

previously enjoyed close relations with some of the country's leading Social Democrats. Last week a leading Christian Democrat pointed directly at the Marburg University law professor Wolfgang Abendroth as a key manipulator of the terrorists' belief structure.

It is possible that Social Democratic Chancellor Schmidt remains silent because of pressure from terrorist control networks within his own party. According to a recent *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* article, SPD

Chairman Willy Brandt is currently holding consultations with a group of SPD leftists including Jochen Steffen, former SDS leader Rudi Dutschke, and Lower Saxony SPD head Peter von Oertzen. This group of known intelligence agency operatives has been maneuvering to found an "independent" left alternative to the SPD. Brandt may well be using them in order to threaten Schmidt's conservative wing with a party crisis.

West German Law Professors 'Debate Terrorism'

Below are extracts of an interview by the West German magazine Der Spiegel with three university professors of law questioning whether they are supporters or sympathizers of terrorist groups. The three are among some 40 professors who forced publication of a book containing the text of a pamphlet distributed at the Göttingen University shortly after the assassination of Federal Prosecutor Siegfried Buback.

This leaflet, authored under the pseudonym "Mescalero," is purposefully ambiguous on terrorist violence, and was designed to open a public discussion similar to the "violence debate" of the late 1960s, a crucial factor in the consolidation of today's terrorist operations. The extracts reveal that one of the professors, namely Ulrich K. Preuss, is a "witting" intelligence agent manipulating the other two. Until 1976, Preuss was a lawyer for terrorists Ulrike Meinhof and Astrid Proll.

Spiegel: ...let's try to use one statement in order to determine what separates you from "Mescalero" and what unites you. The statement accuses (murdered Federal Prosecutor) Buback of "torturing leftists." Did Buback indeed order torture to be used, and are the people this refers to — Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, Jan-Carl Raspe, for example — leftists?"

Preuss: The concept "torturing leftists," taken as such, is extremely liable to misinterpretation. There does exist the idea that certain prison conditions — especially isolation and the resultant sensory deprivation, to use the medical term — must, under the present conditions, be described as a new form of torture.

Spiegel: Is that just some idea, or is that *your* idea?

Preuss: I have discussed this with Ulrike Meinhof and with Astrid Proll, whom I personally counseled, as well as with others who have described the same feelings about their own cases, and I said to these people: It is possible for people to say that this is a modern form of torture.

Spiegel: We're not interested in what people say, but only in what *you* say.

Preuss: I myself have made no secret of my rejection of this sort of prison treatment, but I have not described it as torture, since I know this would bring up many false associations, and that things would keep having to be explained afterwards. For me, therefore, torture means physical abuse in the classical sense of inflicting pain.

Spiegel: concerning the second part of our question: In your view and in that of "Mescalero," are the terrorists sitting in Stammheim prison and elsewhere leftists?

Preuss: Ulrike Meinhof, Horst Mahler and whoever else, all came out of the left culture of the student movement, and therefore we, as leftists who mostly come from there too, have a relationship with them. I, for example, have a very close personal relationship with Horst Mahler.

I can't pin each of them down, and so I regard all of them as members of this left family who have, however, taken completely different paths, ones which we disapprove of. They belong to the left current, even though the consequences they have drawn from this are rejected by us and by the overwhelming majority of the left.

Spiegel: If...

Gerstenberger: I'd rather say it somewhat differently. For us leftists it is much more problematic to say that the prisoners are no longer leftists, since this would make our disputes with them too simplistic.

Spiegel: Now, if...

Knieper: May I also answer your question? It's much more difficult for me to say: What is left? Up to what point does that go? Have the violent criminals catapulted themselves out of the left camp? This might lie in the fact that I did not come out of the student movement. This is probably the reason why I don't have any set opinion on this.

(To Preuss): I have the impression that you're also not absolutely sure about it, as I noted by your hesitation a while ago.

Preuss: No, I'm not uncertain here. They have taken a different path from ours. But how can they be classified if they don't stay a part of the left?

Knieper: Permit to strongly disagree with you: We do know, for example, that Mussolini came from the Italian left, but no one can seriously count him as a member of the left for his whole life.

Preuss: You have to make distinctions. Whenever I talk about prisoners, I am actually thinking about particular people. I'm thinking about Ulrike Meinhof, or about Mahler. I don't think, for example, about Baader, whom I did not know beforehand ... But now, if you want to have it in terms of political classification, then I don't have any problem with saying that, for example, terrorist groups who are responsible for the murders of Buback and Ponto...

Spiegel: According to the Bundeskriminalamt this is the group around the former lawyer Siegfried Haag.

Preuss: ...are not leftists. There is absolutely nothing political about them; they're desperados...

Spiegel: You'll have to watch out that you don't make "Mescalero" look like another Martin Luther King.

Preuss: Unless you have bad intentions, you can't conclude from the fact that he says that socialists are not holy men, that he is therefore declaring justified murders to be his program.

But just so that you don't misunderstand me: It is realistic to say that during social revolutions, both technical and political, things happen exactly like they do in street traffic.

Gerstenberger: No, Ulrich, don't say that.

Preuss: Why not, if it's true? Every revolution brings risks and claims victims, but the difference is whether you can't prevent it, or whether you declare it to be a means which is justified by the ends. And the latter is what "Mescalero" rejects.

Racial Violence Erupts In Britain

Bloody clashes which erupted last weekend between rival extremist groups and police in the south London slum of Lewisham — largely populated by West Indian immigrants — have set off a wave of self-feeding racial violence in Britain the main target of which is the Callaghan government. The direct initiators of the violence are on the "left" the Socialist Workers Party, the British affiliate of the Fourth International "International Socialist" group of long-time NATO agent Ernest Mandel, and on the "right" the National Front, whose origins are in the British Union of Fascists of the 1930s.

BRITAIN

The Socialist Workers Party, professing to act under the banner of "ant-fascism" recruited up to 3,000 supporters, including street thugs armed with home-made weapons for a pitched battle against police who were trying to protect a 500-strong National Front march on Aug. 13. A total of 113 police officers were injured in the Lewisham riot, and a few days later another broke out in a depressed working-class area of Birmingham. Scores of civilians were hurt and dozens of rioters arrested. Authorities fear that another violent outbreak will take place next week at the annual Notting Hill carnival — a community cultural event which was the site of race riots last year.

The Socialist Workers Party is also planning to challenge a march by the National Front scheduled for early fall, promising that they will not allow "nazis" to walk the streets of Britain, while the Front has vowed to "defend British free speech from red terrorism."

The race riot scenario has so far conformed to a script outlined in the summer 1976 issue of *Race and Class*, the

official journal of the Transnational Institute, European sister organization of the Washington-based Institute for Policy Studies. The publication editorially "predicted" outbreaks of explicit racialism in Britain, equating this with "creeping fascism."

Pressures for more energetic action against the deliberately provoked violence have been mounting, especially from Conservative circles, but the Government has been reluctant to ban "political" marches for fear of being accused of repressing free speech and possibly alienating Labour Party supporters in the trade unions, where so-called left-wing groups have high credibility.

Labour Cabinet Minister Roy Hattersley, in a television interview following a Parliamentary bye-election this week in which the National Front increased its percentage of the vote from 2.9 to 3.0 percent, said that the Front's gains represented a "great horror" and that it was time to stop ignoring the group and start exposing it. However, no action has been announced against the activities of the Institute for Policy Studies-controlled left.

Meanwhile, the press is feeding the violence-ridden atmosphere with analyses of the psychology of extremism and its attraction for "struggling working-class people" who are fed up with economic collapse and joblessness. Setting the stage for future confrontations, the *Sunday Telegraph* noted: "Liverpool and Leicester, Bradford and Birmingham (all large factory towns — ed.) are cities all equally vulnerable." The U.S.'s *Journal of Commerce* reported that the fascist National Front is the "fastest growing political party in Britain," and CIA conduit Bernard Nossiter in the *Washington Post* gave increased credibility to the Socialist Workers Party who he claimed are "bent on revolutionary change."