stop the movement's internal discussion and decision-making capacity. On April 7, 1981, the entire squatters' council (128 people) was arrested. By August 1981, over 300 people had been brought up on serious charges, the equivalent of conspiracy indictments in the U.S.[95]

The squatters had prepared elaborate telephone, radio and word-of-mouth communication networks through which hundreds of people could be instantaneously mobilized when the police gathered for their attacks, but because Berlin is so spread out, those who would have helped resist the police attacks arrived at the scene too late--long after the barricades inside the occupied houses were broken through and the residents taken away by the police. With no other available alternative in sight, the response of the movement was to begin a new round of street fights by the late afternoon on the same day the police had attacked. This escalating spiral of attacks and counterattacks culminated in the massive outbursts of Black Friday.

After the confrontations of Black Friday, German authorities launched a major national propaganda offensive against the squatters, attempting to isolate and criminalize them by linking them with guerrilla groups. Roman Herzog, then minister of the interior in Baden- Württemberg (and beginning in 1994, President of the Republic), charged that the RAF was infiltrating and recruiting from the squatters' movement, and the West German Interior Minister, Gerhard Baum, claimed to be able to tie 70 of the 1300 known squatters to armed groups. The media pointed out that Knut Folkers, serving a life sentence for terrorism, was arrested in 1974 in a squatted house and Susanne Albrecht (whose face adorned the "Wanted for Terrorism" posters which hung in every post office and many other places in West Germany) was part of a group which moved into a vacant house in Hamburg in one of the first occupations in 1973. Positing links between the squats and armed groups was one of the government's chief means of trying to isolate the movement, which in turn refused to ignore the plight of the imprisoned "terrorists." During April 1981, another wave of riots was touched off in Berlin, this time in response to the death of an imprisoned RAF member on a hunger strike.

Although the German movement was under attack and its major daily news source was momentarily silenced on Black Friday, local calls for actions aroused mobilizations which surpassed even the most optimistic expectations. After "Black Friday," the number of occupied houses jumped from 35 to 160 in West Berlin and from 86 to at least 370 (possibly as many as 500) in all of West Germany.[96] The number of squatters was estimated at between 5000 and 8000.[97] Alongside vacant apartment buildings, empty factories, breweries and other commercial spaces cleared for demolition were taken over. These larger buildings provided even more room for groups to create regional cultural/action centers. At the KuKuCK in West Berlin, fifty people lived in a complex that also included 3 stages, performance areas for ten theater groups, practice rooms for five bands, a studio, a cafe and an auto repair shop.[98] Besides providing room for larger groups to live near their projects, such spaces were also ways for the movement to involve people at many levels. As one observer noted:

> Creating cultural centers -- the Kukuckcentrum, Spectrum Cafe, Bobby Sands Cafe,
> took it with the help of alternative mechanic collectives, printing collectives, plumbing
> collectives, took it with money collected from habitues of alternative cafes, with the help
> of "Patenschaften," literally "Godparent" groups, support groups of teachers, union
> members, artists, doctors, lawyers who created a moat around occupied housing,

keeping the alligators at bay, pledging to sleep in when police came.[99]

The movement had moved into a new phase: Instead of demanding alternative youth centers from the government (as in Zurich), they took matters into their own hands, defied the authorities and defended their centers. Autonomy had become real, not simply an abstract aspiration or phase of rebellion against parental control trips. On March 29, over one thousand people converged on Münster for the first national congress of squatters. Vowing to fight the state's criminalization of their movement, the assembled squatters promised to spread the occupations further. In October, the squatters' council in Berlin wrote an open letter to the city's citizens. Asserting that without police attacks, there would be no riots, the letter provides an insightful exposition on the meaning of autonomy as it explained the motivation for squatting houses:

> When we occupied them, it was not only for preserving living space. But we also wanted to live and work together again. We want to put a stop to the process of isolation and destruction of collective living. Who in this city is not aware of the torturing loneliness and emptiness of everyday life that arose with the growing destruction of the old connections through urban redevelopment and other kinds of development of the city. This has driven more people out of their apartments than the war.[100]

The governing Social Democrats' inability to stop the new occupations led to a new hard-line Christian Democratic government in Berlin, but their offensive against the squatters proved of little value. The movement's response to an ultimatum issued by the new mayor demanding that the squatters clear out of eight houses was a poster of ten people mooning the government and an international call to '*Tu Wat*" (Do Something). Although some optimistically estimated that 50,000 Autonomen from all of Europe would converge on Berlin to defend the squatted houses, at the appointed hour, less than 5000 people took to the streets--not an insignificant number when we remember that there weren't more than a couple of hundred Weatherpeople in the streets of Chicago during the Days of Rage in 1969.

In 1981, the government's inability to defeat the squatters in the streets led to a tactical innovation: legalize the squatted houses in the large cities, thereby depriving the movement of a focus for action and, more importantly, of a sense of fighting against the existing system. Legalization meant that those who were previously living an everyday existence of resistance to a repressive order were suddenly transformed into guests of a tolerant big brother who not only provided them with a low-rent house but also with money to repair it. On the one side was the carrot -- but the state continued to alternate its use with the stick, hoping not only to split off the movement's "hard core" from the "marginal supporters" but also to drive more militant activists into underground actions which would alienate and depoliticize the popular movement. As long as the struggle was between the forces of law and order and militant street-fighters and "terrorists," the vast majority have little choice but to sit on the sidelines and take in the spectacle.

Of course, in the smaller cities and towns, places where the movement's activist base was small, the government's tolerance was never known. Squatted houses were simply cleared soon after they were occupied, and the local authorities were able to contain what militant opposition there was. In the larger cities like Berlin, Hamburg and Frankfurt, however, legalization was an important factor in the depoliticization of the movement. Even when the new city government in Berlin brought massive police power to bear against the squatters, they were not able to force the movement out of existence. Over a year of legalizations and intense police attacks only succeeded in reducing the number of squatted houses in West Berlin from 162 to 123, but the continuing crisis refused to disappear. The government

estimated that only 25 of these 123 houses were active squatters, the rest being wither "drop-outs" or peaceful squatters ready to negotiate. These "hard-core" squats were then targeted by the police, while the rest were brought to the bargaining table.[101]

Despite the severe repression, the political impact of the squatters on the established system was far greater than anyone imagined. While often overlooked, the relationship between extraparliamentary movements and the political system is worth exploring, particularly in the case of West Berlin since its constellation of direct-action movements and establishment politics prefigured the alignment of national political forces a few years later.

The Elections in Berlin

At the beginning of 1981, the West Berlin city parliament was forced to resign in scandal, when state-insured loans to the firm of architect Dietrich Garski became due. Already rocked by similar scandals, this time the city was forced to shell out 115 million Marks (at that time, about $60 million) when Garski's company ran out of money while building two military academies in the Saudi Arabian desert. Insult was added to injury when it became publicly known that Garski had personally designed what **Der Spiegel** joined others in calling "the ugliest new buildings in West Berlin" (Aschinger at Bahnhof Zoo).[102]

As continuing political violence polarized the city, the radical *Alternative Liste* (AL) ran for office claiming to represent the squatters. A conglomeration of ecologists, squatters, Turks and other immigrants, radical pacifists, women's groups, theoreticians and activists from the New Left of the 1960s, the AL also included a few ideologues from the small 1970s new communist movement (generally Maoists who had been active from its origins). These individuals coalesced with more than 35 citizens' initiative groups (who previously confined their energies to putting issues--not candidates-- on the ballot), with some senior citizens' groups, and with the local Greens. (West Berliners were not eligible to vote in elections in West Germany because the city was governed by Allied occupation forces). The local Greens -- themselves plagued by scandals -- joined the more radical AL, which then became, in effect, the local arm of the national Green party.) Much to the credit of the AL, foreign workers residing in Berlin--although legally barred from voting or holding office--were also run as candidates on the AL ticket.

AL members were highly intellectual, and they did not use charisma, huge amounts of money, or celebrities to win votes. Rather, they attempted to involve hundreds of people in creating a radical political force within the government as part of a larger movement. The AL succeeded in attracting Berlin's leftist intelligentsia, and in its formative years, the organization often had all-night meetings where global questions such as East-West relations and the divided status of Berlin were debated. Hundreds of position papers on a vast range of issues were written and discussed in the course of the AL's preparation for their first electoral campaigns. Their platform included strong positions against NATO and advocated reducing the garrisons of the allied powers to purely symbolic forces. In 1981, when no one seriously considered the possibility, they came out in favor of the reunification of Germany as a way to establish a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe.

The AL rode the wave of popular unrest in Berlin. In March, 1981, when the squatter's movement was fighting with the police, polls gave the AL as much as 15 percent of the vote, and they did not back away from this noncoincidence; they publicized the fact that one of their offices was located in a squatted house and particularly pushed their candidates who lived behind barricades. (The Christian Democrats responded in kind, vetoing the nomination of one of their candidates who was accidentally discovered having a residence in a squatted house and, in the name of law and order, calling

for no compromises with the squatters.) Because of their strong stand against nuclear power and weapons, the AL pledged not to coalesce with the pro-nuclear power and anti-squatter Social Democrats, a position which further helped to garner votes for the AL from many people who generally boycott elections.

On May 10, 1981, the ruling Social Democratic-Free Democratic coalition government was voted out by West Berliners. The number of votes received by Berlin's Social Democrats fell to their lowest level since before the Nazi putsch. The table below summarizes the results of the election.

May 1981 West Berlin Election Results

	Seats	Percentage	Comparison with 1979
Christian Democrats	60	47.3%	+2.8%
Social Democrats	49	38.4%	-4.3%
Free Democrats	7	5.5%	-2.6%
Alternative List	9	7.9%	+4.2%

In absolute numbers, the Social Democrats' losses were not so great, but the relative balance of power within the parliament was altered. The Free Democrats barely received enough votes to survive (a minimum of 5 percent was needed to be part of the government), and they continued to "govern" the city, but with a more conservative Christian Democratic partner. On the one hand, the liberal coalition SPD government collapsed, but on the other hand, the AL, which some regarded as an arm of the movement, entered the senate for the first time. Although the mass media called the vote a shift to the Right, the real winner was the radical AL which nearly doubled its tally from two years before and won seats in the government for the first time.

In alliance with the Free Democrats, the Christian Democrats were in a position to form a new majority coalition with a clear mandate to force an end to the mushrooming squatters' movement. The first step taken by the new conservative Berlin government was to break off all negotiations with the squatters and call in the police against them. The CDU was determined to make the Berlin squatters into a national example. Twice after the elections--on May 26 and June 25 to 26--police attacks were met by street fighting of the intensity of Black Friday. Even after the media called it a "civil war," the Christian Democrats continued to believe that they could accomplish through force what the Social Democrats had sought at the bargaining table, and they vowed to clear out ten of the key squatter strongholds during the last week in August. In response, the squatters put out the *Tuwat* call inviting activists to come to Berlin and defend the movement.

On September 13, 1981 amid a flurry of guerrilla attacks on U.S. personnel and bases in West Germany, over 7000 riot police were needed to guard Secretary of State Haig from at least 50,000 demonstrators in West Berlin, and in the ensuing turmoil, hundreds were arrested and over 150 police injured.[103] When the street fighting returned to more "normal" levels, the police were vicious: On September 22, Klaus-Jürgen Rattey, an 18-year-old squatter, was killed (run over by a city bus) during the melee after 2000 riot police charged eight occupied houses in Winterfeldplatz. The next night heavy rioting broke out in ten West German cities (as well as in Amsterdam), and there were over 50 attacks on corporate and government targets in West Berlin.[104] Only then did the Christian Democrats back off. On September 26, the stalemate was formally announced: no more attacks on squatters--the *Bundestag* would debate the housing question.

The crisis in Berlin had an immediate national impact, and the results of the elections there were replicated in other places. In 1982 in Hamburg, for example, the electoral forces aligned with the radical

movement did even better: the Free Democrats were unable to stay in the government when the Green Alternative List (Hamburg's equivalent of the AL) won more than enough to be represented, and the SPD won a majority. Although the numbers varied a little, the Berlin and Hamburg election results of 1981 were duplicated in the national elections of March 1983, allowing the entrance of the Green Party into the *Bundestag* for the first time. By receiving over two million votes (5.6% of the total), the Greens captured 27 seats in the *Bundestag* and became part of the electoral opposition to Chancellor Helmut Kohl's new Christian Democratic national government. In local elections the next year, the Greens surpassed their national performance: One estimate placed the number of Greens elected to local government entities by 1984 at between five and seven thousand.[105] Having lost hundreds of thousands of voters to the Greens, the SPD shifted in the direction of Green positions. While the Greens called for the end of the Cold War division of Europe into blocs, SPD politicians quickly took up the movement's call for a nuclear-free zone.[106] A former Social Democratic mayor of West Berlin was heard describing himself as a German patriot, and representatives from the Free Democrats also spoke out for a "German nationalism of the Left."

Most often understood as a reaction to NATO's new missiles or the abysmal state of German rivers and forests, it was no coincidence that the Greens' success came at the same time as extraparliamentary movements militantly contested government control of cities and national policies regulating nuclear power and weapons continued to grow. As the call for the demonstrations at Brokdorf put it: "Who still believes that even a particle of the corrupt politics in Berlin would have become known if not for the house occupations and the street fighting--that there would be a discussion about the Bundeswehr and NATO, without the resistance in Bremen, Hannover, Bonn?" Despite its political impact, the extraparliamentary Left in Berlin emanated from a source of politics which had little to do with elections, nor could the political establishment greatly affect it. Strata of marginalized youth developed a way of life which stood in opposition to the established system. As I discuss in the next section, their spontaneously-generated forms of organization provide significant and innovative ways for generating popular opposition.

The Structure of Spontaneity

Parliamentary groups operate according to the logic of the established political system. The first rule of any party must be: Obey the law. In order to insure members' compliance with existing rules for participation in the government, a structure must be maintained that is compatible with the state. Insurgent social movements aimed at limiting the power of government and creating autonomy seek forms of decision-making of a qualitatively different kind. The organic structure of the popular sources of the Autonomen (feminists, squatters, ecologists and the alternatives) were loose tactical organizations within which many people with diverse viewpoints could debate differences and democratically participate in formulating programs and making decisions. General assemblies open to all were the final decision-making bodies of the Berlin squatters as were similar gatherings at Gorleben. Within these general assemblies, decisions were reached as often as possible through the consensus of hundreds of people, a process which sought to maximize participation and nurture the expansion of activists' political consciousness. Sometimes smaller groups were delegated by the general assembly, but only to carry out the will of the larger group.

In Berlin, the individual houses were the building blocks of the movement, serving as its eyes and ears. Democratic self-discipline among the squatters made it possible to avoid an overdose of centralism. Composed of representatives from each house who shared information and made strategic decisions, the squatters' council functioned as a forum where rumors and news were discussed, and it

also linked the movement with its counterparts in other cities and countries. Self-discipline was evident in the special care not to produce media stars or individual leaders. More often than not, television crews could not find anyone willing to speak with them.

The anti-nuclear movement was similarly decentralized and bottom-up. Locally-organized action-committees put out the calls for both the Gorleben occupation and the actions at Brokdorf. Although national coordination existed for both mobilizations, there was no centralized anti-nuclear organization that developed a national strategy or steadied the movement's ups and downs. Apparently, such centralization was considered superfluous, since the anti-nuclear movement continued to build its mobilization capacities and popular support without it and ultimately stopped the construction of all new plants. As anti-nuclear weapons demonstrations grew more massive, two large national coalitions formed, one composed of independents and the other dominated by Communists.

In the mid-1970s, autonomous groups first came together as vehicles for activists who were not organized into Marxist parties to discuss practical issues of tactics and strategy. By creating spaces in which fresh perspectives on militance and spontaneity could be articulated, these small autonomous groups helped steer the anti-nuclear and alternative movements clear of the ossified thinking of the traditional Left (although the same was significantly not true of the disarmament movement and the Greens). Few if any Marxist groups showed up at Gorleben, a blessing in disguise that allowed the movement there the space to develop its own analysis and experiences (from which many people were further radicalized). The squatters' and anti-nuclear movements similarly constructed space in which popular initiatives governed by democratic forms of decision-making and wide ranging debates were possible. Even within these free forums, however, rigid thinking appeared as illustrated in the following example. At the same time as the Free Republic of Wendland was in its first week of existence, for example, over 1000 socialists, ecologists, activists from alternative institutions, and "non-dogmatic" Leftists gathered at a conference in Kassel to discuss "Ecology and Socialism." In one of the keynote speeches, Green member Rudolf Bahro (formerly an imprisoned critic of the regime in East Germany) maintained that the workers' movement could not and should not continue to be separated from the ecology question. This statement brought on hours of debate with the conference's orthodox Marxists who expressed strong reservations about the "value of environmental politics as a part of the workers's movement."

Another source of the Autonomen was the alternative movement: a collection of self-managed institutions built-up to serve the everyday needs of the movement. Bookstores, movement bars, free schools, ecology centers, food stores, cooperative living groups (*Wohngemeinschaften*) and day-care centers were created by activists throughout West Germany. In West Berlin, where the alternative movement was particularly strong, the movement entrenched itself in the Kreuzberg neighborhood. The **Tageszeitung**, a daily movement paper, grew to a national circulation of over 50,000.[107] According to government statistics, in February 1982, anywhere from 1300 to 1500 new "self-help" groups in West Berlin involved 15,000 volunteers in projects affecting 80,000 to 100,000 people.[108] These alternative institutions spawned a self-help network (*Netzwerk*). Each person put a small part of his or her monthly salary into the network, and these funds were then given or lent to various left projects and new or needy alternative institutions. In their first year of existence beginning in October 1978, *Netzwerk* assembled a membership of over 3600 people and distributed about 300,000 Marks (then over $150,000).[109] It quickly grew in membership and resources, and it served as a model in more than 36 other cities.[110]

Like the feminist movement, each of these sources of the autonomous movement (squatters, the anti-nuclear movement and the alternatives) shared a similar decentralized, bottom-up form of

organization as well as a common belief in immediate action decided upon by participants, not by commanders. In the contemporary world, is there a need for Leninist centralized organization to bring scientific consciousness to the masses? Or does the conscious spontaneity of the Autonomen contain its own transcendental universality? The organized spontaneity of the squatters' council and other organically-generated groups seems to prove that rigidly centralized organizational models are superfluous and even destructive. By creating forms of direct democratic decision-making that necessitate popular involvement, autonomous movements unleash a process that, when allowed to proceed according to its own logic, continually enlarges its constituency and further radicalizes its adherents. Unlike the epoch in which Leninist centralism was formulated, we live amidst jet planes and global news broadcasts, developments that make international connections intuitively obviously to the most casual activist. Fax machines, tape recorders and e-mail help integrate time and space, facilitating the sharing of experiences and making it possible to overcome regional isolation. Free radios and independent print shops make informational ties globally possible from the base.

Without centralized organization, however, political discussions at public meetings were seldom coherent enough to produce unity or to have an effect on anyone besides whomever happened to show up at a given time and place. Despite clear similarities between the various incarnations of the decentralized impulse for autonomy (feminism, peace, squatters, alternatives, ecologist), few attempts were made to understand their shared political content. Since there was no centralized organization of the movement, a fragmentation of the movement's consciousness and theory accompanied its multifarious activism. Worst of all, in the midst of escalating mobilizations and confrontations with the police, the movement's energies were often directed by the most militant activists whose presumably higher level of commitment and sacrifice gave them the moral high ground from which they pontificated on the need for armed resistance and the facilely criticized tendencies from which they were distanced.

Ideally, the movement could find a process where each of its parts would be strengthened by criticism. Instead, each wing of the movement considered itself in isolation from the others. All too often, spokespeople in meetings and articles written sought to legitimate the "correct" nature of their position. In December 1980, for example, Wolfgang Pohrt wrote a review in **Der Spiegel** of the recent book *Wer Soll das alles Ändern?* ("Who Should Change it All?"), a portrayal and analysis of the German alternative movement by Joseph Huber. In a scathing attack on Huber and the alternatives, Pohrt went on to accuse them of having "Nazi" tendencies and of succumbing to what Adorno had named the "authoritarian syndrome." Rather than examining the sectarian character of Pohrt's attack on the alternatives, many militants in Berlin greeted the harsh rebuff of the alternatives as further proof of the rightness of their contempt for the "petit-bourgeois" alternative institutions. *Radikal*, Berlin's local underground newspaper whose editors were among those facing criminal charges, went on to reprint the review from **Der Spiegel** without even soliciting a response from Huber. A movement whose internal process involves glib slander of individuals without simultaneously providing means of discussion of such allegations is not more democratic than established politics. The coarse form and politically insulting content of Pohrt's review is an example of the paltriness of the inner life of the movement, a process in which friendly disagreements are turned into major antagonisms.[*] But Pohrt is one example among

---

[*] Pohrt's own contradictions were reflected years later in his advocacy of the use of nuclear weapons against Iraq during the Gulf War. He moved from attacking mild-mannered Joseph Huber as a Nazi to calling the anti-war movement in Germany "brownshirts." It was not only in Germany that "left-wing" personalities advocated such extreme positions. Problems like these are universal and human in scope, and are not contained within national boundaries.

many. At one point, the squatters' council was unable to continue meeting because fistfights broke out among the diverse participants.

Pragmatic activism and decentralization are certainly healthy qualities when counterposed to the totalitarianism of the Nazis, and they testify to the grassroots strength of the movement as well. On the other hand, the fragmentation and atomization of the youthful movement's theory and practice can also be seen as reflections of the centrifugal force of corporate capitalism and German culture. From this point of view, the anti-intellectualism and aggression of some activists are a spontaneous carrying over of some of the worst characteristics of present day Germany, not the self-conscious or collective creations of a liberatory movement. In the contemporary context, self-defeating tendencies (what Herbert Marcuse called "psychic Thermidor") are extraordinarily important problems of social movements, and later in this book, I will return to the issues of organization and internal reaction.

Another question posed by the forms of interaction discussed above is the movement's self-definition. Because some of the alternative institutions received financial support from the state, for example, some people questioned whether these groups were actually part of the autonomous movement. A few critical voices went further, asserting that the alternative institutions and the West Berlin scene (including the squatters) were nothing more than "political Disneylands" where young people could go through their adolescent rebellion, after which they would "come to their senses" and fill the niches of the bureaucracy and the offices of big corporations. Other autonomists responded that the building of a new society is not an abstraction or to be reserved for the distant future and that the abandoned inner cities was precisely where free space to begin building a new society was created. Because many radicals bitterly condemned the alternative institutions as "the middle class within the movement," it was difficult to even argue the possibility that alternative institutions (like distrusted and often spurned Greens) could have either liberatory or cooptive functions, in part depending upon their relationship to a larger social movement. So long as the movement is defined solely by its oppositional moments, it fails to offer alternative forms capable of sustaining its over the long-term. Activists oppose nuclear power and weapons, housing policies based on profits for speculators, hierarchy and patriarchy, but they did not develop to the point where they could offer a socially legitimate alternative which a majority of people could join. The alternative movement is positive insofar as it provides some activists with nonalienating jobs, creates non-hierarchical institutions, and provides a sense of community rooted in friendship. But the alternative institutions can serve as mechanisms of integration when they lead to the commercialization of previously uncommercialized needs, fulfill unmet needs within an oppressive system, help to fine-tune the established system by mitigating its worst excesses, and provide a pool of highly skilled but low-paid social workers within "alternative" institutions. The criticism of alternative institutions by activists often helped depoliticize and isolate the alternatives, giving rise to individual and group power trips, greedy takeovers of their resources for individual ends, and authoritarian attempts to control their political content.

Despite their apparent shortcomings, oppositional moments were increasingly transformed from single-issue struggles into a coherent and vital movement. Besides being the driving force behind larger social movements and political adjustments, these militants succeeded in forging a new synthesis of theory and practice. Unknown in Europe since the heady days of Russia's Bolsheviks and Germany's Spartacists, a synthesis naming both capitalism and patriarchy as the structures to be destroyed galvanized itself across national and continental boundaries, as I discuss in the next chapter. More than a decade after the New Left, newly developed youth movements continued to question fundamental

premises of industrial civilization. In this questioning was hope for a new kind of society, based not on the accumulation of wealth and hierarchical politics, but on the improvement of the quality of life for all.

NOTES Chapter 3

Versions of parts of this chapter appeared in **Monthly Review** (September 1982) as "The Extraparliamentary Left in Europe" and were presented as "Recent Cultural-Political Radicalism in Europe" at the Pacific Sociological Association meetings in April 1982 and "Europe's Autonomous Movement" at the American Political Science Association meetings in September 1989. I wish to acknowledge the special assistance of Ann Acosta, Susanne Peters and Uwe Haseloff in this chapter.

1..Susanne Peters, *The Germans and the INF Missiles* (Nomos, 1990).

2..Mary Kaldor estimated that five million people demonstrated in the capitals of Western Europe in 1981 and 1983. See "Who Killed the Cold War?" **The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists** (July/August 1995) p. 58. The numbers of demonstrators at the largest gatherings in the fall of 1981 were approximately 150,000 in Rome, 120,000 in London, 50,000 in Paris, 150,000 in Helsinki, 500,000 in Madrid, 300,000 in Athens, and 350,000 in Amsterdam. See Wilfried von Bredow, "The Peace Movements in France and in the Federal Republic of Germany -- A Comparison," paper at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, September 1982.

3..Andrei Markovits and Philip Gorski, *The German Left: Red, Green and Beyond* (Oxford University Press, 1993) p. 199.

4..For more information on the Easter marches, see Markovits, pp. 46-58; Christine Bachmeier, Alexander Ewald, Thomas Fischer und Sabine Norton, *Mythen knacken: 40 Jahre Westdeutsche Linke,* hereafter MK (Neues Forum, 1989) pp. 85-6, 92.

5..This observation was first made to me by Gretchen Dutschke-Klotz and was verified by several other participants in SDS.

6..MK, p. 118.

7..MK, p. 94. When popular movements disintegrate, social democratic and neo-Leninist groups acquire new members. According to Sidney Tarrow, the Italian Communist Party's membership rose from 1,500,000 in 1969 to 1,900,000 in 1978. See "Political Parties and Italian Movements of the 1960s and 1970s" in Russell Dalton and Manfred Kuechler (editors), *Challenging the Political Order: New Social Movements in Western Democracies* (Oxford, 1990) p. 269. The opposite also apparently occurs. At several points in *Feuer und Flamme: Zur Geschichte und Gegenwart der Autonomen* (Edition-ID Archiv, 1990), Geronimo (pp. 61-4) discusses how M-L groups loose membership as autonomous movements gain strength.

8..MK, p. 106; Also see *Die Früchte des Zorns: Texte und Materialien zur Geschichte der Revolutionären Zellen und der Roten Zora,* hereafter FZ (Edition ID-Archiv, 1993) p. 507.

9..In a masterful study, *The Politics of the West German Trade Unions: Strategies of Class and Interest Representation in Growth and Crisis* (Cambridge University Press, 1986), Andrei Markovits analyzed these non-union sanctioned strikes. "The most common feature of the 1973 strikes were demands to slow down the speed of the assembly line, lower piece-rate quotas, improve the physical condition of the work environment, and introduce more generous rest periods during working hours...Many of these strikes in the metal-processing industry were either initiated or led by foreign workers and women grouped in the lower wage categories who were disgruntled over the gap between their wage rate and those of their male, German colleagues." pp. 226-7.

10..MK, pp. 111-113.

11..See Ulrike Heider, *Schülerprotest in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Suhrkamp, 1984) p. 220 for one example of the distance between the Left and the counterculture. The latter's isolation was the

central theme of *Autonomie oder Getto? Kontroversen über die Alternativbewegung*, herausgegeben von Wolfgang Kraushaar (Verlag Neue Kritik, 1978).

12..Johannes Schütte, *Revolt und Verweigerung: Zur Politik und Sozialpsychologie der Spontibewegung* (Focus Verlag, 1980) pp. 141-2.

13..Geronimo, p. 35.

14..Saral Sarkar, *Green-Alternative Politics in West Germany, Vol. 1: The New Social Movements*, hereafter GAP (United Nations University Press, 1993) p. 36.

15..Burns and van der Will, p. 185.

16..Tilman Fichter und Siegward Lönnendonker, *Kleine Geschichte des SDS* (Rotbuch Verlag, 1979).

17..The largest student organization of the New Left in the U.S. was also called SDS, but American SDS stood for Students for a Democratic Society. It was less intellectual and more militant than German SDS. While both organizations emerged from acrimonious splits from social-democratic parent groups, there was no formal link between the two. In the U.S., the movement among white students alone was far bigger than the entire German New Left. The ratio of SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) members to total population was 1/7000 in the U.S. compared with 1/30,000 In West Germany. Despite their smaller numbers, German New Leftists were more well developed in the tradition of radical theory, a difference with their counterparts in the U.S. which might explain the consolidation of Green politics in Germany at a time when the movement in the U.S. was in great disarray.

18..Gerard Braunthal, *Political Loyalty and Public Service in West Germany: The 1972 Decree Against Radicals and its Consequences* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1990).

19..Braunthal, p. 101. Only in the mid-1980s, when members of the Greens sitting in parliament question the decree's appropriateness, was it finally disavowed, but by then new social movements far more radical than anything anyone had expected made the issues associated with the *Berufsverbot* mute.

20..FZ, p. 200, 709.

21..quoted in Markovits, p. 86.

22..See Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, et. al., *Zwei Kulturen? Tunix, Mescalero und die Folgen* (Verlag Ästhetik und Kommunikation).

23..The trajectory of the proliferation of autonomous movements is easier to fix than the exact time when the Autonomen was first used as the name for autonomous groups. Geronimo (pp. 83, 151) locates the first visible autonomous groups in the transcendence of single-issue struggles within the Brokdorf anti-nuclear mobilizations of 1976-7. Documents in the archive of the Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung demonstrate clearly that the Hamburg Autonomist Plenary met for the first time in December 1979, and that they had been strongly influenced in their choice of a name by the struggle in Zurich. In 1980, a pair of radical leaflets in Amsterdam bore the name Autonomen. In *Marginalisierung und Militanz: Jugendliche Bewegungsmilieus im Aufruhr* (Campus Verlag, 1992), Matthias Manrique locates the first meetings of the Autonomenplenum Kreuzberg in Berlin in the late Fall of 1981 (p. 168). While the exact time of the use of the name "Autonomen" cannot be fixed with scientific certainty, we see clearly that similarly-minded groups adopted it as a label to show continental affinity with radical politics loyal to no nation-state or political party. The international reproduction of the name is an instance of what I call the eros effect, the intuitive adoption of tactics and analysis by social movement activists.

24..In 1971, a wave of squats and even proposals for a youth center had surfaced in Zurich, but the

organizing committee was swamped by cadre groups. "Every party sent its delegates to the committee, who then fought for their resolutions and attempted to recruit shocked inhabitants [of the neighborhood] to their own correct line." Needless to say, the impetus was short-circuited. Kriesi, pp. 290-3.

25..."Offener Brief an den Stadtrat von Zürich," **Zürich Tages-Anzeiger** (December 13, 1980) p. 34.

26..Hanspeter Kriesi, *Die Zürcher Bewegung* (Campus Verlag, 1984) p. 42.

27..Michael Haller, "Aussteigen oder rebellieren: Über die Doppeldeutigkeit der Jugendrevolte," in Haller, p. 12.

28..Gruppe Olten, *Die Zürcher Unruhe 2* (Orte-Verlag, 1981) p. 123.

29..Kriesi, p. 178.

30..See the police chief of Hamburg's report, dated 30 October 1986, "Autonome: Selbstverständnis und Motivation."

31..**Emma Sonderband: Schwestern Lust--Schwestern Frust: 20 Jahre Frauenbewegung,** (Nachdruck 1990) Einleitung 1991, p. 4.

32..This speech is translated and excerpted in *German Feminism: Readings in Politics and Literature*, edited by Edith Hoshino Altbach, Jeanette Clausen, Dagmar Schultz and Naomi Stephan (State University of New York Press, 1984) pp. 307-310.

33..Helke Sander, "Mütter sind politische Personen," **Courage** (October 1978) pp. 38-45. The women's actions in Berlin transformed the groups that undertook them and led to women's councils being established in many other cities. In Münster, a group of 60-70 women quickly came together, and developed campaigns using irony and defamation of men as key tactics. One of their members produced "The Cultural Revolution of Women," the first radical feminist text of the new wave of German feminism. As women met, they read texts from the U.S. women's movement and adopted them for their own. For the most part, however, the movement was oriented to practice rather than theory.

34..Ann Anders (Herausgeberin), *Autonome Frauen: Schlüsseltexte der Neuen Frauenbewegung seit 1968* (Athenäum, 1988) p. 11.

35..Alice Schwarzer, "Ewig zittere das Weib," **Emma Sonderband**, p.137. It should be noted that German law was a hodgepodge of various statutes. After the Second World War, the U.S. essentially rewrote its basic laws according to the U.S. constitution. In January 1949, the Bundestag approved an Equal Rights Statute but it had little enforceability. Another equal rights statute in 1957 modified rigidly patriarchal marriage and family laws.

36..Schwarzer was able to persuade only three groups to join her at first, women from Frauenaktion '70 in Frankfurt, the Socialist Women's Federation in Berlin and one part of the "Red Women" of Munich. See Altbach, p. 103.

37..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 61.

38..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 71.

39..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 75.

40..Kristine von Soden (Herausgeberin), *Der grosse Unterschied: Die neue Frauenbewegung und die siebziger Jahre* (Elefanten Press, 1988) p. 89.

41..Anders, p. 25.

42..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 76.

43..Out of discussions at the Hornstrasse, a women's university seminar was organized at the Free University of Berlin in 1974. Although there was considerable opposition to its excluding men, the principle of women's autonomy was maintained and explained to a growing cadre of university students.

By the fall of 1974, 350 women were involved in the seminar. The group occupied much of its time writing a critique of Herbert Marcuse's essay on feminism. Women's seminars spread to a dozen other cities, and after its Berlin organizers encountered women's studies programs during a trip to the U.S., a decision was made to organize a summer university for women in 1976. Over 600 women arrived for the first summer university, and it became a strategy forum particularly important for women whose local towns had few feminists.

44..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 81.

45..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 48.

46..von Soden, p. 145.

47..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 88.

48..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 103.

49.. While these shelters opened autonomously and excluded men, within a few years, state funding insidiously undermined their autonomy and males were making their way into the shelter as co-workers. By 1983, there were approximately 80 feminist shelters and as many as 40 active planning groups for new shelters. Within the feminist shelters, autonomy was the key internal organizational principle: Women who came for help found they could take on as much responsibility for running the shelter as longer-term volunteers and sometimes even paid staff members. Because government monies were often rejected unless strict understandings regarding the autonomy of the centers were agreed (including in many cases the complete exclusion of men--something most state agencies could not sanction), the feminist shelters were less well funded than they otherwise could have been. See Myra Marx Ferree, "Equality and Autonomy: Feminist Politics in the United States and West Germany," in *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe* edited by Mary Fainsod Katzenstein and Carol McClurg Mueller (Temple University Press, 1987) pp. 185-188.

50..*Frauenjahrbuch 1976*.

51..Altbach, p.107.

52..Anders, p. 23.

53..Marie-Theres Knäpper, *Feminismus, Autonomie, Subjektivät: Tendenzen und Widersprüche in der neuen Frauenbewegung* (Germinal Verlag, 1984).

54..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 75.

55..See the discussion in Ferree of this important topic.

56..Altbach, p. 48. **Courage** ceased publication in 1984.

57..During a political conflict in Berlin a butyric acid attack on the automobile of another feminist was made.

58..*The Power of Women and the Subversion of Society.*

59..The discussions around this issue became notoriously acrimonious, dividing women's centers into feuding tendencies calling each other "reactionary." These dynamics led one commentator to remark that: "Also the German women's movement was not spared a German sickness: rigid friend/foe and black/white thinking; the widespread incapability to discuss differences while maintaining solidarity and the customary defamation of anyone thinking differently." **Emma Sonderband**, p. 80. I question whether this is a specifically German problem. Suffice it to say that the cultural tendencies of patriarchal interaction emerged within the women's centers. See the end of Chapter 5 for a discussion of the "German problem."

60.. It was estimated that women did two-thirds of the socially necessary labor in Germany and men

only one-third--meaning that women did twice as much work as men. In 1968, the average woman worker made 1.61 Marks/hour less than the average male. In 1973, this gap rose to 2.60 Marks/hour. **Emma Sonderband**, p. 65. In 1939, there were only 700,000 women with jobs outside the home; by 1955, there were more than 4 million or 36% of the work force. Herta Däubler-Gmelin, *Frauenarbeitslosigkeit oder Reserve zurück an den Herd* (Reinbeck, 1977) pp. 32 and 45.

61..Altbach, p. 247.

62..Hannelore Mabry, "The Feminist Theory of Surplus Value," in Altbach, pp. 265-274. Mabry's general point appears well taken although counterexamples can be found. On September 9, 1978, for example, 15,000 trade unionists marched against wage discrimination and female unemployment in Rheinland-Pfalz at an event sponsored by the main union federation.

63..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 95.

64..Eva-Maria Stark as quoted in **Emma Sonderband**, pp. 115-116.

65..See the discussion in Anders, pp. 34-5.

66..The entire discussion was further complicated when **Courage** published a text discussing the marital problems of a well-known leftist then in prison whose wife was suing him for child support and alimony. Because **Courage** painted him as a villain, despite his persecution by the government, many women wrote to the magazine to support him. See Altbach, p. 240.

67..translated in Altbach, p. 108.

68..**Emma Sonderband**, p. 118.

69..Vera Slupic, "Love is work--but love is also love," in *Beiträge zur 4. Sommeruniversität, 1979.*

70..Dagmar Schulz, "The German Women's Movements in 1982," in Altbach, p. 374.

71..see Werner Hülsberg, *The German Greens: A Social and Political Profile* (Verso, 1988) p. 132.

72..A "women's council" was formed that quickly counted a membership over 5 million. Along with other groups, they pressured candidates to take progressive stands on women's issues. Governments have begun to make major concessions to feminists in terms of hiring quotas in major universities (where women constitute under 10% of tenured faculty) as well as in affirmative action plans for public sector jobs.

In 1988, Rita Süssmuth's *Frauenlexikon* listed three varieties of feminists: "socialist feminists" who reckoned with class conflict, "cultural feminists" who believed in a superior women's culture, and "ecological feminists" oriented toward a reconciliation of women and Nature. At the same time, the more progressive **Feminist Studies** spoke of "political-socialist feminism" and "culturally critical feminism" grounded either in historical or biological otherness of women. Schwarzer took issue with Süssmuth's tripartite categories since they omitted "radical feminists" who had "put everything in question" without being grounded in a conception of "women's nature (or human nature generally)" while raising the issue of power and class.

73..Altbach, p.194.

74..Y. Lenoir, *Technocratie francaise* (Pauvert, 1977) p. 95 as quoted in Dorothy Nelkin and Michael Pollak, *The Atom Besieged* (MIT Press, 1982) p. 23.

75..Günter Minnerup, "West Germany since the War," **New Left Review** #99 (September-October 1976) p. 4. A few months earlier, the same magazine published a report that in Italy, "...the long social crisis opened in 1968-9 by the student upsurge and by the most extensive and radical workers' struggles of the post-war period has also ended, at least temporarily." See "Paradoxes of the Italian Politcal

Crisis," by Paolo Flores d'Arcais and Franco Moretti in **New Left Review** #96 (March-April 1976) p. 35. Social movements often appear unexpectedly and leave analysts of various political persuasions unable to predict their proliferation.

76..Nelkin, p. 22.

77..Minnerup, pp. 19, 38.

78..Nelkin, p. 39.

79..Anne Dudeck, "Selbstorganisierte Bildungsarbeit im Wandel," in Roland Roth und Dieter Rucht (Hg.), *Neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1987) p. 224.

80..Enno Brand, *Staatsgewalt: Politische Unterdrückung und innere Sicherheit in der Bundesrepublik* (Verlag die Werkstatt, 1988) p. 188.

81..Markovits and Gorski, pp. 103-4.

82..GAP, pp. 121, 131.

83..GAP, p. 165.

84..Nelkin, p. 45.

85..FZ, p. 727.

86..See Ulrike Wasmuht, *Friedensbewegungen der 80er Jahre* (Focus Verlag, 1987); Markovits and Gorski, p. 111; Brand, p. 234; FZ, p. 465.

87..Manrique, p. 65.

88..See Burckhard Kretschmann, Monika Binas und Broka Hermann, *Startbahn-West: Fotos und Interviews* (Privat Druck); Brand, pp. 213-4; FZ, pp. 394-418. Ultimately, courts ruled the airport was a federal issue and not subject to local referenda.

89..FZ, p. 429.

90..Altvater, p. 100.

91..**Der Tagespiegel** (Berlin), June 8, 1980. The shortage of available houses resulted in standard non-refundable deposits of around 6000 DM (then about $3000) for a small apartment. More than 60,000 households--largely comprised of senior citizens--paid more than a third of their income towards rent. The West Berlin average was 20 percent of income for rent, heating and electricity. Other major cities were equally bad. In Munich, for example, 10,000 people were registered with the housing office as emergency cases, and even by conservative estimates, an additional 12,000 Germans were searching for housing there on the "free market."

   While particularly severe, the housing crisis in West Berlin was especially irrational since the city had been depopulated by an exodus of Berliners after the war. Attracting Germans to work there was so difficult that even in the midst of the recession of 1974-76, a monthly average of 10,000 available jobs existed. For many, the city's geographical and political isolation from the rest of West Germany (and its economic dependence on outside help) were key reasons for Berlin's lack of appeal. Most West Berliners suffered acutely from "wall fever," and many left the city at least once a month. To help Berliners make life there more attractive, the government subsidized wages (8 percent was automatically added), paid birth bonuses to mothers, gave special allowances to the elderly (30 percent of the slightly more than 2 million West Berliners were over 60 years old in 1976), provided freely flowing student support money, and subsidized airfares to and from the city.

92..Haller, p. 104.

93..**New York Times** (May 6, 1981) p. A-17.

94..See the discussion on Kriesi, p. 200. Internationally, much the same could be said of Punk. See James Stark, *Punk '77: An Inside look at the San Francisco Rock n' Roll Scene* (1977).

95..SG, p. 207. Quoting government statistics, Margit Mayer counted 54 police evictions, 410 police raids, 4687 criminal investigations and 2287 arrests vis-a-vis the squatters movement in West Berlin. See "Restructuring and Popular Opposition in West German Cities," in *The Capitalist City* edited by M. Smith and J. Feagin (Blackwell, 1987) p. 353.

96..**Die Tageszeitung** (May 4, 1981) p. 12. Manrique counted 160 by the end of 1981 (p. 159). Kriesi maintained there were over 500 (p. 170), a figure also given by Manrique (p. 168) for early summer in 1981. The police referred to "about 700 known house occupations." See *Verfassungsschutzbericht* (1981) p. 71.

97..See Steven Katz and Margit Mayer, "Gimme Shelter: Self-Help Housing Struggles Within and Against the State in New York City and West Berlin," **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research** 9 (1), 1985, p. 33; also see Manrique, pp. 80, 118.

98..Manrique, p. 133.

99..Nanette Funk, "Take It," in **Semiotexte** (German Issue) p. 297.

100..GAP, p. 55.

101..By March 1984, only 14 houses were still illegally occupied, the remainder having either been legalized, cleared out by police or abandoned. GAP, p. 54.

102..**Der Spiegel** (January 19, 1981) p. 28.

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

104..Manrique, p. 160.

105..So far, no one has systematically counted the number of Greens elected to office. See Hülsberg, p. 234.

106..For a comprehensive treatment of how the Social Democrats swung around to the Left, see Andrei Markovits, "The German Left: Between a Crisis of Identity and Orthodoxy," **New Political Science**, Spring-Summer 1993.

107..In 1995, Taz had a readership of 410,000 and printed just under 60,000 copies daily. Nonetheless, the end of the government's special subsidies for Berlin contributed to a financial crisis. **German Press Review**, September 22, 1995.

108..Petra Kelly, *Um Hoffnung kämpfen: Gewaltfrei in eine grüne Zukunft* (Lamuv Verlag, 1983) pp. 180-1. Joseph Huber guessed the numbers comprising the national "active movement" at between 6000 groups/30,000 activists and 15,000 groups/135,000 activists in 1980 (p. 29). Sarkar quotes numbers of 10,000 alternative self-help and service projects with 80,000 activists and 4,000 alternative economic enterprises with 24,000 jobs in 1983 (GAP, p. 257). In addition, there were as many as 100,000 *Wohngemeinschaften* in the FRG in 1983 (p. 241).

109..Selbsthilfe Netzwerk Berlin, *Ein Jahr Netzwerk* (1979).

110..For an analysis of how *Netzwerk* fit into the overall movement and its context, see Margit Mayer, p. 355.