

[Please note that all the footnotes in this document have been added by the translator & editor – none of them appeared in the original document]

The Structure of the RAF

July-August 1976

What follows are the statements of two of twenty-five RAF prisoners who commented on the structure of the RAF to counter the hysterical clichés which were developed through the use of the bought-off State security witness, Gerhard Müller¹, as part of the State's campaign of psychological warfare.

“Statement of Brigitte Mohnhaupt in Stammheim on 22-07-76”²

Brigitte Mohnhaupt (BM) - ...Obviously it is idiotic to say student, because that has been the case for all of us and it is in the past. One can only answer, “nothing of the sort.”

The second point is that I won't answer any questions from you, from the court, from the Federal Prosecution. That would be absurd. That is not the kind of relationship we have. The exact term for the relationship between us and the court, and the justice system, and the Federal Prosecution, is war, and the clearest expression of that is that four of us are dead, assassinated as prisoners.

So, there is absolutely no possibility of discussion here, at this level. Why then do we do it, after everything that has happened? Why do we come here? Why do we participate in the trial?...

Theodor Prinzing³ (TP) - No, that's not the objective. The relationship...

BM - Yes, that is part of it. And that's only the beginning; I want to start now with what I intend to say here, and I have no intention of listening to your nonsense.

The reason why, after everything that has happened, someone from among us would still come here, after the death of Ulrike⁴, is because we believe it is necessary, through what we can say here, to reveal the true structure of the group as it really is and was.

¹ Gerhard Müller - supporter of the RAF who turned State evidence after his arrest.

² Brigitte Mohnhaupt - founding member of the RAF, arrested in the early 70s. She was released and went back underground. Arrested again in 1984, she is now serving a life sentence - as of 2005 she is still held separate from the general prison population.

Stammheim - high security prison in Stuttgart. A special court, used for trials of RAF members, was built inside the complex.

³ Theodor Prinzing - judge in the first major RAF trial.

It is not like the psychological warfare fabrication which Müller put forth in his statements... it is not as he claimed, for he described it as a practically fascist structure. It is necessary that this be finally made clear. And this will obviously destroy the entire lie according to which Ulrike committed suicide.

It's not our job to prove if or how Müller lied. That level, criminology, certainly does not concern us. For us, it is only a question of substance, of clarifying the essence of the politics and the nature of the structure as it really was. Certainly, that is very difficult here, but we will try to describe it simply.

I will now do that. I would like to start with the core of Müller's statement, with its goal. The statement regarding the attacks and his implication, the implication which State Security determines is necessary in order to secure convictions. Here I must point out that the strategic conception developed by the RAF in 72 was directed against the American military presence and American policy in the Federal Republic⁵, and the different tactical and operational actions against these were: the attack against the CIA Headquarters in Frankfurt, the attack against the U.S. Army Headquarters in Heidelberg and the kidnapping of the three City Commanders in Berlin. This decision, this project, was developed through collective discussions involving everyone in the RAF; in other words, there was a consensus of all the groups, of each of the units in the cities, and everyone understood what this meant, the purpose of these attacks⁶.

As such, we are all responsible for these attacks against the US military presence in the Federal Republic. That is to say, we are all responsible for the actions, for the attacks against the Headquarters.

That already says it all, everything about the structure. And it makes it clear that what Müller, that idiot, is trying to say - that six people could have carried out all of the attacks - it's completely absurd.

Within the totality of the strategic conception, there was also the plan to take the Allied Commanders prisoner and exchanging them. I do not want to talk about the escalation that that would have represented and the escalation that was encapsulated in this project from the perspective of the forces of reaction. There is really nothing to say about it here.

The decision, the idea behind these attacks and our responsibility, is explained by a key part of our history, the polarization of the student movement against the Vietnam War. For us, there was one completely clear way to understand the limitations of the

⁴ Ulrike Meinhof - founding member of the. RAF, murdered in prison in 1976.

⁵ Federal Republic of Germany - FRG, West Germany.

⁶ On May 11, 1972, a RAF bomb destroyed the Officer's Club of the US Army in Frankfurt. A Colonel was killed and thirteen officers were injured. On May, 25, 1972, a RAF bomb exploded at the headquarters of the American Army in Heidelberg. A Captain and two Sergeants were killed, five others were injured. The kidnappings were never carried out.

mobilization for Vietnam, its objective limitations, what it could accomplish and what it could not accomplish before it was crushed and recuperated.

One could say that the experience of the need for armed struggle, the need to reach the level which corresponds to the situation in which we find ourselves here in the FRG, an American colony, a strategic sub-center of American imperialism - it is this experience which created the RAF. All of the arguments have already been developed here in the statements. I don't believe it is necessary to repeat them again. As far as I'm concerned, this explains the origin of the group.

Concretely, regarding the City Commanders, the kidnapping had, from a material perspective, the goal of freeing the prisoners. The goal was to arrange an exchange of the City Commanders for the prisoners who had already been arrested, and who had been subjected to isolation and torture.

Meaning that, for the group, it was objectively necessary to free the prisoners. An exchange was the only way.

So far as I know, Müller didn't talk about the Berlin City Commanders, except in his gossip to *Stern*⁷; he left this out of his statement. The desired goal was to completely suppress the politics of the RAF in 1972. It's clear that Berlin was a decisive event for us, and relatively difficult to pull off, difficult operationally. Three City Commanders; three, which signified three large commandos were necessary to realize our goal. The action was already in the execution phase, but as a result of the arrests it could not be carried out. Andreas⁸ was arrested about two weeks before the chosen date, and as a result, obviously, a part of the infrastructure was smashed. That is to say, we couldn't be certain whether the part of the infrastructure that was involved in the action had also been compromised. There was also the fact that the American City Commander was heavily guarded. The timing and coordination was difficult. For us it was no longer possible to carry out this action.

This is important, because that is what we – and Andreas and Gudrun⁹ in particular - were prepared to do. It is for precisely this reason that the State Security won't let Müller talk anymore, so that they can say that Andreas and Gudrun participated in the attacks against the Police Headquarters¹⁰.

It's disgusting and it's idiotic. This doesn't correspond at all to the facts. Andreas and Gudrun were, during this period, with me in Berlin, and we didn't organize that thing down there.

⁷ *Stern* - weekly bourgeois news magazine.

⁸ Andreas Baader – founding member of the RAF, murdered in prison in October 1977.

⁹ Gudrun Ensslin - founding member of the RAF, murdered in prison in October 1977.

¹⁰ On May 12, 1972, the RAF bombed the Bavarian Police Headquarters in Munich in retaliation for the police shooting of RAF member Tommy Weissbecker in Augsburg.

His lies are demented; as if just four or five people could carry out all of these attacks against the FRG. It is not even necessary to dwell on this, because it is obvious to everyone how ridiculous this is, and the goal is clear to see. So, this entire travesty, these five accused, to whom everything is directly attributed, and of whom only three remain¹¹. All of this represents the same line, by which the same spectacle, in effect, the entire line being applied, becomes clear. It is psychological warfare carried out by the Federal Prosecutor and the court. There are no contradictions within it, and, naturally, it cannot have any.

Müller says about Munich¹² - I believe he said it was Andreas and Holger who did it. The fact is that neither of them participated. I have already said that at that point Andreas was in Berlin, and these actions were carried out by groups that were in Munich. Finally - now we can say it - the RAF was at the time organized in the following way: there were eight groups established in six cities, and specifically two strong groups in two cities. One of these groups was in Munich. The groups, the different units, were integrated into a logistical system. There was contact between the different groups for discussions, but they were autonomous in their decisions regarding operational execution.

The precise objective, the planning, the verification, the moment of action, was left up to the different groups, and that is the only way it could be. And obviously that is how it worked ; we didn't know anything concrete in advance about these actions. However, even if we had known, we wouldn't have prevented them, because, yeah, it's not a simple thing to stop a group from doing what it has decided to do. In fact, we couldn't have prevented it, neither in terms of the underlying perspective nor technically; it was impossible given the conditions. It was clear, the sense of these actions was clear; they were a response to the fact that combatants were shot in the street, that is to say, Petra and Tommy¹³. It would never have been our intention to prevent them.

By means of such implications, Müller is trying to obscure the strategic conception, to completely exclude it, to destroy it by idiotic implications. The strategic conception was defined from the beginning as opposing the American military presence, opposing the occupation by the US Army, opposing total political and economic dependence vis-a-vis the USA. The goal of his statement is to distort this; it attempts to repudiate the politics of the group; it attempts to obliterate them.

There is still more. When he claims - I could perhaps go into this more later in the light of the particular questions that you will ask me; for now I will only do so in a general way. For instance, the statement which suggests that Ulrike carried out the attack against the

¹¹ The five were Ulrike Meinhof, Gudrun Ensslin, Jan-Carl Raspe, Holger Meins and Andreas Baader. Ulrike Meinhof was murdered in prison 1976. Holger Meins died on hungerstrike in 1974.

¹² On May 12, 1972, the RAF bombed the Bavarian Police Headquarters in Munich in retaliation for the police shooting of RAF member Tommy Weissbecker in Augsburg.

¹³ Petra Schelm - On July 15, 1972, Petra Schelm, a RAF member, was shot dead by police at a roadblock in Hamburg.

RAF member Tommy Weissbecker was killed by police earlier in 1972 in Augsburg.

Springer Building¹⁴ over the objections of Andreas or Gudrun or separately from the group, and the claim that this led to a split, or, at least, to conflict between members, terror, or I don't know what it was that the pig said exactly. The truth is that when the Hamburg action was carried out - and this was already clarified during this trial - we knew nothing, precisely because of our structure; it was an autonomous action carried out in an autonomous way by the Hamburg groups.

After the action, there was a lot of criticism from other groups. As a result, Ulrike went to Hamburg to find out what was going on and to let us know how this had happened, because the RAF, in its basic understanding, never conceived of actions where there was a risk that civilians could be hurt. It was an essential principle in all discussions and in the criticism addressed to the Hamburg group, that they carried out the action without realizing that Springer, naturally, wouldn't evacuate the building. So given this, it had not been well prepared. That is why Ulrike was sent to Hamburg at that time, to clarify this, to find out what had happened. After doing this, she formulated the statement about this action, in which everything was explained, the entire process, the warnings, Springer not evacuating, etc. Which, shows that what Müller said, yeah, we know that already, and we know the goal. What he claims now, regarding Ulrike, that she had or could have intended to carry out actions that the others objected to, it is completely absurd, but it fits in perfectly to the propaganda line, "the tensions", etc. Its purpose is to legitimize Ulrike's murder. The claim that there were tensions is a story that goes back - according to what Müller has said here - to Hamburg, to the organization of the group in 71-72. It is purely and simply a fabrication that they are trying to put together here, and with one objective: to legitimize the murder...¹⁵

TB - Good, now I must tell you that your opinions and value judgments are not relevant here. I cannot accept your allegations that there has been a murder here. You will force me to apply the regulations.

BM - Of course. There is still a point with regards to Berlin. When Müller claims that Andreas ordered the actions there, or even that he pushed people, I don't know exactly how he put it, but it's absurd, because the action against the City Commanders was impossible before the others were carried out. So there was no discussion regarding the actions in Berlin. If Müller says this, it can only mean one thing - because he already exposed the action against the City Commanders in *Stern*, and clearly he knew about them, but obviously not the concrete details - by maintaining his claim, the political line was to be destroyed. Above all, no political line is to be found in these lies, and naturally not in this trial.

That is all I want to say about these actions right now.

¹⁴ Springer Bombing - On May 19th 1972, the RAF bombed the Springer buildings. Three telephone warnings were ignored and seventeen people were injured.

¹⁵ The State and media claimed Ulrike Meinhof committed suicide as a result of tensions within the group in prison. This propaganda contradicts all independent studies, which indicate that she was murdered.

Defense Attorney Temming (DAT) - And precisely regarding the fact that Müller, the prosecution witness Müller, stated that the attack against Springer was conceived and prepared by Ulrike Meinhof...

(The Prosecution objects to the question because of the use of the term “crown witness.”)

DAT - I will rephrase my question. Do you know if Ulrike was in Hamburg at this time, and do you know if there were tensions between Ulrike and Andreas regarding this point or others, or, in a general way, what the state of their relationship was?

BM - I've already said that there was a general criticism after this action, that is to say, between all...

TP - We don't want to hear any more repetition here.

BM - But, really, stop it; you don't even know what I'm going to say.

It is precision that he wants. So, perhaps I will repeat the core of the issue. What happened is what I have already said: Ulrike left, at that time, to find out what had happened and then, based on what she found out, based on checking the facts in Hamburg, she formulated a statement.

To be more precise: she was in Berlin and in mid-May, roughly, she went to Stuttgart. She was in Berlin to prepare the kidnapping. She participated in the planning and organization.

Afterwards, she went to Stuttgart to do another important job. And if she did it, it was because she understood a lot about it; simply stated, she could do it well. It is necessary to obtain material for discussion and that is the context in which Ulrike worked, the organization of information on the international level. That is to say that she attempted to make known the discussions taking place on the left, specifically on the international level with foreign groups. At that time, the discussion about the guerrilla in the factories was unfolding. There were attempts of that type in Italy, a certain tactic that was possible in Italy, as a result of specific conditions there, but which we thought was not possible here. And that was precisely what she wanted to do at that time, to organize the entire process of discussion from this angle, within the perspective of an international strategy. That was why she went to Stuttgart. I think that Andreas called her in Stuttgart right after what happened in Hamburg because of the large amount of criticism we received, and she left immediately for Hamburg to clarify the situation. This is, I believe, how it unfolded. In saying this, I am also answering the question as to whether there were differences, or whatever the hell, a split. The facts show very clearly and absolutely without a shadow of a doubt that that is a complete fabrication.

DAT - Another question. It concerns the statements of the Prosecution witness, Gerhard Müller, who claims that there were plans to liquidate Siegfried Hausner¹⁶. Do you know anything regarding this subject, and do you know if individuals have left the group, or how it unfolded?

BM - Of course there were people who left. It would be untrue to say otherwise. Contradictions develop within a group engaged in the process that this one is engaged in. As such, in the process of the struggle, there are obviously contradictions, and there are people who decide at a certain point to no longer do the work. They've had enough, they decide to return, to go back, or they do other things, even though everyone knows perfectly well that this isn't possible, that it is a lie, when one has already been engaged in a practice such as ours. Such a decision can only be a step backwards, which always signifies a step backwards into shit.

There were people who left, but there was never a question of liquidation at any time. There were departures involving people who could no longer do the work, who no longer wanted to do it, because they understood that it meant illegality, which is what armed struggle always means. It was a completely free decision on their part. Leaving was the right thing for them to do. It would be stupid for them to stay, because there wouldn't, in any case, be any way to engage in a shared practice.

There were also departures that we ourselves decided upon. There were people who knew that we were ending relations with them for clear reasons. In the final analysis, naturally, it was for the same reasons, because, at a given moment, it was no longer possible to have a shared practice. They do other things, conscious that they can never again engage in this practice.

Maybe it should be explained how things would happen when someone decided to stop. It always happened as follows: it was always determined in the course of a discussion involving the entire group, the unit in which the person participated, which is to say that everyone took part, or at least the majority, everyone who could, under these conditions, take part.

This took place in the context of discussions. It wasn't done in a heavy-handed way. Each time there was an evolution which allowed the one concerned, in the same way as all of the others, as each person within the group, to understand that the point had been reached where it was no longer possible to struggle together, the time had come for him to make a decision; to change, if he still wants to, if he has the courage, if he can do it, obviously, with the help of all of the others - or else he can leave. At that point, he is free to leave, and there is no pressure, because it's his decision, because he understands this, and because it involves a process in which everyone is involved. Because every departure or exclusion, if it isn't carried out in a responsible manner, creates hate, and, as such, sooner

¹⁶ Siegfried Hausner - On April 24, 1975, the Commando Holger Meins of the RAF took over the West German Embassy in Stockholm, Sweden. They demanded the release of twenty-six political prisoners held in West Germany. Police stormed the building, setting off explosives laid by the commando, and injuring Siegfried Hausner. He was denied necessary medical attention and subsequently died in transit.

or later, the guy will end up visiting the cops. The group never threw anyone out. It never happened that way. That isn't how the structure of the group works.

This is something else that completely discredits Müller's entire story about Hausner, the liquidation story. That is to say, naturally, such a thing is theoretically possible - that's not the issue. This is simply a fact when one struggles in illegality. But within the entire process which the group undertook in 72, it would have been an error, it would have been in contradiction with the situation. As regards Hausner, it is even more absurd, because it is completely false that he wanted to leave. There was absolutely no reason, given who he was, given what he had done, that would have led us to force him to leave or to have liquidated him. It's absolutely ridiculous. Nothing would justify it. Obviously, everyone makes mistakes, but nobody had the arrogance or the absolutism to say, "Me, I don't make mistakes."

In any case, that was the situation within the group. How could we have said, "Now it is necessary that he leave, and if he doesn't leave the country, then...?" Müller said that if he couldn't go to Holland, if he couldn't be evacuated to a foreign country, then it was necessary, as an emergency solution, to simply liquidate him. Only State Security could invent such things. Such a thing could never strengthen the structure, the group, the individuals, but on the contrary would weaken it, would destroy it.

If such a thing could happen in the group, how would it ever again be possible for people to struggle, to have the courage, to find their identity?

To liquidate someone who has struggled with us, as a first resort, simply because there is no longer a place for him - that is a completely ridiculous fabrication.

I can give another example: the story of the woman in Berlin, Edelgart Gräfer, I believe - in any case it was Gräfer - who denounced a half a dozen people. She betrayed the people. She gave their address. And what happened? What did we do? She got a slap in the mouth and was hit in the throat with a placard. So, I think these facts speak for themselves: when someone denounces people, in effect lines them up against the wall, because we never know what could happen when the cops break into an apartment, and this person only receives a slap in the head, then it is all the more absurd to think that someone who has never betrayed anyone could, as the result of a situation where everything culminates, as Müller describes it, in searches and whatever, in arrests, could simply be shot down. It's absolutely out of the question.

And, finally, the proof, I might say, that all of that is impossible: Siegfried Hausner led the Commando Holger Meins¹⁷, and it is out of the question that it could have been otherwise, could have been done differently. Quite simply, he made the arrangements, he did it himself, which clarifies the nature of the structure. I believe this clarifies everything. How could he have done it? How could he have struggled in a reality like the one Müller described?

¹⁷ On April 24, 1975, the Commando Holger Meins of the RAF took over the West German Embassy in Stockholm, Sweden. They demanded the release of twenty-six political prisoners held in West Germany.

DAT - Another thing: the Prosecution witness, Müller, claimed that that Andreas Baader wanted a hierarchical structure, that Andreas Baader wanted control. I would like to know how this could have been, how it would have been possible given the structure of the group and given the general relationship of the group to the question of leadership?

BM - Was there ever anyone who wanted to take leadership...

Federal Prosecutor Zeis (FPZ) - It seems to me that this problem, whether or not there was a hierarchical structure, was already the object of a long statement this morning...

BM - I want to introduce some concrete aspects...

FPZ - The question...

BM - I want to introduce some concrete facts about Andreas.

FPZ - Enough! Be quiet when I speak!

BM - Oh, really, stop talking drive!

You talked about the "alleged leadership" of the group. No. If someone had claimed to be a leader, then he would only have made a fool of himself. So, the claim that someone wanted to be in charge is, quite simply, ridiculous. So, the reality, as it was and as we understood it, was that leadership could be a function and, in certain situations, could be necessary, for example, during actions. That is how we defined it, and, naturally, it was Andreas who assumed this function. If he assumed it, it was simply because he could, in a very precise way, develop an understanding of situations, and based on his analysis of various situations, he could develop an approach. He could outline a certain approach, he could establish the line, the tactical and strategic line. But this was never simply the development or the solitary decision of a single person. The concept, the project developed by a member, is submitted for discussion by everyone, because everyone participates concretely in the practice and, as such, also in establishing the line. Everyone must discuss the line, understand it, contribute to its development, and everyone must be able to make decisions in any situation. Because in certain situations, we are alone, and if we don't understand the line then nothing will work. What Andreas did was determined, precisely established and developed, by everyone in the course of discussions. And from the moment the line was established, Andreas, like everyone else, naturally, had to rigorously follow that line, was, so to speak, tied to the line. Of course, this wasn't a constraint, because everyone understood that it was necessary, that it was correct, a correct tactic, for him, as for the others. Later, this was completely blown out of proportion. That is to say that leadership always has a certain function, and, naturally, for those who use it, as for those who assume it, it is only tolerable if it is not domination, if it is entirely defined by what everyone wants. In any event, the principle in the organization is free will. That is to say that everyone must be able and must want to do it. We called this the cadre line, that everyone can arrive, whether they have been in the

RAF for a long time or not, at an equal footing, that is to say, that everyone can do everything themselves. This is not this stupid thing about which Müller speaks here, with his open group, which, in practice, would mean that everyone participates in all aspects of the work process. Nothing like this exists. His statement is totally false and is meant to signify that everyone knew everything, and thus, that Müller knows everything. But Müller knows very little, because Müller wasn't cadre. It is simply an invention on his part, with the specific goal pursued by State Security.

TP - So, another value judgment?

BM - No, I'm not finished yet. One moment...

TP - Keep to the facts which you know and which you can clarify, please.

BM - This is precisely one. I know that he wasn't cadre.

TP - That you can talk about, but the rest is a personal opinion. Has the question been answered in a satisfactory way, Mr. Defense Attorney?

BM - No, I'm not finished yet...

TP - Tell me, have you got a dossier prepared for each question put to you here?

BM - Obviously, I've... I've reflected about what I have heard here, of course.

TP - Do you know the questions that are going to be put to you?

BM - How would you expect me to know them?

TP - If you have an idea...

BM - I've read about the Müller affair in the press...

TP - You've already seen the files concerning Müller?

BM - I've read the Müller statements in the press. Listen to what I say! And on the basis of what I know about Müller, on the basis of what I know about him from *Info*¹⁸, etc., from the *Stern* article, I have some idea. I've clarified some points myself, the points where he describes the structure of the group. I will specifically state that it's fascist; what he describes is a fascist group structure, so it's clear to me what I can say here in my role as a witness.

So, the cadre line. That is to say that everyone must be able to assess things themselves. Naturally, that is concretely related to leadership, which is to say that everyone must be

¹⁸ *Info* - a magazine of writings by political prisoners, which allowed the prisoners to stay in touch with each other's ideas.

able to assume leadership, which simply means that there can never be domination, that leadership is defined as a function, but it can disappear. That, quite simply, is a precondition for continuity; so that if a cadre is arrested, we are not immobilized and disoriented, but people can make decisions themselves, can continue, that there isn't a rupture, there isn't a collapse. That is necessary for continuity, and as such, necessary for the entire politic, for the entire practice. In this regard, we once said that the guerrilla is a hydra, that is to say that it always develops new heads. That's the goal. There is something in *Info*, which the Federal Prosecution certainly has, very certainly, so they know full well that there was never a hierarchy - which expresses what I think very well, something Holger¹⁹ said: "Everyone is the collective." That is exactly what I think. And something Ulrike said during her Berlin trial: "The guerrilla is the group." Meaning that everyone contributes and gets something out of the entire learning process, which obviously is ongoing, which is practice. And it is only in this way that we learn, by this practice, that is to say, in this confrontation, because it demands, it forces, learning. It forces us to change. It is in this way that "the guerilla is the group."

Messengers and bosses, superiors and underlings, as Müller presented it, all of that is antagonistic to a structure like ours, to armed politics, to the guerrilla. It resembles the structure that spews out blueprints for psychological warfare, the State Security structure.

We have defined what leadership is for us. "Leadership: what it must be is a concrete perception of the situation *and* how to transcend it; the objectives and their transmission *within the structure* of the fighting group." That is to say what we have learned is that leadership in the guerrilla consists of permanent initiative, the imposition of our politics, of armed proletarian politics.

It is not "leadership" which constitutes the guerrilla group. Rather, it appears only as a function required by the group's learning and working processes; so it is born of and from the group's practice. When everything goes well, it brings together everyone's initiatives and experiences, developing a collective process which creates the continuity and the capacity to act. That is the only way it can work. To repeat what has been said before: the basis of all of this is the relationship between subjectivity and objectivity, between will and necessity, to bring them together and carry them into action. It is only in this way - a simple question of experience - that subjectivity is actually possible. Who you are, that you, the person who struggles, the subject, that you become who you are and who you want to be, that is really the point of struggle. That is what we are trying to establish here; liberty is only possible in a struggle for liberation.

DAT - How can this be reconciled with the power to give orders, which supposedly existed and which was supposedly exercised by Andreas Baader, according to the statement of the Prosecution witness? He gave the example, I believe, of an order to shoot, that all members of the RAF, in the case of an arrest, had to defend themselves with arms.

BM - Yeah. I'll split my answer into two parts.

¹⁹ Holger Meins -

On the one hand, there is the relationship, the understanding that the group had regarding orders, how the group defined this, and how they defined the entire process, and defining this was a process for us. And, after that, very concretely, regarding the order to shoot.

I'll speak in a general way about orders. We saw the order as a collective decision in the execution phase. So, during the action, there were orders. It is simple, it is a military necessity, and it is also correct, it is functional. And it's precisely because it is functional that it has nothing to do with coercion, because the action is a collective decision. It was discussed in advance. It was decided by everyone, and everyone had a precise job to do, which everyone did. And orders are only a question of coordination.

That is one thing. The other is the power to give orders. The entire scenario described by Müller, the one regarding Andreas, the boss with absolute power...

So, for example, according to Müller's statements there was an order to shoot. I will simply say that this is a distillation of psychological warfare since 1970, which claims that the RAF members have an order to shoot. About which the RAF has often spoken, about exactly this and precisely on this point. But I will speak about it even more precisely. It has been repeated in the media since Hamburg, since Petra was shot, that there is an order to shoot, as such, cannon fodder, human material sent to the front by some people in the shadows. That is the story. And Müller...

TP - You must now answer the question about the order to shoot, posed by...

BM - I'm now talking...

TP - ...the defense attorney. What you are presenting here has nothing to do with the question.

BM - Yeah, well I disagree.

I'm in the process of talking about the order to shoot.

In reality, Müller knows very well that there was never an order to shoot. There was none and no one among us received it. Why does he claim this? I just said, according to the expression used here, that that has "nothing to do with the subject," that a distillation of psychological warfare is to be justified by this statement, to make it appear that this is true, with the goal of destroying the group.

Defense Attorney Heldmann (DAH) - Müller claimed here, in his role as a witness, that the structure of the Red Army Faction was as follows; Baader as the main leader, then a core membership, then simple members and, finally, marginal members. Can you confirm these statements?

BM - I've explained, in this regard, how we understood it and how it was; many leaders and the cadre line, how we developed it, how it was developed within the entire process. That was the goal, and it was already that way in most groups that had been together for some time.

Concerning members on the margins, etc., what can be said is that there were, of course, contacts with people who weren't completely integrated into the group. But this is completely correct, because the RAF is, it must not be forgotten, a military organization and not a neighborhood collective. That is to say that contacts are determined according to precise functions, according to political and operational criteria. That, for example, was naturally part of it. You see very well, again very clearly, the nonsense of this claim about an "open group."

That things could be organized so that everybody had access to all information or took part in all operations, that is obviously not possible. Not everyone needs to know everything, and it is obvious why not. Everyone has the information that is necessary for him to do what he has to do. That is to say that it is the function which determines this. To do anything else would be idiotic, absolutely out of the question, and everyone understood very well why it wasn't necessary. There is a very open discussion developed within the groups and between the groups about strategy and tactics, as well as theory and analysis, but which remains very clear on principles of organization. It is an open, collective process of all those who struggle. It is correct that I only know what concerns me, because one must, naturally, deal with the fact that when one is arrested, there can be traitors, one could break under pressure, one could be tortured. We know this, and it is, quite simply, the condition of all illegal military organizations to act as is required, as a function of the conditions. Otherwise it is a collective of idiots.

For a group that wants to struggle, all this rubbish about an "open group" would never come to anything, because it would signify acting like a bunch of ignoramuses, like people who don't know at all what they're doing. Openness is a very good thing, open discussions, open, frank relationships, and that is also how it happens, but never concerning military details; that is to say that the political structure is open and collective, and within the commandos there is also a collective style of work, but the question of military details, of contacts, etc. is strictly functional. A conspiratorial...

TP - It is not a question of asking what the term "open" means. I believe, Mr. Heldmann, regarding the question which you've asked three times, it has been answered adequately...

BM - ...open group, as a principle of organization for an illegal group, simply does nothing but support a stupid denunciation.

DAH - Are there members who exercise control over other members? That is to say, does there exist a control function within the group, or even the control of a group?

BM - What do you mean a "control function"? I don't really understand.

DAH - I can't say exactly either, I have page 10,221 from the minutes of the main trial here, an extract from Müller's statement, "What's more, these core members, these members of the leadership, exercised a permanent control." And another example, "Take, for example, one of these people in Stuttgart, one of these core members" - as Mr. Müller calls them - "he was always phoning Berlin to keep the situation there under control and to see if people were behaving as they should."

BM - Oh, the telephone. This example speaks for itself. Information is simply necessary to be able to act, to be able to determine the overall situation, and that, obviously, also goes on between us, between the different groups. That's entirely clear, because to be able to intervene on certain points, it is necessary to know what's going on in other cities. And if those who were in Stuttgart called Berlin, it was completely normal. Everybody did it many times every day, when we were going to do something together or when we had to coordinate certain things. To speak of control in this matter again proves that the statement is total twaddle.

DAH - Are there or have there ever been lawyers who were members of the RAF?

BM - Lawyers who were members of the RAF? That's more or less the same thing - we can only laugh, because we do not have close relationships with lawyers. Lawyers are lawyers, and, as lawyers, they aren't members of the RAF. And we certainly don't want to have lawyers in the RAF, and we never had any. It's a contradiction in itself. If someone was a lawyer, he wouldn't want to be a member of the RAF, unless he was no longer a lawyer, because he would have to make a complete break with his job. Lawyers are part of the justice system, even if they criticize it. That is obvious. And our relationship with lawyers has been and is - and it's odd - shitty. I really don't feel like going into more detail, because it's very tiresome, always the same thing. Those guys usually have their own interests, hidden agendas, and a fear which they rationalize politically. Most of them try to pull the wool over the prisoners' eyes. So, there are always problems.

DAT - A question regarding *Info*. The Prosecution witness, Müller, claims that *Info* served to achieve criminal ends, internally and externally, but mostly outside the prisons. Could you speak a little bit about the purpose of *Info*? Secondly, could you specify if there's an obligation to participate in *Info*? And thirdly, in connection with *Info*, was any pressure exercised by some prisoners over other prisoners via *Info*?

BM - *Info* was the total opposite of that. It is the only possibility - that is how we conceived of and understood it - the only possibility, in general, of social interaction between isolated prisoners. Even if it was only a surrogate, only letters and paper. But it was the only possibility for political discussion, political information and, obviously, orientation. There was absolutely no hierarchical structure or anything of that sort. Regarding what Müller said about *Info 1* - I don't remember the exact terms he used anymore, that there were different categories, that one had to pass from one category to another, as such, a sort of careerist ladder. That's absurd.

Info 1 was everyone organized in the RAF, and was simply functional.

Info 2, practically speaking, didn't exist. It should be produced one day, but, in reality, it never existed. And *Info 2*, which was never produced, was the one that functioned as the *Info* for the hunger strike and all of the prisoners who participated in the hunger strike. I see absolutely no hierarchy in that, no categories. It simply came from two different groups. The first was made up of members of the RAF. The second included many other prisoners, like those from the June 2nd Movement²⁰ and guerrilla groups from Hamburg and Munich, all of those who participated in the hunger strike, and that was no small number. It was impossible to simply short-circuit it. It was two different levels of discussion, of relationships within the groups. The short-circuit was in the attempt to present a united position paper, which had, in general, no real purpose.

And *Info 3* had nothing to do with hierarchy. *Info 3* consisted of information, that is to say, newspaper articles, analyses, articles on political economy, etc., in short, basic information pieces. Everyone who was in prison and wanted it for their work received it. To say that *Info 3* was in any way less important is complete nonsense. It represented a certain form of political information, the media, press reports, foreign reports, as such, everything we needed to have an idea of what was going on, and finally economic analyses which we've developed as well. That was the content of *Info 3*.

Regarding those that... How did you say it?

DAT - Was there an obligation to participate...

BM - Oh, I see. The sense of *Info*, its entire purpose, as we determined it, was as a means to resist isolation. We have said that every sentence that a prisoner writes in *Info* is like an act; each sentence is an action. And it was this way for the prisoners. We had nothing, no possibility to do anything in isolation, except to use this means of communication. And that was really a radical process of collectivization for those who had not previously experienced one. Because, through *Info*, everyone knew what everyone else was writing. In general, it was completely different from a hierarchical structure. Everyone wrote what he thought, what was, for him, the problem, the point at which he couldn't progress alone, always attempting to give a political appreciation, attempting to understand the situation and the conditions, so as to be able to resist isolation, resist the annihilation of the group by isolation. And, in this way, it obviously did play a role in which everyone exercised control on everyone else. But that is a good thing. It is not at all bad. It is not domination, but the negation of domination. I would even say it was an attempt to maintain a structure in prison, on a completely different level, as the total negation of the fascist structure, and, as such, against the entire machine that wants to make us disappear. As such, *Info* was simply a way for us to continue to struggle, even at this level and in the only way possible for a prisoner kept in isolation, by the effort of analysis, by determination. It is obviously a very limited possibility, and the example of its limitation is the hunger strike.

²⁰ 2nd of June Movement - anarchist guerilla movement based in West Berlin. It dissolved in 1977 and a part of its membership entered the RAF.

It is, quite simply, our ultimate means of defense; otherwise, we would not have to hunger strike against isolation...

DAT - I have another question regarding the role, or the alleged role, of discipline.

(Prinzing disallowed the question.)

DAT - We could, perhaps, better explain this in the context of the hunger strike. What purpose did the hunger strike have? During the hunger strike was there an effort to use *Info* to pressure any of the prisoners on hunger strike? So, first, what was the purpose of the hunger strike? And, second, was *Info* used during the hunger strike as a means of discipline to prevent anyone from breaking the hunger strike?

BM - *Info* was never a means of discipline, not during the hunger strike and not at any other time - coming from who, from who really, each of us or what? *Info* wasn't a whip to keep people in line, but a weapon that each of us needed, because it was a means of communication, even if it was only paper. Perhaps it is ridiculous to speak of a weapon, but that's how it was. There is really no other way in isolation.

And specifically, during the hunger strike, there was obviously no pressure. The hunger strike is a practical example of the fact that no pressure can be exercised, because otherwise the actions would be impossible. We discussed the hunger strike for a long time between ourselves. Should we do it or not? What did the group think about the conditions? Which is to say, each member of the group. The Federal Prosecution seized all of the material relating to this, so obviously they know all of this full well. All of their claims are slanderous lies, but otherwise of no importance. In any case, the hunger strike was the product, the result, of the discussion. And in the discussion, each person clarified issues, such as "Can I and do I want to hunger strike?" Because, we knew full well what it signified, that the situation could lead to our death. That is to say that this was and always is a part of what it means to struggle: one can die, one can be defeated. Our experience is that it can't be any other way in prison. In any case, that was an individual decision for everyone, and it could only work that way. This can be confirmed by what was written in *Info* itself, for everyone wrote whether he wanted to do it and why, if he felt he could do it, and, obviously, whether he agreed with the tactic. In a general way, whether the hunger strike could be a tool, could be a weapon for the prisoners. We drew the conclusion that it was one for us, a modest one, because we had no others. And regarding the thirst strike, where it goes much faster, it was entirely clear. For example, Ulrike's statement, in Berlin, that we would thirst strike if Andreas was again denied water, as had happened at Schwalmstadt. Obviously he would have died. All of these decisions were taken collectively. It was also very simple. We can even prove it, but that is certainly not what we want to do. It doesn't interest us to enter into legal arguments to destroy the lies and the falsifications of the press and State Security. We can show that we were all in agreement, and that those who backed down during the hunger strike, as a result of the total confrontation it represented, are obviously also evidence that this was not done under duress. They stopped, and that signified for them that they didn't want any more of these politics, of the form of struggle that these politics - the guerrilla -

necessarily implies, without which it is not imaginable. That is the conclusion, that they don't want any more of this confrontation, that they want to live at any price, even if that only means to continue to vegetate, like an animal, like a plant, in isolation. Not the struggle, not rebellion, not revolutionary war, that's no longer their thing.

Müller himself backed down. He backed down and he betrayed us. Look at him and you can see how collapse occurred in his case. He only gazes at his navel and doesn't develop another politic. That is the price he sold himself for. He wanted a deal, and now he has one. In this, he is completely consumed by State Security. The result of three years of brainwashing, and there are letters from him where he says as much. Now it's a completely different story.

DAT - One more question to finish. You have said that the hunger strike was a means of struggle, if only a limited one; *Info* was as such also a weapon. Fighting against what and a weapon against what?

BM - The hunger strike? Against the conditions of detention, against extermination by isolation; because it was absolutely necessary to do something against that, to fight against that, and because this struggle was the only one possible in these conditions. Experience showed us that everything attempted on the legal level, for example the complaints, and everything I know about from all of these years, remained absolutely ineffective. Because the fact is, as I said at the beginning, the relationship is war.

The entire machine created by the State Security, the Secret Service, the media, and the political justice system carries out a war; it is a function of counterinsurgency. And the legal means that remain are obviously completely useless, mere trappings. This quickly became clear. It was clear for us with Astrid²¹, the first to be really destroyed by the dead wing. We didn't have, the prisoners didn't have, any other means except the hunger strike, an action carried out from a position which was really an extremely defensive position, but carried out collectively, with determination, on the basis of the decision that we must break the means employed against the prisoners: the isolation. It was obviously also a weapon, or, in any case, it could become one.

(Prinzling interrupts.)

FPZ - You earlier asserted, in response to a question from the honorable attorney, Dr. Heldmann, I believe, that there was no order to shoot within the group. So, I would like to ask you why then, at the time of your arrest, you were carrying a weapon in perfect working order, as such, ready to shoot? Would you respond to this question?

BM - Oh, nonsense, no.

²¹ Astrid Proll - founding member of the RAF. She had to be released from prison after the dead wing destroyed her health. She fled and was re-arrested years later in England, after which she served a short sentence. She has disavowed her RAF politics and worked for amnesty for prisoners who have left the RAF.

TP - What legal basis do you invoke?

BM - Absolutely no legal basis. After everything I've just said, this is really too ridiculous.