

PART 3



POLITICAL ACTIVISM IN THE PROTEST YEARS, 1962–1973

Constructing the Student and the *Gammler*



“Hell is loose in Schwabing!”¹ This headline appeared in the newspaper *Der Münchner Merkur* on 25 June 1962. On several warm summer nights, the Schwabing quarter, close to downtown Munich, became the setting for major youth riots and protests. The article noted,

Whereas the first turmoil on Thursday ... happened due to some kind of impulse, the riots on Friday and Saturday ... were initiated by rowdies. At the second and third turmoil, ... hundreds of youngsters (on average twenty years of age) banded together, destroyed cars, threw fireworks, bottles, and rocks, until the police went forward brutally with batons.²

Unable to identify the nature and reasoning for such sudden riots, authorities and the media initially worried about the return of *the Halbstarke*. Former mayor Thomas Wimmer even feared that the events in Schwabing could be a starting point for “some nasty surprises ... in the future.”³ Yet partially sparked by the police, unrests turned into political protests, pushing *the student* as the new construct of youth into the epicenter of discussions.

Throughout the 1960s, repeated riots and demonstrations reflected a larger struggle over the form and nature of West German democracy. Arguably initiated by the events in Schwabing, and repeatedly tied to the takeover of city spaces, debates about youth politicized society at large. For many, *the student*—and to an extent *Gammler* buns—as an emerging image of youth embodied a new generation and discourse. Born after World War II, these youngsters questioned adult authority and political frameworks, the latter leading to intense debates about higher education, the Cold War, and emergency laws. In 1966, the two major parties within the Federal Republic created a grand coalition

with a supermajority, further encouraging protests and the organization of youth. These developments were new within West Germany's democracy,⁴ and raised historic fears about political instability as experienced during the years of the Weimar Republic. In fact, at the height of protests in spring 1968 one state representative noted, "If Bonn is not to become Weimar, then the Bavarian capital cannot have the image of 1918 and become a fertile ground for extreme disruptions and an opportune arena for violent struggles."⁵ As elsewhere, *the student* thus embodied disorder and fear, making this image of youth a discursive space or microcosm for broader conversations.

Again, the construction of *the student* and *the Gammmler* as disruptive, violent, and possibly antidemocratic forces had its benefits.⁶ Situated within the so-called protest years (1962–1973), the rise of both images emerged as frozen political structures embodied by aging chancellor Konrad Adenauer slowly dissolved. After a brief interlude government headed by Ludwig Erhard, a grand coalition between the two major parties—the conservatives (CDU/CSU) and the social democrats (SPD)—formed a government from 1966 until 1969. Their supermajority brought people to the streets and helped create the Extraparliamentary Opposition (APO), a movement that authorities interested in traditional democratic structures belittled as angry young men. While there was perhaps a real crisis around youth, it was again consistently defined only as that and exaggerated overall for self-serving purposes. As a result, youth once more proved a powerful rhetorical space for larger discussions and provided the leverage for expanding mechanisms of social control.

Although constructions of youth as *students* and *Gammmlers* followed similar trends as during previous decades, a growing ability and broader willingness of the actual young to help frame its own image became increasingly apparent. With more power and influence, namely once comparing such dynamics to the situation during the crisis years, young people played a more active role. Even though authorities and primarily the media continually described them as violent and anti-democratic, the young pushed a counternarrative and tried to tell their own stories. This struggle over what youth means during the protest years illustrates the growing diversity of a young democratic structure, as well as the increasing power and interest of young people to construct an image of youth.

The third and final part of *Coming of Age* thus highlights the rise of *the student* and *the Gammmler* during the protest years. In 1962, the politicization of youth took shape on the streets in Schwabing, marking an awakening of a new generation. From that point forward, young

people increasingly asked inconvenient questions, challenged authorities, protested, and organized. Continuing tensions plus the inability of adult authorities to defuse the situation led to a climax in 1968 and the death of two individuals on the streets of Munich. As a result—and beginning in the wake of the riots in Schwabing—to control *the student* and *the Gammler*, and with that certain city spaces, became important. Local authorities re-evaluated outdated police tactics, relied on surveillance and spatial planning, and tried to streamline judicial processes. The young, on the other hand, began organizing and fighting back, resulting in continuing riots on the streets of Munich, dynamics that ultimately helped the Bavarian capital grow up.

Creating the Student

Not surprisingly, protests initiating a shift in discourse and introducing *the student* began in Schwabing, the young and vibrant quarter of Munich. Located just north of the city center, its main boulevard Leopoldstraße runs all the way from the Siegestor Arch of the Victor to Münchner Freiheit square. The Ludwig-Maximilians University—the largest university in West Germany at the time—was located in Schwabing; the Academy for the Arts and the Technical College was nearby. In the early 1960s, these three institutions brought roughly 20,000 students to the city.⁷ As the bohemian part of town, Schwabing was also the home of countless artists and musicians. Studios, sidewalk stands, restaurants, cafés, movie theaters, and a busy nightlife attracted mainly students and youngsters. Actually, the Director of the Youth Welfare Office, Kurt Seelmann, described this Schwabing “state of mind”⁸ in the early 1960s with a reference to new trends among young males, noting, “the environment was almost exclusively inhabited by extremely nice young people (even though some of them might have had a full beard).”⁹ On warm and beautiful days thousands pushed along the main boulevard to enjoy its atmosphere, as many sat outside to have coffee or ice cream. In the evening, restaurants and bars filled up quickly as music, cabarets, and theaters intrigued visitors and locals alike. Those over eighteen had few problems enjoying themselves on rock ‘n’ roll dance floors and in jazz clubs, while underage individuals could take pleasure in musicians on street corners. For authorities and residents, such noise and constant activity became concerning and irritating, and the latter repeatedly called upon the police to deal with breaches of peace. Law enforcement then broke up street musicians and pavement artists, leaving many to wonder how

such behavior aligned with the city's new slogan, "Munich, an embracing metropolis."¹⁰

An increase in disruptions became apparent by 1962, and ultimately triggered the riots in June. Earlier that month, a university riot developed when the police tried to clear a crowd of about two thousand individuals after a jazz concert near the university.¹¹ On 20 June the police responded to a similar call, as youngsters supposedly "made disrupting noises by playing music, clapping, even dancing and yelling."¹² When arriving at the Wedekindplatz square in Schwabing, the police noticed a group of street musicians, and roughly 150 listeners. As the patrol rolled up to the scene, onlookers welcomed them with whistles and boos, while some even threw bottles and started yelling, "Nazi state."¹³ The police eventually began clearing the area, against the opposition of many onlookers. A day later, the police again dealt with three youngsters making music at the Monopteros monument before a similar situation escalated later the same day. That time, the police tried to disperse a crowd of several hundred people who were listening to five musicians in Schwabing. The musicians disrupted the peace, while onlookers blocked parts of the main road. As a result, the police tried to escort the musicians away from the scene, only to face an upset audience believing the officials had arrested the young performers. Some bystanders surrounded the police car; others released air from its tires. The police officers, on the other hand, called for reinforcement, and the riots of Schwabing began.¹⁴

For the next five days, Schwabing saw an unprecedented disruption of public peace. Sparked by a seemingly minor incident, hundreds of people began blocking the streets. In the following days, between 10,000 and 20,000 protestors participated in similar events.¹⁵ Emerging riots played out along almost the same script each night: a crowd assembled on the Leopoldstraße boulevard throughout the day; in the evening, some began blocking the street. Reminiscent of incidents when *the Halbstarke* obstructed traffic at the Stiglmaierplatz square several years earlier, protestors stepped onto the street, carrying tables and chairs, sat down on tram tracks, and refused to move. Several couples danced on the street, which gave the protests a playful and provocative character [Figure 5.1]. As one participant recalled, "Initially, it was quite amusing, [and] the people enjoyed making fun of the police."¹⁶ The police, on the other hand, conceptualized them as "disruptive to traffic."¹⁷ Leopoldstraße boulevard in particular was a main access route to downtown Munich at the time. Once initial orders to disperse remained mostly unanswered, police units began dispersing the gathering with force. In groups, the police tried to push people



Figure 5.1 Dancing on the streets during the so-called riots in Schwabing, 1962. Courtesy of Otfried Schmidt/Süddeutsche Zeitung Photo.

off the streets. Unable to distinguish between onlookers and participants, officers used their batons indiscriminately; some even rode their horses into street cafés. The crowd, on the other hand, started throwing beer bottles and other objects. Chaos ensued as the police began detaining protestors at the same time as others tried to flee. Eventually, the police were able to clear the streets again, at least until disruptions resumed the next evening.

The events in Schwabing caught public authorities and adult contemporaries by surprise. Munich had seen relative stability and order since the end of panics surrounding *the Halbstarke*. Those conflicts took place in working-class neighborhoods, and not in the middle-class

bohemian area of Schwabing. Moreover, whereas politicians feared communism, they rarely connected such concerns to youth. If anything, then fears surrounding the vibrant and, at times, chaotic buzz of Schwabing worried authorities. As a result, Mayor Hans-Jochen Vogel came to Schwabing wondering about the nature of these disruptions. He hoped to defuse the situation, and approached a group of protestors. As he recalled later,

After a longer discussion, I was able to convince a group about the uselessness of additional blockades and brawls with the police. My plea to consider Munich's prestige made an initial impression, [and] this group dispersed. Encouraged by this success, I approached a second group. ... This time, however, I was ... pushed into an entrance way as people threw stink bombs, yelled at me ... , and demanded the release of all those arrested.¹⁸

For such protestors, the situation had been incited by police brutality, indiscriminate arrests, and unnecessary violence. Unable or unwilling to abide by the requests of demonstrators, the mayor retreated as the police continued to move forward with batons. Director of the Youth Welfare Office Kurt Seelmann was also caught by surprise. On his way to get ice cream, he found himself in the middle of the unrest. Seelmann tried to get in contact with authorities, hoping to soothe the situation. At some point, a police officer told him to keep moving. Seelmann noted later, "in order to make me speed up, he hit me with a baton on the back."¹⁹ Seelmann had established a dialogue between the young and the police for years, but that night he wondered if "all such efforts had been in vain."²⁰

Although covering the events extensively, the media and the general public also had a hard time framing what happened in Schwabing. An editorial in *Der Münchner Merkur* aimed to distinguish between bystanders caught by surprise, a minority of "rowdies" who threw rocks, and "mainly students";²¹ it also asked its readers "What do you make of these riots?"²² The tabloid *8-Uhr Blatt* reported on the criminal character of the "rioting masses";²³ it also—similar to other publications—simply resurrected earlier images of *the Halbstarke*²⁴ by stating, for example, "That shabby looks and character do not make an artist and attendance in lectures do not make a student is common knowledge. But that hundreds of pseudo-artists and quasi-academics have worked with loitering Halbstarke in order to beat the last sense out of Schwabing is depressing."²⁵ Rumors about a group of "three-hundred Halbstarke, as 'reinforcement,' on their way from Frankfurt and Düsseldorf" to Schwabing, appeared as well.²⁶ Letters to the editors

painted a similar picture: some commentators saw *the Halbstarke* involved in the riots while others had detected “rioting students” and “academics.”²⁷ Many also categorized participants as local students and outside agitators. According to Mayor Hans-Jochen Vogel, on Saturday night it was “mainly the scum of various quarters,” which showed up in Schwabing.²⁸ Only Director of the Youth Welfare Office Kurt Seelmann questioned these sentiments and descriptions openly, given that he had experienced police brutality first hand and personally knew many of supposed *Halbstarke*.²⁹

The media and officials eventually began framing the events in Schwabing as student protests, tied to clandestine communist activities and thus in line with broader 1960s political discussions. Throughout the riots, the police had arrested 248 individuals; 106 of them were students, a fact not surprising given general profiling of youth. For authorities, this finding was sufficient evidence that students were the most dominant group within the riots. That those captured were mainly between eighteen and twenty-nine years old sustained such claims. Moreover, with only thirteen women arrested, female youth seemed to play only a secondary role.³⁰ This conclusion made male students the prime targets even though data suggests that students in general and male students in particular were not the only groups protesting.³¹ Apart from framing the riots as a new kind of protest,³² recent events—namely new Cold War tensions due to the construction of the wall in Berlin in August 1961—also influenced the creation of this threat. The police chief saw “political implications” at hand in Schwabing, and blamed secret communist support and subversive forces.³³ After all, the five musicians triggering the riots had supposedly played Romanian folk songs.³⁴ One of the musicians later recalled that his interest in the Russian author Fyodor Dostoyevsky became sufficient evidence to further sustain these accusations.³⁵ Besides, authorities had arrested several youngsters with connections to East Germany: they arrested Peter Schmitt as a supposed leader, only because he had visited East Germany in 1958/59 and sustained friendships into the GDR.³⁶ The most important evidence of communist involvement was a flyer by the illegal Communist Party (KPD) that surfaced during the riots. The media discussed this flyer at great length, speculated about a communist conspiracy, and even feared an invasion.³⁷ Such constructions of students as communist tools contradicted the experiences of protestors, who saw the events unfold as “something completely coincidental and spontaneous, without any political objectives.”³⁸ Even an internal report from the Office for the Protection of the Constitution saw no connection between the leaflet and the KPD.³⁹ For many authorities such

findings mattered little given their understandings and interpretation of events, plus an increasing state of hysteria.

While the media and local authorities increasingly stereotyped and demonized young participants and bystanders alike, the events in Schwabing politicized individual participants over time. As one voice recalled years later, the riots “did affect me, as one can imagine. The authoritarian state showed its vigor, which I thought we had overcome, and I consequently believed that the majority of the police had to be fascists. I was thus politicized in a heartbeat, and lost all trust into politics.”⁴⁰ Others saw their initial experiences in 1962 in the context of their subsequent involvement in protests. One individual later noted that in 1962 defying authorities was “highly political.”⁴¹ The events even affected those who did not participate. Subversive activist and cofounder of the alternative community *Kommune I* Dieter Kunzelmann “did not leave his house [in Munich] during the riots.”⁴² He still noted, “I experienced for the first time that hundreds of people showed solidarity with guitar-playing bums and that it took such a minimal cause for law and order to turn into chaos. This experience impressed me much, so that in the following years I used every situation to experience it in another form.”⁴³ Then nineteen-year-old Andreas Baader was also arrested in Schwabing. Police officers overheard him stating, “I saw them [the police] beating innocent people yesterday. One man was beaten brutally and then kicked. A woman was beaten to the ground; they [the police] need a beating; something like this ought to be in the news, with photos.”⁴⁴ For authorities this statement was sufficient to prove his active role in the riots, and they arrested Baader. Although released after twelve hours, Baader’s mother later recalled how he came home that night and said, “There is something foul in a state where the police moves forward against singing youngsters.”⁴⁵ These experiences in no way fully explain Baader’s later role within the leftist-terrorist Red Army Faction (RAF) but the events in Schwabing marked a watershed moment for him and many other contemporaries, and only proved originally misleading understandings of the riots as political a reality.

In response to police brutality, many participants began organizing.⁴⁶ In July, a group of fourteen local residents established the Community Initiative for the Protection of Civil Liberties. It hoped to prevent “a police state,”⁴⁷ and tried to raise awareness by setting up meetings, printing leaflets, holding press conferences, and writing letters to editors. In the first leaflet from 16 July it called for witnesses in an attempt to find evidence to prosecute police officers.⁴⁸ In a resolution, it outlined, “Until now, there has been no proof regarding

obstruction of police order (which is interesting, when recalling the broad use of batons!).”⁴⁹ A year after the riots, second chairmen of the initiative outlined the rights of citizens in the student magazine *profil*.⁵⁰ The initiative was eventually dissolved due to financial problems and internal animosities, leaving student organizations like the General Student’s Committee (AStA) in charge. That organization in particular had hoped to defuse and de-escalate the situation early on. On the fourth day of the riots, it had called on students “to not support such consciously provoked turmoil, which have nothing to do with student and ‘Schwabing freedom.’”⁵¹ Shortly after the riots, AStA had then condemned the criminal behavior of participants but also criticized police brutality. While claiming that these had “not been student riots,”⁵² AStA also organized a forum to discuss the events. More than three hundred people showed up. In a lively discussion, participants focused on the role of the police during the riots. Two speakers aiming to defend the role of the police were booed; another speaker noted, “The respect I had for the police is gone. There were lots of rowdies, yes, but most of them wore a uniform.”⁵³ Such sentiments received lots of applause, as many had lost respect for authorities and now looked to politicize existing organizational formats like AStA “to protest against such [state] arbitrariness!”⁵⁴

The Rise of the Student

As a watershed moment, the riots and protests of Schwabing marked the appearance, construction, and awakening of *the student*. With virtually no memories of the war and National Socialism, this new image of youth came of age during the late 1950s, when artificial divisions along generations became all the more evident. As the years passed, a wider public debate helped create such generational cohorts. In 1957, sociologist Helmut Schelsky already defined a “skeptical generation”;⁵⁵ six years later, the weekly news magazine *Der Spiegel* deemed this age cohort as the “exaggerated generation.”⁵⁶ The magazine embedded it within international trends, noting that this generation is “cool, confident, [and] condescending.”⁵⁷ They are the “kids of Marx and Coca-Cola,”⁵⁸ who consume as never before, follow Beat music, love The Beatles, wear miniskirts, and question authorities. U.S. popular culture, among other foreign influences, had made the young more international. Furthermore, argued *Der Spiegel*, “Their use of sex is even more irritating for adults, [and] a source of youth-bashing and youth-idolization.”⁵⁹ Popular culture, a degree of internationalism, and

their disruptive politics made *the student* a force for change and a threat to traditional order.

Similar to previous images of youth, constructions of *the student*—defined as a young, politically active, male, middle-class urbanite—had a history. Historically, the German term *Student* primarily refers to those attending universities and colleges. It is distinguished from the term *Schüler* for elementary and secondary school students and consequently refers to an older age cohort. In the Federal Republic, *Schüler* generally left school in their late teens, becoming college students in their early twenties. *Student* also infers male youth, given that female youngsters could not attend German universities until the late nineteenth century. By the 1960s, the situation had changed, of course, although males still dominated higher education. Moreover, according to historian Harald Lönnecker, German universities have been understood as hotbeds of liberalism, dissent, and delinquency.⁶⁰ Student riots in 1848 come to mind when thinking about the political activism of this construct, as do *Burschenschaften* fraternities. Again, such events remain tied to a male population. Social class restricted and limited access to higher education for most young people, an aspect that changed after World War II. Beginning in the 1950s, an expansion in higher education grounded in postwar prosperity became noticeable, opening up this career path for more individuals. In many ways, however, students remained tied to the middle class. Spatially, the home of students was the university. Located within the center of major cities, student quarters emerged around such places of higher education. Schwabing was one of these university spaces, where *the student* could spend time in coffee shops, restaurants, or bars like the Big Apple and the PN. Numerous bands played in these clubs, including future stars like Jimi Hendrix.⁶¹ At the same time, *Gammler*—young bums traveling through Europe—hung around on street corners, sold various items along the Leopoldstraße boulevard, and prepared a spot for the night in this center of “the German sleeping-bag movement.”⁶² In other words, contemporaries built on historical understandings that saw *the student* as an urbanite who engaged in excessive drinking, disorder, and immorality,⁶³ making this image of youth a threat to stability.

Age and class also defined *the student* and helped misrepresent larger dynamics. Youngsters went to college in their late teens and early twenties. The average age of all those arrested in 1962 was twenty-five, with most students being a little younger.⁶⁴ In short, *the student* was older than eighteen and would not get in conflict with the Law for the Protection of Youth. Whereas this made *the student* more threatening than previous social constructions of youth, the middle-class background

brought anxieties of youth away from working-class *Halbstarke* and into the sphere of *the teenager*. Such emphasis, regardless of a broad range of participants, demonstrates the strength of *the student* as a social construct. However, as historian Kristin Ross noted in the context of protests in France, “May ’68 had very little to do with the social group—students or ‘youth’—who were its instigators. It had much more to do with the flight from social determinations, with displacements that took place outside of their location in society, with a disjunction, that is, between political subjectivity and the social group.”⁶⁵ She ultimately argues that the events were reduced to a student and generational revolt. Similar trends were visible in Munich, where authorities constructed *the student* as the prime force behind the protests. This neglect of other participants allowed contemporaries to frame potential opposition around university environments along delinquency and generation, especially after the events in Schwabing.

The revival of *the student* as a male youngster was tied to his appearance, an interpretation that simply neglected the role and power of young females or deemed them as irrelevant. Early descriptions noted that *the student* had a full beard. Kurt Seelmann described this type of youngster when recalling his visits to Schwabing,⁶⁶ and the police at the riots had only taken photos of suspects with beards—even if witnesses described some participants as “tall, blond, and neat.”⁶⁷ The police arrested a French student as a ringleader simply because he had a full beard.⁶⁸ Similar arrests took place at protests in the GDR, indicating parallels between both German states when it comes to constructions of male youth in the 1960s.⁶⁹ Moreover, emerging stereotypes assigned young women a narrow role within the student movement. After all, the police only arrested thirteen women during the riots in Schwabing.⁷⁰ Most student organizations also had male leaders, an element again visible in other countries. At least until the mid-1960s authorities and adult onlookers saw and understood young women simply as accessories for male protestors. Newspapers wrote about “tween” girls—those in their twenties—standing by and watching male rioters in Schwabing, or female “vagabonding-bees following [male] bums.”⁷¹ According to one contemporary, “females had to be beautiful, fashionable, sexy, intellectual, and ready to serve.”⁷² Such female passivity was supposedly grounded in their curiosity and sexual promiscuity and explains why authorities might have been blind towards early female participation. According to historian Kristina Schulz, “participation of women was simply overlooked,”⁷³ as the media focused more on their looks. Indeed, in Munich, local newspapers wrote about “the necks of Schwabinger art brides” and “open blouse

wearing” women protestors,⁷⁴ thus putting female bodies, not their actual protests, values, and concerns, into the center of discussions. As the wife of student leader Rudi Dutschke, Gretchen Dutschke-Klotz, later recalled, women “were disposed of at will” if they did not fit this ideal.⁷⁵ Such stereotypes continued later on. According to the news magazine *Der Spiegel*,

It was the highest form of female participation if a girl ... yelled “Shut up!” during a meeting of the Student Social Union (SDS). Tired gals of the revolution put their stylistic haircuts in the way of the water cannon representing the executive power of the state; they join their comrades at teach-ins, sit-ins, and demonstrations; and they also help them in matters of love. But they remain silent once it comes to ... underlying male determination for strict German order present with organizational structures.... Now they feel frustrated.⁷⁶

As one historian noted in a similar context, “That politically conscious males did not behave in any way different towards women, but were sometimes even more brutal and exploitive, all the while situating themselves within a narrative of emancipation,” was upsetting.⁷⁷ As a result, and although the women’s movement did not gain steam until the late 1960s,⁷⁸ the early role of female participants rarely concerned male protestors, authorities, or even historians.

At the same time, appearance also became a way to protest. Similar to *the Halbstarke* and *the teenager*, actual students used different styles to resist contemporary norms. Male youngsters made long hair, beards, and casual clothing part of a purposeful shabbiness, and turned such style into a statement against middle-class values. So-called *Gammler* bums—youngsters living on the streets and traveling through Europe—openly defied norms. As one young female contemporary recalls, “‘dressing up’ meant refusal against revolutionary consciousness,” turning rags into a revolutionary statement.⁷⁹ Clothing again became political, apparent at a ceremony for the opening of a new student apartment complex in Munich in 1967. Although an official occasion, AStA Chairman Rolf Pohle wore corduroys and a turtleneck. After Pohle made a brief political statement regarding the lack of democratic frameworks, the representative from the Ministry of Culture and Education felt provoked and snapped, stating, “Wear a proper suit before talking about democracy!”⁸⁰ Apparently a ragged style and appearance played an important role when constructing, detecting, and identifying *the student*; yet it also visibly distinguished those unwilling to conform to a traditional and orderly view of democracy.

This political nature of *the student* was in line with a long history, yet unusual compared to previous images of youth, which was stereotyped as delinquent during the crisis years and had little agency and power. The situation had improved in the miracle years, due to the rise of youth culture and new opportunities. *The student*, on the other hand, had a long history of being political, visible in the promotion of national and liberal ideals throughout the nineteenth century, as at the Hambach Fest in 1832.⁸¹ In the 1960s, such interest in politics was present due to debates about Germany's Nazi past, partially triggered by the Adolf Eichmann trial. In fact, after the riots in Schwabing one member of the Community Initiative specifically referred to this trial in a press conference to defend the initiative's claims for justice.⁸² In 1963, the Frankfurt-Auschwitz trials brought discussions about the Holocaust even more into the limelight, giving youngsters the opportunity to confront adults with uncomfortable and, at times, unreasonable questions and accusations. Parents and adult authorities as such lost credibility, even more through apparent continuities between the former Nazi state and West Germany. On the federal level, former member of the Nazi Party Kurt Georg Kiesinger became the third chancellor of West Germany in 1963. In Munich, Bavarian Minister of Culture and Education Theodor Maunz in particular sparked debates. He had been professor of jurisprudence providing commentaries on National Socialist laws throughout the Nazi period. According to historian Dieter Deiseroth, such individuals at least indicated "a limited break with the fascist past."⁸³

Unwilling to accept such realities, the new generation found ways to respond: "It started harmlessly," activist Alois Aschenbrenner recalled. "For instance, wearing police uniforms ... to the university to then stand in front of the podium of two professors—[Prof. Reinhart] Maurach too, because he was an old fascist, a criminal law commentator, back in Hitler's times. We wanted to raise awareness regarding such unwillingness to deal with the past."⁸⁴ At the riots in Schwabing, some individuals had provoked the police yelling "Nazi state," "Gestapo," and "Nazi police."⁸⁵ Later, students would interrupt the commemoration for the resister Scholl siblings because they saw such an event as hypocrisy. According to an official report, students "disturbed the ceremony by dropping leaflets, uncoiling a banner with slogans like 'Nazis out,' 'Murderers celebrate their victims.' There were supposedly brawls. The demonstration ... was primarily aimed against speaker Prof. Buszmann and other professors ... because of their supposed National Socialist past."⁸⁶

Apart from discussing the Nazi past, student protests circled around numerous other issues. As historian Konrad Jarausch summarized in a broader context, student protests in general incorporated three dimensions: debates regarding student subculture, the improvement of educational opportunities, and political activism.⁸⁷ In the postwar period, opposition often arose within the context of West German rearmament, soon coordinated within annual Ostermärsche Easter marches.⁸⁸ In March 1964, for example, the *Kampagne für Demokratie und Abrüstung* (Campaign for Democracy and Disarmament) had organized a demonstration in Munich, titled “From Cologne to Warsaw: Nuclear-Weapon Free!”⁸⁹ Annual events grew dramatically by 1968⁹⁰ because of the need for education reform. In 1964, pedagogue George Picht had described this “misery of education” in great detail: a lack of facilities, teachers, and basic funding.⁹¹ Soon students began demanding more funding for institutions of higher education, direct input into university governance, and broader structural reforms. Also, as one young contemporary from Munich put it, “The indifference of the administration and senseless traditions”⁹² needed to go. Conservative contemporaries and authorities, on the other hand, feared leftist student groups undermining the university.⁹³ Hence, they tried to limit democratization throughout the university, pushing young protestors on the streets. In July 1965, “the largest demonstration in the postwar period”⁹⁴ took place in Munich when around 10,000 protestors demonstrated in favor of education reform.⁹⁵

International issues, most notably the War in Vietnam, fueled student opposition as well, especially once the conflict in Southeast Asia intensified. Two-thirds of the young were willing to take their protest to the streets,⁹⁶ namely in front of the U.S. consulate and the *Amerikahaus* in Munich.⁹⁷ Protestors repeatedly carried an effigy of U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson to highlight their opposition, participated in sit-ins in the middle of the street, or disrupted celebrations of German-American friendship.⁹⁸ At times, protests turned violent, as demonstrators threw rocks at U.S. institutions, or used a small rocket to drop leaflets over the McGraw barracks in Munich to encourage desertion among U.S. soldiers.⁹⁹ Aware of the American role as the guarantor of West German freedom within the Cold War, political authorities became worried. *The student's* anti-imperialist agenda became also visible during the brief visit of the Iranian shah in Munich in 1967. Protestors welcomed the shah with boos once he arrived at the central train station, and demonstrations and disruptions followed him to the National Theatre, the Old Art Gallery, and City Hall. The police tried to keep order in an attempt to prevent brawls between *the student* and an

accompanying group of shah supporters,¹⁰⁰ fearing further radicalization of *the student* and general disorder.

Soon embodying a complex mixture of antiestablishment characteristics, *the student* also became the symbol of anti-emergency law protests. According to the Germany Treaty from 1952, the United States, France, and Great Britain held the right to interfere in internal relations in case of an emergency. These rights would remain in place until the West German parliament passed adequate emergency laws.¹⁰¹ Since the late 1950s, the conservatives (CDU/CSU) led by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and later Ludwig Erhard had tried at various times to pass such laws. However, they needed the support of the social democrats (SPD) to get the two-thirds majority necessary to change the constitution. In the early 1960s, the SPD opposed various proposals, claiming such plans would restrict democratic processes and civil liberties. Soon discussions about the emergency laws faced a stalemate. In 1966, the CDU/CSU and the SPD then formed a Grand Coalition. As the first coalition between conservatives and social democrats in the Federal Republic, the Grand Coalition had a supermajority of 450 to 49 votes in parliament.¹⁰² Theoretically, this alliance was more than enough to get a two-thirds majority needed to change the constitution. As more serious conversations regarding emergency laws took shape, questions around a lack of oversight given the limits of parliamentary opposition and concerns around far-reaching emergency laws took shape, mostly outside traditional frameworks.

The leftist Socialist German Student Union (SDS) and the Campaign for Disarmament had increasingly coordinated such efforts, eventually formed the board Emergency of Democracy, and later aligned itself partially with the Außerparlamentarischen Opposition (Extraparliamentary Opposition, APO).¹⁰³ Initially, such organizations had been part of a student council, as each group was broadly aligned with a political party. There had been the Social Democratic University Group as well as a more conservative Munich Student Union.¹⁰⁴ Soon, however, various individuals formed alternative organizations, especially in Schwabing. The undogmatic and artistic group Subversive Action, for instance, met in a cellar. Here, they read and discussed Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Karl Marx, and others; their objective was to “expose societal repression.”¹⁰⁵ Regular participant Dieter Kunzelmann later became a founding member of the Kommune I in West Berlin, a politically motivated commune set up to provide an alternative to traditional middle-class family structures. Elsewhere, people simply discussed political issues in restaurants and bars. Many visited different groups each night, participated in debates, and networked. Accord-

ing to one contemporary, during the 1960s “a left subculture sprouted on every corner in Schwabing,”¹⁰⁶ outside traditional, hierarchical, and adult-approved organizations. Throughout West Germany, such groups often aligned themselves with the APO.¹⁰⁷ Sustained mainly by the Socialist Student Union (SDS), this Extraparliamentary Opposition has commonly been described as synonymous with the student movement.¹⁰⁸ Rather diverse throughout the years, the APO played a key role in Munich and gained broad support beyond students, mainly after the formation of the Grand Coalition in 1966 and the push for emergency laws. According to scholar Rolf Seeliger, an alienation from traditional parties was a major reason for the rise of the APO.¹⁰⁹ Soon local student groups like the SDS and the Humanist Union worked together, apparent in attempts to democratize the university. Events like “Democratic Action January 1968”¹¹⁰ and subsequent protests brought much attention, and some local politicians even joined calls for more democracy. Most political authorities, however, feared this extraparliamentary format. Bringing to mind attempts to push *the delinquent boy* into structured political setups during the crisis years, local politicians noted that protestors should join a traditional party. Such voices clearly favored structured political arrangements, perceived APO as an antiparliamentary force, and feared politically organized young people overall.

The Arrival of the Gammler

Adult authorities also worried about those youngsters simply dropping out of society altogether. A phenomenon soon embodied by *Gammler* bums, this image of youth disrupted class strata and traditional morals in the most visible form. Most came from middle-class backgrounds¹¹¹ yet chose to simply travel around Europe, bumming around Leopoldstraße boulevard in Schwabing, begging for money, sometimes playing protest songs, or painting on sidewalks¹¹² [Figure 5.2]. According to one contemporary description, *Gammler*

have messy hair and beards, [and] wear ragged and audacious clothes. The Gammler takes it easy, while leaning against walls or sitting on stairs. The Gammler is not walking but rambling, slouching, looking lost, worn out, disinterested. At night the Gammler is sleeping outside, in parks, in grit boxes, run-down cars, and unfinished buildings.... The Gammler is not interested in money or ownership, could be compared to the Greek philosopher Diogenes, just sitting in the sun, thinking and discussing with other Gammlers. They live for the moment.¹¹³



Figure 5.2 A group of so-called *Gammler* at the Monopteros monument in the English Garden park in Munich, 1968. Courtesy of Hans Enzwieser/Süddeutsche Zeitung Photo.

Similar behaviors had sparked the riots in 1962, thus making local authorities worried right away. In addition, officials feared Americanization, especially once hearing about similar situations in the United States. In June 1966, one Munich police official spent six weeks touring the United States, stopping in no less than seventeen cities. He concluded, “for the liberalization of our laws we have to pay a price. ... We need to put even more emphasis on preemptive measures, [and] ... attempts to influence the young have to be expanded. Additional means of control are necessary for Beatclubs, *Gammler*, and pseudo-artists.”¹¹⁴ Moreover, in a society valuing hard work, order, and discipline, the attitude and appearance of *the Gammler* marked “a crawling revolution,”¹¹⁵ and a threat to social order. References to National Socialism surfaced right away, as adults commented, “During Hitler’s times this would not have been possible”; another curious bystander called for forced labor,¹¹⁶ substantiating a survey conducted by the polling group Allensbach in 1968, in which more than 50 percent of those asked about *Gammler* wanted them sent to compulsory work camps.¹¹⁷ Comments about gassing these bums could be heard on the streets of Munich and elsewhere then and later on,¹¹⁸ and outline the presence of the Nazi past on street corners; such references also illustrate how youth yet again became a platform for talking about moral values, social norms, postwar order, and the past.

Again, the media and local authorities hyped the arrival of the protesting *student* and the noncompliant *Gammler* in Munich. Although a minority movement,¹¹⁹ vagrant and vagabonding youth soon dominated front pages. *Der Spiegel* as well as local newspapers widely discussed *the Gammler*.¹²⁰ In addition, authorities sustained such constructs. One member of the local city council stated that “445 out of 608 *Gammler* are under twenty-one years of age. These numbers indicate that such behavior was a problem of the young and not so much a societal problem.”¹²¹ Some local authorities saw such deviancy rooted in a feeling of adventure; others detected an unwillingness to conform, criminal energy, and even increased drug use.¹²² In fact, by 1965 an internal survey within the police revealed a growing criminalization of and discrimination against young people overall. Thirty-one percent of police officers saw *the student* as their enemies.¹²³ Historian Werner Linder described such profiling as an “unscrupulous *marginalization* and *criminalization* of these individuals.”¹²⁴ Speculations about alcohol, crime, sexual orgies, and venereal diseases, at times, accompanied these narratives. Some even wondered if *Gammlertum* or bumming around could lead to socialism, an interesting dynamic given that authorities in East Germany feared it could lead to capital-

ism. Described by one historian as “a provocation par excellence,”¹²⁵ connections to students became increasingly fluid. At the same time, fears regarding *the student* remained high, especially due to sensationalist reports. A caption in *Die Deutsche Nationalzeitung*, for instance, read “Stop [student leader] Dutschke now! Or there will be a civil war. Hunt Nazis—but flatter communists?” Below the headline, five images showed the student leader.¹²⁶ Rooted in fears regarding instability and communism, it was the Springer press in particular that became a supporter of conservative policies. Springer was the most powerful press conglomerate in West Germany, publishing newspapers like *Die Welt* and *Die Bildzeitung*. For *the student*, noted one historian, “the Springer press symbolized everything that was wrong with society: inadequate engagement with the Nazi past, the authoritarianism and lack of democracy, and the pervasive influence of anticommunism.”¹²⁷

Again, a binary emerged, pitting two groups against each other along age or generation. On one side, there were adult authorities, more conservative in their values, and in favor of social order, traditional morality, and structured political processes. On the other side, there was *the student* and *the Gammler*: mainly young, middle-class males, and their female companions, disruptive to political order. As one contemporary summarized, when adults talked to the *Gammler* in Munich, then “two opposites meet: the bourgeoisie owners against those without ownership, the clean against the unclean, the working against those dismissing work.”¹²⁸ This atmosphere left little space for complexities or even conversation between both groups, and put Munich arguably on a path towards its most violent postwar protests yet.

1968 in Munich

The visit of the shah in Munich marked the beginning of further escalation, triggered by events in West Berlin. After a brief visit in the Bavarian capital, the shah and his wife faced demonstrators at West Berlin’s city hall on 2 June. In contrast to Munich, the local police did not separate supporters of the Iranian leader and protestors. Instead, it stood by as followers of Shah Pahlavi used sticks to beat demonstrators and bystanders alike. Chaos ensued, and the situation escalated as undercover policeman Karl-Heinz Kurras shot twenty-six-year-old Benno Ohnesorg.¹²⁹ News of Ohnesorg’s death spread quickly, reaching Munich in an instant. Three days later, about seven thousand demonstrators marched silently through the city, some with signs reading “Benno Ohnesorg, Political Murder”; protestors lay down a wreath at a

memorial at the square in Remembrance of the Victims of Fascism,¹³⁰ illustrating their interpretation of events. In the following months, the death of Ohnesorg created a tense and volatile situation within the Bavarian capital. Closely linked with the situation in West Berlin, many followed the trial against Kurras. He was acquitted several months later, raising fears amongst Munich's authorities in regard to retaliation from *the student*. Demonstrations continued, while inciting remarks by local Munich authorities that students were "stupid and primitive"¹³¹ hardly served to soothe tensions.

Several months later, tensions in West Berlin again triggered protests in the Bavarian capital. In spring 1968, Josef Bachmann tried to kill student leader Rudi Dutschke. On 11 April, Bachmann approached Dutschke outside a pharmacy. Once the student leader confirmed his identity, Bachmann shot him three times.¹³² Again, news spread quickly to Munich and elsewhere.¹³³ Whereas Dutschke survived the attack, many blamed a larger media campaign against *the student* for the assassination attempt. Publicist Axel Springer in particular became the target of protestors, together with conservative and reactionary voices.¹³⁴ As then student Hanfried Brenner recalled later, "Of course we became active right away, ... and mobilized Schwabing."¹³⁵ The official reaction by Chancellor Kiesinger and others did little to abate such anger.¹³⁶ Indeed, conservative Bavarian politician Franz-Josef Strauß stated, "with these scoundrels there is nothing to talk about; every word is wasted on them."¹³⁷ For him, Munich and the Federal Republic tumbled towards another unstable Weimar Republic.

The fears of authorities materialized soon thereafter, as protests took place throughout Munich. Already at the night of the assassination attempt, roughly 200 to 300 "mostly younger people"¹³⁸ marched from the university to the office building of Springer Publishing, the Buchgewerbehaus building. As participating protestors remembered, the police were not prepared for such demonstrations.¹³⁹ Soon some protestors climbed on the roof, destroyed windows, and tagged walls. One slogan read "Murder, Springer"; another banner recalled the names of the victims, "Ohnesorg, Dutschke."¹⁴⁰ Groups of protestors yelled, "Today Dutschke, Tomorrow Us!" and "Springer, Murder!"¹⁴¹ Around 1:00 A.M., some demonstrators entered the building and engaged workers in discussions in an attempt to convince them to join protests. As one protestor noted, "it was no problem getting into the building."¹⁴²

Once able to clear the situation and disperse the crowd, local law enforcement made sure it would not be caught by surprise again. As a result, authorities began closely monitoring *the student* around Schwabing throughout the next days. Officials hence noticed the dis-

tribution of leaflets calling for “the seizure of the Buchgewerbehaus building in Munich”;¹⁴³ protestors also “planned to prevent the delivery of the daily tabloid *Die Bildzeitung*,” a Springer publication.¹⁴⁴ Increasingly losing the advantage of surprise, roughly three hundred protestors showed up at the Buchgewerbehaus building the next evening. Again, according to official records, “Some demonstrators tried to get into the building. [This time] police officers positioned within the area prevented such [efforts].”¹⁴⁵ Around 8 P.M. that evening, the police called on protestors to clear the access road. Eventually, law enforcement moved forward, using water cannons. A group of six protestors, seemingly directing the riots from their white Chevrolet car nearby, were soon soaked by those water cannons.¹⁴⁶ Demonstrators responded by throwing rocks. A chaotic scene developed: many protestors resisted, while others merely continued to discuss current political issues with police officers. The police followed their newly developed police tactic and tried to avoid direct involvement. By midnight the majority of the demonstrators had dispersed and authorities began clearing the road to allow the free flow of traffic and with that the delivery of Springer newspapers.

After days of protests throughout the Easter weekend, the situation at last escalated on 15 April. Following a longstanding tradition, a diverse group of protestors joined the Easter march taking place that day. Inspired by the events in West Berlin, the march brought more people together than ever before. Throughout West Germany, roughly 300,000 people protested. Some carried signs; others simply came along in an attempt to demonstrate against the emergency laws, war, or the Springer press. In 1968, many also showed their sympathy for Rudi Dutschke.¹⁴⁷ After an initial gathering and various speeches, roughly 1,500 protestors marched to the Buchgewerbehaus building.¹⁴⁸ Again, some began blocking the entrance with various objects, hoping to prevent the delivery of newspapers; some also sat in the middle of the street. This time the police moved forward with less restraint, especially when protestors threw rocks. At least sixteen people were injured;¹⁴⁹ two individuals—young journalist Klaus Frings and student Rüdiger Schreck—were hit by an object and died in the hospital.¹⁵⁰ The protests in Munich had reached a sad climax.

In the months following the death of Frings and Schreck, the situation calmed down as local authorities and protestors began evaluating the overall events.¹⁵¹ An official report surfacing in early September blamed various student organizations and *the student* more directly; it also gave a profile of offenders based on gender, family status, age, and profession. According to this, 219 protestors had been originally

indicted, only twenty-one of them female. More than 75 percent of all were between eighteen and twenty-nine years of age; a majority were unmarried male youngsters. Only 33 percent of arrested protesters were enrolled at the university, and thus actual students.¹⁵² That aspect, however, seemingly bothered no one given the power of *the student* as the contemporary construct of youth during the protest years. Protestors took a step back as well, rethinking what had happened. On 17 April, AStA organized an event, in which a group of demonstrators marched to the Königsplatz square in downtown Munich, rallying around the slogan, “Against political murder, terror, violence, and anarchy.” Many carried signs reading “Terror neither from the right nor from the left!,” “One death is enough,” and “Rocks are no political arguments.”¹⁵³ Subsequent discussions among participants and bystanders about the question who was at fault for the two deaths continued long into the night. Although between thirty and eighty individuals walked over to the Buchgewerbehau building, that day the police did not have to intervene. A similar demonstration took place six days later. Following the motto “Is there a new beginning?”¹⁵⁴ roughly six thousand participated. Again, politicians from all major parties as well as student leaders from several organizations spoke at the Königsplatz square.¹⁵⁵ The situation seemingly calmed down, and conversations between various sides became a possibility.

The eventual return of harsh rhetoric indicated the continuing power of *the student* as a discourse. Voices in the media and responses of protesters, at times, continued to paint a grim picture. In fact, a reporter for *Der Bayerische Rundfunk* radio compared student leaders to monks during the inquisition;¹⁵⁶ the ultraconservative newspaper *Christ und die Welt* even saw *the student* on the way towards becoming asocial, and warned of “a dangerous path from opposition to isolation to antisociality.”¹⁵⁷ Student organizations like the SDS, on the other hand, did not fully dismiss violence as a legitimate means of politics. For them, the events in West Berlin had only sustained fears of a totalitarian state. As one participant noted, “We do not act according to Gandhi, but according to Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Mao.”¹⁵⁸ Nonetheless, protests against the emergency laws in May 1968 remained mostly nonviolent [Figure 5.3]. On 20 May, for example, roughly 2,500 marched to the main office of local labor unions, hoping to convince workers to join their movement.¹⁵⁹ Yet the Easter riots had deterred many, limiting the appeal of the protests. Several days later, protesters tried to politicize the public by disrupting a theater performance with “emergency-go-ins.”¹⁶⁰ They had little success. Other demonstra-



Figure 5.3 Students protest against the Emergency Laws at Stachus square in Munich, 1968. Courtesy of Marlies Schnetzer/Süddeutsche Zeitung Photo.

tions and actions followed, and, according to Police Chief Manfred Schreiber, “demonstrations continued without major disruptions.”¹⁶¹

Whereas the overall appeal of the protest movement appeared to decline in the coming weeks, minor skirmishes continued. In May 1968, the emergency laws passed in the German Bundestag; a year later, higher education reform also moved through the legislature. At that point, it became more difficult for protestors to rally behind various issues. Yet even beforehand many individuals had withdrawn their support, especially once they saw the violence in April and the unwillingness of some leaders to condemn it altogether. Soon former protest leaders left certain organizations, or radicalized even more. AStA leader Rolf Pohle joined the newly forming left-wing terrorist group, the Red Army Faction (RAF).¹⁶² Actions continued beyond 1969, however.¹⁶³ In February protestors occupied Munich’s Academy for the Arts to protest against conservative elites, the old establishment, and the proposed university reform.¹⁶⁴ Some occupiers wrote slogans on walls reading, “SS-University” or “Nazi-Kiesinger”¹⁶⁵ to illustrate their protests; others set up a motorbike race within the building as a way to provoke the state legislature.¹⁶⁶ Of course, that race in particular, com-

bined with some other behaviors, made it much easier for authorities to frame this occupation as vandalism. Minister for Culture and Education Ludwig Huber had consequently little difficulty convincing a majority in parliament to end the rule of the mob.

It took a couple more years until *the student* left the limelight altogether. This had to do particularly with the fact that some local authorities tried to hold on to this image of youth as long as possible. In a memorandum regarding “the interference of teaching and research ... by disturbances of students,”¹⁶⁷ one professor tried to resurrect fears. Whereas he acknowledged that the situation in 1969 did not compare to that of 1968, the memorandum outlined a lack of publicity regarding ongoing disturbances. Away from the public sphere, students now used what he described as “guerrilla war” tactics: “The university is helpless ... within this grueling war of nerves.”¹⁶⁸ Yet the lack of major issues of contestation and the end of the Grand Coalition left less room for such voices to be heard. In June 1970, *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung* could thus report on the “disarmament of the Easter marchers”¹⁶⁹ already even if authorities continued to reference and employ *the student* until 1973.

Notes

1. “In Schwabing ist der Teufel los,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 25 June 1962.
2. *Ibid.*
3. “Was halten Sie von den Krawallen?” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 26 June 1962.
4. According to Hanna Schissler, these protests “fundamentally questioned West German ‘normality.’” Schissler, “‘Normalization’ as Project,” 361, in *Miracle Years*.
5. Kock, *Der Bayerische Landtag 1946–1986*, 182. See also: Fritz Allemann, *Bonn ist nicht Weimar* (Cologne, 1956); “Wird Bonn doch Weimar?” *Der Spiegel*, 13 March 1967.
6. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 278.
7. In the winter semester 1962/63, Munich registered 20,032 students. Bay-HStAM, Staatskanzlei 13619. See also: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, ed., *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München* (Neukeferloh/Munich, 2001). The numbers increased dramatically in the following years, reaching more than 30,000 by 1968. See: Manfred Schreiber, “Das Jahr 1968 in München,” in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, ed. Venanz Schubert (St. Ottilien, 1999), 35–54, here 41.
8. Ernst Hofenrichter, “Unsterbliches Schwabing,” in *Lebendiges Schwabing*, ed. Rolf Flügel (Munich, 1958), 218–30, here 218; Franziska Bilek, *Mir gefällt’s in München: Ein Geständnis in Bildern und Worten* (Munich, 1958); Fricke, *München rockt*.

9. Stefan Hemler, "Aufbegehren einer Jugendszene: Protestbeteiligte, Verlauf und Aktionsmuster bei den 'Schwabinger Krawallen,'" in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 25–57, here 27. See also: StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129.
10. Michael Sturm, "'Wildgewordene Obrigkeit'? Die Rolle der Münchner Polizei während der 'Schwabinger Krawalle,'" in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 59–105, here 60. See also: Anton Fingerle, *München: Heimat und Weltstadt* (Munich, 1963).
11. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11131; StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129. See also: *Information des AStA der Universität München*, "Studentenkrawalle: Jazz in der Uni," 18 June 1961; Sturm, "Wildgewordene Obrigkeit," in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 62.
12. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129. See also: StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11131.
13. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129.
14. Bernd Drost, prod., *Gestern und Heute: 'Schwabinger Krawalle'* (Munich, 1990); Oktavia Depta, prod., *Wolfram Kunkel und die Schwabinger Krawalle* (Munich, 2009).
15. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11131.
16. Gerhard Fürmetz, "Fünf Protestnächte mit weitreichenden Folgen: Die 'Schwabinger Krawalle' vom Juni 1962," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 71–79, here 71.
17. *Ibid.* See also: BayHStAM, MJu 24032, quoted in Hemler, "Aufbegehren einer Jugendszene," in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 47–48; Max Thomas Mehr, ed., *Drachen mit tausend Köpfen: Spaziergänge durch linkes und alternatives Milieu* (Neuwied/Darmstadt, 1982), 53–58; Fritz Fenzl, *Münchner Stadtgeschichte* (Munich, 1994), 238–41; Geschichtswerkstatt Neuhausen, *Vom Rio zum Kolobri*, 155–56; Michael Farin, ed., *Polizeireport München 1799–1999* (Munich, 1999), 392; Fricke, *München rockt*, 12–14.
18. Hans-Jochen Vogel, *Die Amtskette: Meine 12 Münchner Jahre* (Munich, 1972), 45–46. See also: StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129.
19. Fürmetz, "Anwalt der Jugend," 146, in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*.
20. *Ibid.*, 147.
21. "Gaudi und Rowdy," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 23–24 June 1962. See also: "Das ist kein Spaß mehr!" *Der Münchner Merkur*, 25 June 1962; "Nächtlicher Krawall in der Leopoldstraße," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 23–24 June 1962. *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung* described the events in a similar fashion: "Treibjagd auf die Rowdys," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 27 June 1962; "Aufstand der Massen in Schwabing," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 23–24 June 1962.
22. "Was halten sie von den Krawallen?" *Der Münchner Merkur*, 26 June 1962.
23. *8-Uhr Blatt*, 23 June 1962, quoted in Andreas Voith, "'Tanz der Gummiknüppel' und andere Sensationen: Zur Presseberichterstattung über die 'Schwabinger Krawalle,'" in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 107–123, here 111.
24. *Ibid.* See also: "Riesenkrawall in Schwabing," *Abendzeitung-Nachtausgabe*, 22 June 1962;
25. "Schwabinger Ungeist 62," *8-Uhr Blatt*, 24 June 1962.

26. "In München ging ein unrühmliches Kapitel zu Ende," *8-Uhr Blatt*, 30 June 1962.
27. "Für uns war es jedesmal eine Erlösung," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 7–8 July 1962.
28. "Nacht für Nacht: Tumulte in Schwabing," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 June 1962.
29. Seelmann-Bericht, quoted in Fürmetz, "Anwalt der Jugend," in '*Schwabinger Krawalle*', 141–50. See also: "Krawalle im Meinungsstreit," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 29 June 1962.
30. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129.
31. BayHStAM, Ministerium des Inneren 97954.
32. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129.
33. BayHStAM, Ministerium des Inneren 97954.
34. Karsten Peters, ed., '*1200 Jahre Schwabing: Geschichte und Geschichten eines berühmten Stadtviertels*' (Munich-Gräfelfing, 1982), 126. See also: Diethart Krebs, "Zur Geschichte und Gestalt der deutschen Jungenschaft," *Neue Sammlung* 6 (1966): 146–70, here 152–62.
35. Depta, prod., *Wolfram Kunkel und die Schwabinger Krawalle*.
36. BayHStAM, 97954.
37. See, for instance: "Im Rathaus: Ruhe nach dem Sturm," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 28 June 1962; "Die erste Nacht ohne Krawall," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 28 June 1962.
38. Fürmetz, "Fünf Protestnächte mit weitreichenden Folgen: Die 'Schwabinger Krawalle' vom Juni 1962," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 71–79, here 71.
39. The fact that East German reporters discussed the events in Schwabing and even sent journalists to Munich increased fears. "So blässt man ungewollt in Ulbrichts Horn," *Der Bayernspiegel*, 3 July 1962.
40. Julius Schittenhelm, in *München rockt*, 13. See also: BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13612; StAM, RA 101155.
41. Sturm, "Wildgewordene Obrigkeit?" in '*Schwabinger Krawalle*', 76.
42. Dieter Kunzelmann, *Leisten sie keinen Widerstand! Bilder aus meinem Leben* (Berlin, 1998), 36. See also: Stefan Hemler, "'Nicht aus dem Haus gegangen:' Die 'Subversiven' und die 'Schwabinger Krawalle,'" in '*Schwabinger Krawalle*', 173–74.
43. Kunzelmann, *Leisten sie keinen Widerstand*, 37.
44. Bundesarchiv Koblenz (BundAK), Stammheim-Akten, Band 6, quoted in Klaus Stern and Jörg Herrmann, *Andreas Baader: Das Leben eines Staatsfeindes* (Munich, 2007), 44.
45. *Ibid.*, 49. According to this biography, Baader's "career as a protestor began at that date [26 June 1962, in Schwabing]." *Ibid.*, 43.
46. A group called Provisional Committee in Defense of Democratic Rights in Schwabing planned a meeting on 26 June 1962 at the Monopteros monument at the English Garden Park. 250 people showed up. Participants discussed the events before dispersing. BayHStAM, Ministerium des Inneren 97954; "Die fünfte Krawallnacht," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 27 June 1962.
47. StadtAM, Ratsitzungsprotokolle, Sitzungsprotokoll 735/16 (1962). See also: StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11132; Esther Arens, "Lektion in Demokratie: Die 'Schwabinger Krawalle' und die Münchner 'Interessen-

- gemeinschaft zur Wahrung der Bürgerrechte,' in 'Schwabinger Krawalle', 125–40, here 127.
48. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 9049 (Flugblatt zur Untersuchung der Polizei).
 49. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11132.
 50. "Im Waffenlärm," *profil*, no. 3 (May 1963). See also: Arens, "Lektion in Demokratie," in 'Schwabinger Krawalle', 137.
 51. "ASTa distanziert sich," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 26 June 1962.
 52. "Es waren keine Studentenunruhen," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 3 September 1962.
 53. "Studentenschaft und die Schwabinger Krawalle," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 5 July 1962.
 54. "Gegen diese Willkür mußt du demonstrieren!" *Welt am Sonntag*, 1 July 1962.
 55. Helmut Schelsky, *Die skeptische Generation: Eine Soziologie der deutschen Jugend* (Düsseldorf, 1957).
 56. "Übertriebene Generation," *Der Spiegel*, 2 October 1967.
 57. Ibid. Henning Wrage writes about the commercialization, referencing the lemonade *Bluna*. Wrage, "Neue Jugend: Einleitung," in *Handbuch Nachkriegskultur*, 650. See also: Axel Schildt and Detlef Siegfried, eds, *Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980* (New York, 2006). The concept of generations remains methodologically "slippery" but useful when tracing new constructs. Stephen Lovell, "Introduction," in *Generations in Twentieth-Century Europe*, ed. Stephen Lovell (New York, 2007), 9; Jarausch, *After Hitler*, 164.
 58. "Übertrieben Generation," *Der Spiegel*, 2 October 1967.
 59. Ibid.
 60. Harald Lönnecker, "Studenten und Gesellschaft, Studenten in der Gesellschaft: Versuch eines Überblicks seit Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Universität im öffentlichen Raum*, ed. Rainer Christoph Schwinges (Basel, 2008), 387–438. See also: Lindner, *Jugendproteste seit den fünfziger Jahren*, 106–16.
 61. Frick, *München rockt*, 39–41.
 62. "Schalom aleichem," *Der Spiegel*, 19 September 1966.
 63. Lönnecker, "Studenten und Gesellschaft: Studenten in der Gesellschaft," 387–390.
 64. Hemler, "Aufbegehren einer Jugendszene," in 'Schwabinger Krawalle', 29.
 65. Kristin Ross, *May '68 and Its Afterlives* (Chicago, 2002), 2–3. George Lipitz notes in a similar context, "youth activists did play an important role in the political struggles of the decade, but they represented specific interest groups and constituencies among youth, not youth as a whole." Georg Lipitz, "Who'll Stop the Rain? Youth Culture, Rock 'n' Roll, and Social Crisis," in *The Sixties: From Memory to History*, ed. David R. Farber (Chapel Hill, 1994), 206–34, here 206.
 66. Hemler, "Aufbegehren einer Jugendszene," in 'Schwabinger Krawalle', 27.
 67. "Alles Material übergeben," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 29 April 1968.
 68. Sturm, "Wildgewordene Obrigkeit," in 'Schwabinger Krawalle', 79. See also: Karl Stankiewicz, *München '68: Traumstadt in Bewegung* (Munich, 2008). 24.

69. McDougall, *Youth Politics in East Germany*, 191.
70. BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 11129. See also: Hemler, "Aufbegehren einer Jugendszene," in Fürmetz, ed., *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 29.
71. "Schalom aleichem," *Der Spiegel*, 19 September 1966. See also: Ute Frevert, "Umbruch der Geschlechterverhältnisse? Die 60er Jahre als geschlechts-politischer Experimentierraum," 642–60, in *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften*, ed. Axel Schildt and Detlef Siegfried (Hamburg, 2000).
72. Inga Buhmann, *Ich habe mir eine Geschichte geschrieben* (Munich, 1977), 164.
73. Kristina Schulz, *Der lange Atem der Provokation: Die Frauenbewegung in der Bundesrepublik und in Frankreich 1968–1976* (Frankfurt am Main, 2002), 78.
74. "In München ging ein unrühmliches Kapitel zu Ende," *8-Uhr Blatt*, 30 June 1962.
75. Gretchen Dutschke-Klotz, *Wir hatten ein barbarisch schönes Leben. Rudi Dutschke: Eine Biographie* (Cologne, 1996), 81. See also: Marita Krauss, "1968 und die Frauenbewegung," in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, 133–62, here 146.
76. "Die rosa Zeiten sind vorbei," *Der Spiegel*, 25 November 1968.
77. Buhmann, *Ich habe mir eine Geschichte geschrieben*, 164.
78. See namely: Krauss, "1968 und die Frauenbewegung," in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*.
79. Gerl-Falkovitz, "Milde Verklärung? Erlebnisse als Studentin '68," in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, 60. See also: Marion Grob, *Das Kleidungsverhalten jugendlicher Protestgruppen im 20. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des Wandervogels und der Studentenbewegung* (Münster, 1985), 224–309; Sabine Weißler, "Unklare Verhältnisse: 1968 und die Mode," in *1968: Handbuch zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Studentenbewegung*, ed. Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (Stuttgart, 2007), 305–10.
80. Studentenwerk München, ed., *'Wo geht's hier zum Studentenhaus?' 75 Jahre Studentenwerk München* (Munich, 1995), 44. See also: Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz, "Milde Verklärung? Erlebnisse als Studentin '68," in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, 55–69, here 59; Günter Gerstenberg, *Hiebe, Liebe und Proteste: München 1968* (Munich, 1991), 9.
81. Konrad Jarausch, *Deutsche Studenten 1800–1970* (Frankfurt am Main, 1984).
82. "OB Dr. Vogel beging 'Landfriedensbruch,'" *8-Uhr Blatt*, 28 July 1962.
83. Dieter Deiseroth, "Kontinuitätsprobleme der deutschen Staatsrechtslehre(r): Das Beispiel Theodor Maunz," in *Ordnungsmacht? Über das Verhältnis von Legalität, Konsens und Herrschaft*, ed. Dieter Deiseroth, Friedhelm Hase, and Karl-Heinz Ladeur (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), 85–111, here 103. See also: "Aufgeblickt, himmlische Herrscharen," *Der Spiegel*, 4 December 1967; "Diese Herren," *Der Spiegel*, 19 February 1968.
84. Alois Aschenbrenner, quoted in Bayerischer Rundfunk, *Die 68er–40 Jahre danach*, accessible at <http://archive.is/005H6>, [last accessed 11 March 2014].

85. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11131; StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11129. See also: "Das ist kein Spass mehr!" *Der Münchner Merkur*, 25 June 1962.
86. StAM, RA 101154. See also: "Zwischenfälle bei Gedenkstunde für die Weiße Rose," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 24–25 February 1968; "Die Leitbilder der Geschwister Scholl," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 2–3 March 1968.
87. Jaraus, *Deutsche Studenten*, 9. As Jaraus underlines, the term *student* often carries a negative connotation.
88. Karl Otto, *Vom Ostermarsch zur APO: Geschichte der außerparlamentarischen Opposition in der Bundesrepublik 1960–1970* (Frankfurt am Main, 1977); Hans Konrad Tempel and Helga Tempel, "Ostermärsche gegen den Atomtod," 11–14, in *30 Jahre Ostermarsch: Ein Beitrag zur politischen Kultur der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und ein Stück Bremer Stadtgeschichte*, ed. Christoph Butterwegge (Bremen, 1990).
89. StadtAM, Zeitgeschichtliche Sammlung 190/5 quoted in Protest Chronicle Munich (1964), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2014]. See also: "Studenten gegen Atomrüstung," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 21 May 1958; "Drei Tage nächtlicher Protest der Studenten," *8-Uhr Blatt*, 23 June 1958; "Schweigemarsch der Studenten," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 19 May 1958; "Schwache Teilnahme an den Ostermärschen," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 4 April 1961; "Sie kämpfen gegen die Atombombe," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 24 April 1962.
90. "Ostermaschierer rufen zu Aktionen auf," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 April 1968; StadtAM, Zeitungsarchiv 178.
91. George Picht, *Die deutsche Bildungskatastrophe: Analyse und Dokumentation* (Olten, 1964). See also: Jürgen Habermas, *Protestbewegung und Hochschulreform* (Frankfurt am Main, 1969); Ernst Nolte, *Sinn und Widersinn der Demokratisierung der Universität* (Freiburg, 1968).
92. Fricke, *München rockt*, 67.
93. Hans Julius Schoeps and Christoph Dannenmann, eds., *Die rebellischen Studenten: Elite der Demokratie oder Vorhut eines linken Faschismus?* (Munich/Esslingen am Neckar, 1968).
94. "Studenten demonstrieren für bessere Bildungschancen," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 2 July 1965. See also: "Studentendemonstration," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 24 June 1965; "Konvent der Uni München kritisiert den Bundeskanzler," *Die Abendzeitung*, 9 July 1965; "Studenten gehen auf die Barrikaden," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 25 June 1965; "Priorität für Bildungspolitik," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 1–2 July 1967; "Bildungspolitik mit Provinz-Niveau," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 3 July 1967; Dollinger, *München im 20. Jahrhundert*, 275.
95. "10,000 Studenten demonstrierten gestern in München," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 2 July 1965.
96. "Zwei Drittel zum Protest bereit," *Der Spiegel*, 19 February 1968. See also: "Diesen Krieg kann niemand gewinnen," *Der Spiegel*, 4 March 1968; "Bereit, auf die Straße zu gehen," *Der Spiegel*, 12 February 1968; Eckhard Siepmann, "Vietnam: Der große Katalysator," in *CheSchahShit: Die Sechziger Jahre zwischen Cocktail und Molotow*, ed. Eckhard Siepmann (Berlin, 1984), 125–27.

97. "Antiamerikanische Demonstration von Polizei in München aufgelöst," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 28 May 1965; "Zwei Demonstranten mit Transparenten verhaftet," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 27 July 1965; "Verwarnung wegen Auflauf," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 10 November 1965; "Demonstranten gegen den Vietnam-Krieg," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 February 1966.
98. dpa-Foto, Fotomuseum, quoted in Protest Chronicle Munich (1965), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2015]. See also: StadAM, Stadtchronik (1968); StAM, RA 101154.
99. StadAM, Stadtchronik (1968); BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13619. See also: Protest Chronicle Munich (1968), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2015]; "Aufruf zur Desertation war vergeblich," *Die Abendzeitung*, 9 May 1968; "Vietkong-Fahne vor US-Kaserne," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 9 May 1968; "Parolen gegen den Vietnam-Krieg," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 9 May 1968.
100. BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13617; Protest Chronicle Munich (1967), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2015]; *Der Münchner Merkur*, quoted in "Sanfte Polizei Welle," *Der Spiegel*, 19 June 1967. See also: Dollinger, *München im 20. Jahrhundert*, 284.
101. The Germany Treaty (*Deutschlandvertrag*) was signed on 26 May 1952. Several changes make the version from 23 October 1954 the basis for further discussions. Accessible at <http://www.documentarchiv.de/brd/dtlvertrag.html>, [last accessed 11 March 2014].
102. Joachim Eichhorn, *Durch alle Klippen hindurch zum Erfolg: Die Regierungspraxis der ersten Großen Koalition (1966–1969)* (Munich, 2009).
103. The Socialist German Student Union (Sozialistischer Studentenbund, SDS) was initially the student organization of the social democrats (SPD). By 1961, it split with the party. See, for instance: Tilman Fichter and Siegwand Lönnendonker, *Macht und Ohnmacht der Studenten: Kleine Geschichte des SDS* (Hamburg, 1998), 45–91; Willy Albrecht, *Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund (SDS): Vom parteikonformen Studentenverband zum Repräsentanten der neuen Linken* (Bonn, 1994).
104. Other main groups included: GAST (Gewerkschaftlicher Arbeitskreis der Studenten) and the LSD (Liberale Studenten Deutschlands). See mainly: Stefan Hemler, "Wie die 68er-Revolution eines ihrer liberalen Kinder fraß: Eine kurze Geschichte der Humanistischen Studenten-Union, erzählt am Beispiel Münchens," *Vorgänge. Zeitschrift für Bürgerrechte und Gesellschaftspolitik* 40, no. 155 (2001): 49–61.
105. Alexander Holmig, "Die aktionistischen Wurzeln der Studentenbewegung: Subversive Aktion, Kommune I und die Neudefinition des Politischen," in 1968: *Handbuch zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Studentenbewegung*, 107–88, here 107. See also: Kunzelmann, *Leisten Sie keinen Widerstand!*; Wolfgang Dressen, Dieter Kunzelmann, and Eckhard Siepmann, *Nilpferd des höllischen Urwalds: Spuren in eine unbekannt Stadt: Situationisten, Gruppe SPUR, Kommune 1* (Giessen, 1991); Aribert Reimann, *Dieter Kunzelmann: Avantgardist, Protestler, Radikaler* (Göttingen, 2009), 43–122.
106. Fricke, *München rockt*, 76.

107. Hemler, "Von Kurt Faltlhauser zu Rolf Pohle," in Schubert, ed., *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, 209–42; Hemler, "Wie die 68er-Revolte eines ihrer liberalen Kinder fraß."
108. Pavel Richter, "Die Außerparlamentarische Opposition in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1966 bis 1968," 35–55, here 37, in *1968: Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft*, ed. Ingrid Glicher-Holtey (Göttingen, 1998); Gerhard Bauß, *Die Studentenbewegung der sechziger Jahre in der Bundesrepublik und West Berlin* (Cologne, 1977); Rob Burns and Wilfried van der Will, *Protest and Democracy in West Germany: Extra-Parliamentary Opposition and the Democratic Agenda* (London, 1988); Hans Dollinger, ed., *Revolution gegen der Staat? Die außerparlamentarische Opposition: Die neue Linke* (Bern, 1968); Karl Otto, ed., *APÖ: Außerparlamentarische Opposition in Quellen und Dokumenten (1960–1970)* (Cologne, 1989).
109. Rolf Seeliger, *Die außerparlamentarische Opposition* (Munich, 1968). See also: Stankiewitz, *München '68*, 21–22.
110. StadtAM, *Stadtchronik* (1968); Stankiewitz, *München '68*, 21. See also: *Protest Chronicle Munich* (1968), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 10 March 2015].
111. StAM, *Polizeidirektion München 15622*. See also: "Schalom aleichem," *Der Spiegel*, 19 September 1966.
112. Else Pelke, *Protestformen der Jugend: Über Beatniks, Gammler, Provos und Hippies* (Donauwörth, 1969); Klaus Weinhauer, "Eliten, Generationen, Jugenddelinquenz und innere Sicherheit: Die 1960er Jahre und frühen 1970er Jahre in der Bundesrepublik," in *Recht und Justiz im gesellschaftlichen Aufbruch (1960–1975): Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Italien und Frankreich im Vergleich*, ed. Jörg Requate (Baden-Baden, 2003), 33–58, here 49. See also: Herbert Reinke, "'Leute mit Namen': Wohlstandskriminelle, Gammler und Andere," 539–553, here 550, in *Repräsentationen und Diskurse vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Karl Härter, Gerhard Sälter, and Eva Wiebel (Frankfurt am Main, 2010). *The Gammler* also had a prehistory, an aspect noted by various scholars. See, for example: Walter Hollstein, "Gammler und Provos," *Frankfurter Hefte* 22 (1967): 409–10.
113. Pelke, *Protestformen der Jugend*, 8.
114. Manfred Schreiber, quoted in Falter, *Chronik des Polizeipräsidiums München*, 169.
115. Hollstein, "Gammler und Provos," 414; Margaret Kosel, *Gammler, Beatniks, Provos: Die schleichende Revolution* (Frankfurt am Main, 1967). See also: Walter Hollstein, "Hippies im Wandel," *Frankfurter Hefte* 23 (1968): 637–46.
116. Peter Fleischmann, prod., *Herbst der Gammler* (Munich, 1967). See also: M. F., "Keine Toleranz für Gammler?" *Deutsche Jugend* 16 (1968): 93–94.
117. Weinhauer, "Eliten, Generation, Jugenddelinquenz und innere Sicherheit," 49.
118. Fleischmann, prod., *Herbst der Gammler*. For similar discussions around punks elsewhere see, for example: Mike Dennis and Norman LaPorte, *State and Minorities in Communist East Germany* (New York, 2011), 165.

119. Kosel, *Gammler, Beatniks, Provos*, 10.
120. "Schalom Aleichem," *Der Spiegel*, 19 September 1966.
121. StadtAM, Ratsitzungsprotokolle, Sitzungsprotokoll 741/13 (1968). See also: StAM, Polizeidirektion München 15622.
122. Walter Becker, *Jugend in der Rauschgiftwelle* (Hamm, 1968); Hans Böttcher, *Sind Gammler Ganoven? Einige Auffälligkeiten und Anfälligkeiten der heutigen Jugend* (Gladbeck/Westfalen, 1968); Hollstein, "Hippies im Wandel," 641; Bernd Werse, *Cannabis in Jugendkulturen. Kulturhistorische Betrachtungen zum Symbolcharakter eines Rauschmittels* (Berlin, 2007), 190–200. See also: Robert Stephens, *Germans on Drugs: The Complications of Modernization in Hamburg* (Ann Arbor, 2007), 20–21. For discussions in Munich see: Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz, "Milde Verklärung?" in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*; BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13617; Schreiber, "Das Jahre 1968 in München," in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*; Vogel, *Die Amtskette*, 179–80; Stankiewicz, *München '68*.
123. Sturm, "'Wildgewordene Obrigkeit?'" in *'Schwabinger Krawalle'*, 104.
124. Lindner, *Jugendprotest seit den fünfziger Jahren*, 87.
125. Reinke, "'Leute mit Namen,'" 550. See also: "Schwabinger Tragikomödie," *Bayerische Staatszeitung*, 29 June 1962; BayHStAM, Ministerium des Inneren 97954.
126. "Stoppt Dutschke jetzt!" *Die Deutsche Nationalzeitung*, 22 March 1968.
127. Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, "Introduction," in *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge, 1993), 1–27, here 12.
128. Kosel, *Gammler, Beatniks, Provos*, 10.
129. "Schah-Reise," *Der Spiegel*, 31 July 1967; "Tod vor der Oper," *Der Spiegel*, 5 June 1967; "Knüppel frei," *Der Spiegel*, 12 June 1967; "Haß in der Mitte," *Der Spiegel*, 19 June 1967; Knut Nevermann, ed., *Der 2. Juni 1967: Studenten zwischen Notstand und Demokratie* (Cologne, 1967); Jürgen Henschel, "Der 2. Juni: Das Ohnesorg-Foto," in *CheSchahShit*, 114–15.
130. "Schweigemarsch für Ohnesorg," *Der Münchner Merkur*, 6 June 1967. See also: Protest Chronicle Munich (1967), accessible at <http://protestmuenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 9 March 2015].
131. "AZ Umfrage zu Studentenunruhen: Durch Provokation zur Diskussion?" *Die Abendzeitung*, 28 November 1967.
132. Ulrich Chaussy, "Das Attentat auf Rudi Dutschke," in *CheSchaShit*, 132–37; Nevermann, *Der 2. Juni 1967*; Nick Thomas, *Protest Movements in 1960s West Germany: A Social History of Dissent and Democracy* (Oxford/New York, 2003), 165–81.
133. For coverage of the attack on Rudi Dutschke within Munich see, for instance: "Ostermaschierer rufen zur Aktionen auf," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 April 1968; "Straßenschlacht in Schwabing: Nach dem Attentat auf Dutschke," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 13–14 April 1968; "Lieber ein roter als ein toter Dutschke," *Die Abendzeitung*, Ostern 1968. See also: Media Archive Springer at: http://www.axelspringer.de/artikel/Online-Datenbank-Medienarchiv68_1086007.html, [last accessed 11 March 2015]; Andreas Renz, *Die Studentenproteste von 1967/68 im Spiegel der Münchner Presse* (Munich, 1992).

134. "Stoppt Dutschke jetzt!" *Die Deutsche Nationalzeitung*, 22 March 1968. See also: Bauß, *Die Studentenbewegung der sechziger Jahre in der Bundesrepublik und West Berlin*, 71–111; Hans Dieter Müller, *Press Power: A Study of Axel Springer* (London, 1969); Florian Kain, *Das Privatfernsehen, der Axel Springer Verlag und die deutsche Presse: Die medienpolitische Debatte in den sechziger Jahren* (Münster, 2003).
135. Quoted in Ulrich Chaussy, "Tod in München—Frings und Schreck: Die Eskalation bei den 'Osterunruhen' 1968 in München," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 89–100, here 90.
136. Kurt Georg Kiesinger, quoted in Thomas, *Protest Movements in 1960s West Germany*, 177; Kurt Georg Kiesinger, *Die große Koalition 1966–1969: Reden und Erklärungen des Bundeskanzlers*, ed. Dieter Oberndörfer (Stuttgart, 1979), 186–87, here 186.
137. Arnulf Baring, *Machtwechsel: Die Ära Brandt-Scheel* (Stuttgart, 1982), 77. See also: Uwe Wesel, *Die verspielte Revolution: 1968 und die Folgen* (Munich, 2002), 35.
138. StAM, RA 101154.
139. StAM, Polizeidirektion München 11134. See also: Chaussy, "Tod in München—Frings und Schreck," 90, in *Auf den Barrikaden*.
140. StAM, RA 101154. See also: StadtAM, Polizeipräsidium München, Filmsammlung 16mm, Nr. 13; StadtAM, Polizeidirektion München 9570/3; Gerhard Fürmetz, *Protest oder 'Störung'? Studenten und Staatsmacht in München um 1968* (Munich, 1999), 47–48 and 53–55; Vogel, *Die Amtskette*, 181–83; Mehr, ed., *Drachen mit tausend Köpfen*, 59–60; Gerstenberg, *Hiebe, Liebe und Proteste München 1968*, 30–33; Protest Chronicle Munich (1968), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2014].
141. StAM, RA 101154.
142. Reinhard Wetter, quoted in Chaussy, "Tod in München," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 92.
143. StAM, RA 101154.
144. Ibid.
145. Ibid.
146. Chaussy, "Tod in München," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 96–97.
147. "Ostermaschierer rufen zur Aktionen auf," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 April 1968. See also: StadtAM, Polizeipräsidium München, Filmsammlung 16mm, Nr. 12; StAM, RA 101154.
148. Ibid.
149. Dollinger, *München im 20. Jahrhundert*, 289.
150. StAM, RA 101154. See also: Chaussy, "Tod in München," in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 98–100; Stankiewitz, *München '68*, 37–41.
151. "154 Strafverfahren gegen Demonstranten," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 17 April 1968; "Anschlag auf rechtstaatliche Ordnung," *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 April 1968; "Verlorenes Wochenende," *Der Spiegel*, 22 April 1968.
152. StAM, RA 101154. According to this official report, 77.2 percent were between eighteen and twenty-nine years of age; 33.8 percent were students.
153. Ibid.

154. Ibid. See also: Dollinger, *München im 20. Jahrhundert*, 289; StadtAM, *Stadtchronik* (1968).
155. BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13617; BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 900050; “Nach der Straßenschlacht die Redeschlacht,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 25 April 1968; “Ich bitte ums Wort,” *Die Abendzeitung*, 10 May 1968. Various newspapers also discussed student groups in more detail. See, for example: “Die politische Hochschulgruppen—was denken und was wollen sie?” *Die Welt*, 27, 29, 30 April 1968; Fürmetz, *Protest oder ‘Störung’?* 48; Volkhard Brandes, *Wie der Stein ins Rollen kam: Vom Aufbruch in die Revolte der sechziger Jahre* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988), 165; Stankiewicz, *München ‘68*, 52–55; Protest Chronicle Munich (1968), accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2014].
156. BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13617. See also: Antje Eichler, *Protest im Radio. Die Berichterstattung des Bayerischen Rundfunks über die Studentebewegung 1967/1968* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).
157. “Studenten, Mikrokosmos des fünften Standes: Der gefährliche Weg,” *Christ und die Welt*, 3 May 1968.
158. *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 18 April 1968, quoted in Gerstenberger, *Hiebe, Liebe und Proteste München 1968*, 34. See also: BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 13617; “Wir hauen auf den Putz,” *Der Spiegel*, 13 May 1968; “Ohne uns wäre es viel schlimmer gekommen,” *Der Spiegel*, 22 April 1968.
159. Gerstenberger, *Hiebe, Liebe und Proteste München 1968*, 44.
160. Peter Schult, “Panoptikum der Exoten?” in *Drachen mit tausend Köpfen*, 52–64, here 49.
161. Schreiber, “Das Jahre 1968 in München,” in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*, 50. See also: BayHStAM, Plakatsammlung 26476; IfZM, Plakatsammlung (May 1968); Protest Chronicle Munich, accessible at <http://protest-muenchen.sub-bavaria.de>, [last accessed 11 March 2014]; H. Jürgen Gießler, *APO-Rebellion Mai 1968: Die letzten Tage vor Verabscheidung der Notstandsgesetz: Dokumentation und Presseanalyse dieser Tage vor dem 30. Mai 1968* (Munich, 1968), 39–54.
162. Stankiewicz, *München ‘68*, 25. For internal discussions within various student organizations see, for example: StAM, RA 101146; Stefan Hemler, “Von Kurt Faltlhauser zu Rolf Pohle: Die Entwicklung der studentischen Unruhe an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München in der zweiten Hälfte der sechziger Jahre,” 209–242, in *1968: 30 Jahre danach*. See also: Michael Sturm, “Tupamaros München: ‘Bewaffneter Kampf,’ Subkultur und Polize, 1969–1971,” in *Terrorismus in der Bundesrepublik: Medien, Staat und Subkulturen in the 1970er Jahren* (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), 99–133.
163. BayHStAM, Staatskanzlei 113612; StAM, Polizeidirektion München 15971; StAM, RA 101149; “Anzeige gegen Rektorats-Besitzer,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 7 February 1969; “Rektorats-Stürmern droht Strafanzeige,” *Die Abendzeitung*, 7 February 1969; Fürmetz, *Protest oder ‘Störung’?* 34.
164. StAM, RA 101147; StAM, Polizeidirektion München 15975; StAM, Polizeidirektion München 16006; “Kultusministerium schließt Akademie,” *Die*

- Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 21 July 1969; “Klage gegen Akademie-Schließung,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 22 July 1969; “Radikale Studenten stürmten die Akademie der Künste,” *TZ*, 20 February 1969; “Studenten besetzen die Kunstakademie,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 21 February 1969; “Kultusministerium schloß gestern die Münchner Akademie der Bildenden Künste,” *Die Abendzeitung*, 21 February 1969; “Münchner Hochschule von Studenten besudelt und demoliert,” *Bild*, 21 February 1969; “Studenten siegen,” *Die Abendzeitung*, 26 February 1969; “Akademie wieder eröffnet,” *Der Münchner Merkur*, 26 February 1969. See also: Thomas Zacharias, “Zwischen Ende der Nachkriegszeit und Anfang der Altbausanierung: Die Akademie von 1968 bis 1989,” in *200 Jahre Akademie der bildenden Künste München*, ed. Nikolaus Gerhart, Walter Grasskamp, and Florian Matzner (Munich, 2008), 112–21, here 116; Cornelia Gockel, “Revolution war gestern: Kunst und Protest an der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in München,” in *Auf den Barrikaden*, 223–40.
165. StAM, RA 101147.
166. *Bayerische Rundfunk* Archiv, “Motorrad-Rennen in der Kunstakademie,” 5 February 2015, accessible at, <http://www.br.de/radio/bayern2/wissen/kalenderblatt/0502-motorradrennen-kunstakademie-muenchen-100.html> [last accessed 28 February 2015].
167. StAM, RA 101151. See also: StAM, RA 101146; Hemler, “Wie die 68er-Revolution eines ihrer liberalen Kinder fraß.”
168. StAM, RA 101151.
169. “Die Ostermaschierer rüsten ab,” *Die Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 21 June 1970.