

notes for a witness statement

ingrid schubert, july 1976

information as a weapon – used in this way because information builds consciousness and in isolation the struggle is about consciousness
the info (our information system) as a surrogate for communication + as a survival program for entirely isolated prisoners – continuity of the collective learning process.

hunger strike – the battle, that's how it was defined + and how it developed. a guerilla action based on our antagonism against the extermination strategy
as an example for this structure – voluntarism
and *the* example against coercion,
on the basis of a collective discussion process –
and it was clear that only those would start who were certain that they wanted it and would persevere. as such, determination and collectivity brought together in the action: unity of theory and praxis
struggle which produces struggle –
functionalization for the struggle – proletarianization/dispossession
to understand and engage oneself as a weapon.

may 14th as the action that expressed proletarian politics – the first action that embraced this concept of politics
and exactly as that already refuting *any* of müller's claims/projections, proving their absurdity, because it fulfilled all of the subjective preconditions: voluntarism/independence/collectivity
and so – with this strength – initiated the group process
content/objective – liberation unified.

and andreas was the guy who was required, because in this phase he was the one who had the capacity to bring together voluntarism and organization – to develop the politics.
and these politics require a structure that must be fought for + in this phase of the organization of the infrastructure/logistics, the notion of a collective learning process, collective discussion, illegal collective was real, without being that conscious –
illegal consciousness must necessarily develop in response to the state's reaction, first to its very existence and then to its actions –
the quantitatively small group that developed the quality necessary to implement these politics and to have this strategic function.
in this phase, the group developed relationships that allowed us to grasp the bourgeois hell one had previously lived in.
the criteria of the relationships: openness, sensitivity.

about andreas – the guy who in every circumstance had a notion of the situation and who, on that basis, conceived of a course of action, a tactic, a strategy, and who in the course of the discussion process (with the criteria: discipline and precision) shared his method of analysis, understanding and acting – who kept the process open, etc.

about gudrun – had this function in the group, because she didn't have all this competitive society's fucked-up reflexes and ways of behaving, and as such represented something like an example and orientation for us.
that is clear in the letters (ulrike/gudrun), of which the baw leaked falsified extracts to the press to prove that there was "tension", "political differences", etc. – the fact is, however, that they reveal a subtle process of criticism/self-criticism and bear witness to closeness/affinity.