

Statement Dissolving the 2nd of June Movement

After ten years of armed struggle, we want to reflect critically on our history and clarify why we have decided to dissolve the 2nd of June Movement as an organization in order to continue the anti-imperialist struggle within the RAF—as the RAF.

The 2nd of June Movement was founded in contradiction to the RAF with the vague purpose of carrying out “spontaneous proletarian politics.” We considered revolutionary theory and analysis—on the basis of which the strategy and tactics, the continuity and perspective for struggle could be developed—to be unimportant, and “jumped into the struggle” with the goal of blowing the minds of young people. And so we determined our practice on the basis of what would blow their minds, and not on the basis of what the real contradictions and weaknesses in imperialist strategy were that we should focus our attacks on.

The Movement was a putative alternative to the RAF for those comrades for whom struggle without compromise went too far.

This produced ten years of splits, competition, and disorientation on the left and also within the guerilla, and it also hindered our own revolutionary development.

We carried out our actions following a populist line, without providing political direction and without managing to mobilize people against the pigs’ strategy.

It is never the responsibility of the guerilla to please the people and win their praise, but rather—in a country where social democracy is tied to Nazi fascism and U.S. imperialism, depriving the working class of any proletarian organizations—it is the guerilla’s responsibility to be the cutting edge, deepening the central political contradictions through armed attacks, so as to drive the state into political crisis.

In the metropole, in the context of imperialism, only the guerilla is in a position to be the politically explosive factor, the form of attack—as such the revolutionary politics—that forces open the breach between society and the state, developing the proletarian politics and anti-imperialist organizing necessary to shift the balance of power in our favor.

The political attack—made material through armed means—is always a victory, even in cases where the operation is militarily defeated, because it anticipates this process and sets it in motion.

That is also the difference between Schleyer and Lorenz. Today, we are certainly critical of our most important action. All the errors that

we've made over the past ten years are to be found in it, and we've learned from these errors.

The '75 liberation action unfolded in a politically charged context. The Stammheim comrades' struggle had given rise to a national and international mobilization, which the widespread hunger strike had brought to a highly developed point with which Schmidt was having difficulty coping. We not only completely ignored this context, but by our choice of prisoners we shifted the political focus.

Therein, as well as by the guy we chose—from a party that was of only secondary importance to the imperialist strategy—lay a calculation rather than a strategy. In our propaganda work before and after Peter Lorenz, the short-term success—the consumable ritual—was more important than the politico-military level of struggle required to break through the imperialist strategy. Therein one can also see the perversion of the fun guerilla¹ of Reinders, Teufel, etc. The RAF's '77 offensive and the state's reaction finally placed the question of strategy before us in a new way. '77 was a step forward in the development of imperialist strategy, as well as in the concept of the guerilla in the metropole. Since the Mogadishu and Stammheim massacres, Schmidt has given Western Europe—under the leadership of the FRG—its political definition: the project and model for imperialism in the crisis created by the liberation struggles in the Third World *and in the West European metropole*.

The unconditional integration of Western Europe into U.S. military strategy and the internal militarization of the metropolitan states through an increasingly unified apparatus—this is the imperialist response to the coming together of revolutionary struggles worldwide.

Revolutionary strategy takes on an international significance insofar as anti-imperialist groups are recognized as the main enemy of the U.S.A. and its West European project.

The U.S.A. and its accomplices knew that the next strategic defeat *anywhere* in the world would put them on the road to ultimate defeat.

The “post-Vietnam era”—that is to say, the attempt to recover from the defensive position that followed U.S. imperialism's politico-military defeat in Vietnam—through a strategy relying on political and economic means—collapsed in Iran, following the chain of defeats that stretched from Angola to Kampuchea.²

Imperialist politics now seeks a military solution that cannot be achieved, and this leads—through the preparations for widespread

1 In German this is a play on words: *Spaßguerilla* meaning fun guerilla and *Stadtguerilla* meaning urban guerilla, both sounding similar.

2 Democratic Kampuchea was the name of Cambodia from 1975 to 1979, under the Khmer Rouge government.

destruction—to the development of total annihilation as a naked concept.

A new, and in reality, final strategic military defeat in the Third World is to be prevented by launching war from Europe, a war that right from the start is meant to be a nuclear war. A new perverse variation on the theory of “limited war.”

They are not preparing war to divide the world into imperialist spheres of control. The issue is revolution or counterrevolution—which is to say, the decisive stage of the confrontation is unfolding.

This decisive stage of the confrontation will, in the final analysis, occur in the metropole, because it is obvious that the victorious Third World liberation movements that have achieved state power can be blackmailed as long as they have to function within the East-West contradiction, and as long as the imperialist centers can apply pressure militarily and through the world market.

This is the essence of the entire international revolutionary process—destruction of the state, self-determination, and identity—which has come into sharp relief in the conflict arising from the struggle against communism in the metropole in recent years. It happens now—or it doesn’t happen at all.

The question facing the entire West European left is whether, in this escalating situation, which will settle things one way or another, they will take on their historic responsibility or betray it.

UNITY IN THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST ARMED STRUGGLE

For the last time:

2nd of June Movement
June 2, 1980