

About some investigations for “terrorist association” in Germany...

Finally after a lot of work of translation, which in this case hasn't been particularly easy, in regard to the text in question, which is whether a nice book nor a political brochure, but instead a text which is based on the most boring, useless, uncreative and dry language, say the bureaucratic one of german repressive authorities (despite the amazing work of putting together done by the ones who had the necessary patience to read the files and “translate” them in a readable language for us all, thanks again for your work!), we are finally able to present the full translation of the “Evaluation of the files of the investigation about the militant campaign against the G8”.

What it this text about?...

This is an analysis done based on the thousands of files produced by repressive authorities while investigating some militant actions (mostly arson attacks) happened mostly between Berlin and Hamburg in the last years, which they relate to the “Militant Campaign against the G8 Meeting 2007 in Germany”, a campaign called on from some clandestine groups in 2005 (there is an extensive documentation on this both in english as in german language on the web).

They tried again for the second time to criminalize a book, “Autonome in Bewegung” (“Autonomen in movement”), which is an extensive report, written from different authors, which offers an overview about the first 23 years of activity of the “Autonomen” in Germany.

They considered it to be the “bible of the militant autonomen” (ndt: militant in the german context stays for a confrontative, pro-direct action attitude, not to be confused with the use done in other countries where it stands for affiliate to a party, political organization or for a self-sacrificing attitude) a mean of indoctrination for recruiting new militants.

Moreover, they tried to give an answers not only to recent attacks, but they began from 1987 and try to use this as a jolly for their lack of proofs in regard to some attacks happened in the last 20 years.

Such investigation lead to the raids happened on the 9th of May 2007 in several cities, a clear attempt to intimidate and criminalise the resistance shortly before the beginning of the G8 meeting, nothing new indeed.

Already on the same night, several thousands people took the streets for spontaneous demonstrations in solidarity, its highlights being the over 5000 people in Berlin and 3000 in Hamburg, direct actions did not slow down at all despite the repressive clima.

The investigation itself had been all in all an hole in the water for the authorities, nevertheless it aloud them to spy on several hundred people active in the autonomous, anarchist and left radical scene, using technological devices, placing cameras in front of apartments, bugs, gps-system on cars, organising follow-ups, which meant for them a possibility to acquire tons of information on private and political life of many.

Surely, one does also not known how much of this apparatus is still at work: by now (ocotber 2008), the official investigation cessated, but one should assume that a certain apparatus has not been dismantled yet...

...and our reasons for translating it...

Why do we reputed to take the effort to spend our time in doing such a translation, in regard to the aforementioned comments about the nature of this text?

For different reasons.

Firstly, it seems to us the first time since many years that people take their time to produce an analysis based on the files originated by a police investigation about a “terrorist association” (we are not actually aware of such an attempt recently in other countries, but

surely we might be totally wrong also! tell us if you are aware of similar projects). Most of us too often do ignore how “their” (referred to the cops one) world and “their” way of thinking is working in reality, we do often not know enough about our enemies, about how they work and consequently build up their theoremas.

Knowledge it is strength, therefore we wanted to arm all the interested people with a tool which might make a bit of light about how certain things work: say, about how the police and repressive authorities organise their investigation, their measures of control and surveillance against us, what do they repute “of interest”, relevant for their aims and what not, presenting newly created and creative concepts such as “contact-person” and many other things which you will read in the text.

Secondly, to offer a possibility to people from other countries to see how german police work, since they are one of the most advanced-ones, running around Europe training other police corpses (such as it has been in Spain or in Greece), sharing their techniques with their colleagues: we do not stay still and we also do want to share with you all such analysis, hoping that you can make a good use of such informations in your countries, surely considering the different political situation in each of the latters.

Thirdly, to show in its fullness the stupidity of such a theorema as the one produced about the “militant campaign against the G8”, where authorities, lost in the darkness of lack of any proof to send people down, played the old game of looking for some “known elderlies” of the autonomous, anarchist, left radical scene, in order to put them on the throne of subversion, give them the role of master of puppets, and define them as the leaders – as well as the material authors – of the militant actions of the last 20 years! Not bad one could say!

Surely, the authorities, with their limited (it could not be different!) mindset can not understand that such people like us try to organise in a non-hierarchical way, which means we recognize no bosses or “master of puppets” in our circles.

But then again it is clear that they *need* to act in this way, since such operations do not let themselves be plotted in other ways.

It is normal that they will never understand that our resistance, various as it might be, does not let herself be inscribed within the terms of the usual old-style leninist way of organizing. As it is clear that such an attempt to criminalize us, stop us, intimidating us and sending us down will always be there as long as our resistance will be.

One does not have to get scared , that is a part of the game in the ever-going try to subvert capitalist relationships, one has to confront it and get ready rather then demoralized and in fear.

We are among the ones who get ready, as hopefully You also, reader.

Solidarious greetings to all the ones met by repression, in fight for a world free from capitalism and State!

Some spare-time translators in struggle, beginning of October 2008

p.s. - n.1: We are spare-time translators, neither professional layouters (if you feel you want to make a nice layout we can just be happy of such idea:), nor we did studied in Oxford english language, we hope the english used here is accessible and understandable for everyone...

p.s. - n.2: You will notice that the footnotes have a break inbetween them (from footnote 45 one will jump to 65): this has to do with the fact that different people translated the text and that some footnotes have been considered as uninteresting. However, since we couldn't be bothered to manually change the numbering again, the break remained...

What doesn't fit, will be made fit!

Assessment of the files about the "militant campaign against G8"
(file number 2 BJs 10/06-2)
October 2007

Introduction

On May 9th 2007 the Chief Federal Prosecutor (BAW) and the Federal Criminal Police (BKA) searches a lot of flats and other places in Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg and in the province of Brandenburg. Occasion were the preliminary proceedings 2 BJs 10/06-2 of the BAW against at last 18 people *suspected of forming a terrorist alliance according to Section 129a Criminal Law and others (Militant campaign against the World Economic Summit (G8) 2007 in Heiligendamm)*¹. This alliance is accused of committing several arson attacks between 2005 and 2007.

The raids took place few weeks before the said G8-summit.

In the middle of June the BAW transferred an "excerpt" of the proceeding's files to the lawyers for inspection. This excerpt consists of 33 files of about 10.000 pages covering the time until shortly before the raids. In the end of August two "special files" were added that consist of forensic expert's opinions of arson attacks and communiqués (called *Selbstbeziehungsschreiben SBS*, something like selfaccusationtexts).

The assessment of the files is divided in two parts.

The first part shows the whole proceedings, as far as known - starting with the activities of the Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (BfV) in the year 2000. The second part draws conclusions from this and evaluates important details.

1. The Files

Preliminaries

Some necessary words in advance to enable you to properly sort out the sometimes adventurous, sometimes dry story of the whole proceedings.

This assessment is based on an **"excerpt" of the files** (when "the files" are mentioned in the following, always this excerpt is meant). This "excerpt only covers about 15% of the complete files. But it can be assumed that they contain essential parts, and that they mainly contain - in the eyes of the investigators - the *incriminating* findings. Because these files laid the basis for all the decisions to be signed by the investigating judge at the Federal Court (BGH), Hebenstreit, about observations, tapping of telecommunication (TKÜ surveillance) and searches. In the course of the following assessment it will be seen that there is only very few incriminating evidence. Therefore, to convince the judge, it can be supposed that this evidence appears more or less completely in the files. Four types of things might be missing:

a) exonerating findings;

¹ all quotes from the files are written *in italics*

b) most of the TKÜ surveillance-protocols, which is all telephone calls, e-mails etc. that didn't seem to be used directly - probably dozens of files with tenths of thousands of pages;
c) Collateral Investigations and Details² of the inquiries of certain arson attacks, trivialities, dead ends, formalia;
d) Findings and Details left out for "tactical proceedings" reasons, like cross connections to other proceedings that are still secret; hints to others accused in these proceedings; potential evidence not sufficiently ascertained yet, maybe hoped to be substantiated in the course of the searches to then present them afterwards.
It is obvious then that also the rest of the files might bear some interesting things, and that the current assessment (and especially the conclusions) possibly have to be corrected by the time we will get to know the missing files.

The painstakingly detailed listing of particular circumstantial evidence and findings in the files might mislead to initially hold the various *notes* and *reports* to be true, independent of the evaluation and classification done later. Watch out, trap! In the files numerous **factual mistakes** can be found. There are false quotes, mixed up names, turned around numbers, wrong assignments of registration addresses and workplaces... Not even the seemingly objective localization of a mobile phone at a certain place and a certain time necessarily has to be correct. Let's leave aside the question whether this stems from sloppiness, misconceptions, wishful thinking or even conscious untruthfulness. What's important is not to be lead up the garden path by the feigned "objectivity" of investigation files.

A further limit in connection with the files: This assessment was done in **Berlin**. As background knowledge was necessary to fit in certain aspects, certain deficits have to be stated as far as the Hamburg-Bremen-Complex is concerned. Additionally some files could not be used for this assessment, as they were "personal files" of some of the accused, who for private reasons didn't want them to be read by other people.

Four participating authorities have to be distinguished: In the beginning of the proceedings we have the German secret service agency of the interior, the **Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (BfV)**.³ The main interest of the BfV is to gather a lot of knowledge - what might be done with these informations later on in other places, if they transfer them at all, isn't their trouble. It doesn't have to give evidence to a judge, it just has to give more or less plausible explanations for their own assessments. For a long time already the BfV is allowed to make use of all the surveillance measures controversially debated in public (like online-searches, bugging of private rooms, etc.) The BfV is "politically controlled" by a parliamentary body (the "G10-commission"). Apart from this relatively weak instrument of control the BfV more or less acts as it likes.

On the side of the BfV there are mainly two departments involved in the proceedings: Department 2A1 does the text analysis, while department 2A6 is responsible for findings about persons, so they are doing TKÜ surveillance and surveillance as well.

The rights and duties of police and justice are defined more in detail.

The **Chief Federal Prosecutor**, Generalbundesanwalt (GBA) as the head of the respective body Bundesanwaltschaft (BAW) is the highest investigative state organ. Task of the BAW is to come to accusations in especially severe cases that will stand firm in court. The public prosecutor's office always is the hinge between the spheres of police and justice, and moreover exposed to political influences of the ministries of the interior⁴. Here

² like notes about *contact persons* of those accused, as well as diverse surveillance protocols

³ which literally translates *Federal Bureau to Protect the Constitution*. As a consequence from German fascism, to prevent the return of a secret state police like the Gestapo, no executive powers were given to the Verfassungsschutz, a security measure that is ignored more each day under the excuse of terrorism.

⁴ Another consequence of fascism was to decentralize the police and have it organized by the provinces. Transforming former border police into a federal police force after 1989, and giving more and more competences to them, as well as to other divisions like the financial police Zoll, this provision is

it is decided whether proceedings are to be continued, in which direction this should happen, which importance is given to it, at what time "measures related to the criminal trial" like police raids are to be taken. The BAW puts the police in charge of investigations in a certain case, which not always but very often is the Federal Criminal Police, the Bundeskriminalamt BKA.

The **Federal Court** Bundesgerichtshof (BGH) is the juridical pendant of the BAW. Not only is the BGH leading criminal trials following BAW's accusations, it also has to watch over the lawfulness of the investigations already during the proceedings. For this reason there is an "investigation judge" at the BGH who has to decide, whether certain severe measures that the BAW applies for can be used or not, for example surveillance of persons and communication. Such measures are defined in the Code of Criminal Procedure, Strafprozessordnung (StPO) and always have to be justified that "*the investigation of the circumstances (...) would otherwise be disproportionately impeded or hopeless.*" This justification is usually not verifiable for the judge, let alone refutable, so that applications of the BAW are always literally adopted and signed by the investigation judge at BGH.

Finally the **Federal Criminal Police** Bundeskriminalamt BKA is doing the actual investigative work and delivers the material needed by the BAW for their applications and, should the occasion arise, accusations. So there is a reciprocal dependency: The police is obliged to act according to their "boss", the BAW, and for some measures need to go the complicated way of applying for them first, then the application is given to the BGH by the BAW, decided and given back to the BKA then in form of an order to realize it (which doesn't need more than a few hours in urgent cases). The BAW needs the investigation material of the police to write their own reports - which they by the way keep for themselves, there is no copies of them in the files.

At the BKA the division of labour is similar to the BfV. There are mainly two departments working at the proceedings, namely ST 12 and ST 11. ST 12 takes the lead in the investigations while ST11 is responsible for *evaluations* of the communiqués and several *reports* about groups and structures⁵.

The officers of the BKA involved with the investigations are acting **within a particular logic**, and it is helpful to know this logic to understand the whole of the proceedings. First, they think of themselves as *neutral* actors and regard their work to be *objective*. They don't sit at their desks and think how they can most effectively harm the radical left opposition, but they prosecute crimes defined in the Criminal Code Strafgesetzbuch.⁶

Secondly, criminal work automatically presupposes a *supposition of guilt*. Each behavior of the suspect (or the already accused) is to be evaluated in connection with the accusations and proved if it can be used as incriminating evidence. No police can work differently - to counter-check this in the sense of a "supposition of innocence" belongs to justice. For sure criminalists also have to take into consideration exonerating material if they don't want to follow wrong tracks all the time and don't catch criminals at all. But it is very difficult to avoid a tunnel view on the suspects - all what they say and do can and will be used against them.

Thirdly, investigative proceedings of this size develop a *momentum of their own*, making it hard for those participating to follow the central thread. Here someone gets stuck in a collateral line and writes endless pages about it, there complex issues are summed up in few sentences. The focus of the investigations might possibly change over time. Notes are made and forgotten. Some work is done twice. Some other "investigative complex"

continuously undermined.

5 ST 11 and 12 are bureaucratic short versions of: state protection department Staatsschutz, group 1 (politically motivated criminality left/right), 1st, resp. 2nd commissioner's office.

6 We will not ask in this text whether it is possible at all to claim neutrality in society (even less in a class society). Also the question is not taken up in how far every state terror always happens in accordance with laws, enforced by regular "neutral" state officials and officers - even in German fascism.

requires formal considerations. All this cannot really be tracked down to some steering command or an obscure political agenda - which does *not* mean that it is impossible that such hidden agendas do exist. For sure there were also backdoor or cafeteria talks taking place on higher levels...

The assessment of the files tries to be as objective as possible. Evaluations can be found in part two and sometimes in the footnotes.

Some numbers for warming up

The proceedings name an accuse 18 persons. Five of them were accused right from the start, one followed shortly after; in the change of the year 2006/2007 six more were included, another six persons during spring 2007, one more only shortly before the raids. Two of the accused were targeted less intensively by the investigations, even the BKA is of the opinion that there is no prime suspicion of a criminal act against them.

In total the proceedings deal with 14 arson attacks, only two of them are seem to be less important.

The time spoken about in the files in an sense reaches back a far distance, back into the 80s. The more concrete history starts two times: first with an arson attack in Hamburg at June 28th 2005 (at that time investigating versus persons unknown), then again with the opening of the proceedings against "only" five accused in the beginning at April 12th 2006. All the things said about things happening before were put in later.

The files consist of ca. 270 different reports, notes, expert's opinions etc., some of them being only one page long, others consisting of more than 100 pages. A lot is repeated, not only that there are doublings of content, but the same report occurs up to five times identically in the files. About 40 objects (about 15%) stem from the BfV, among these 14 analysis of texts, ca. 150 come from the BKA, the rest mostly from different provincial criminal police offices Landeskriminalämtern, LKAs in northern Germany.

For the most part the files consist of reports about "findings about persons" of the accused (about 60), evaluations and text analysis of communiqués of the attacks (about 50), as well as, naturally, technical criminal expert reports (about 100).

About 45 investigating officers of the BKA signed the various reports and notes. Furthermore diverse BKA forensic experts, several officers of the BfV, as well as numerous officers of the LKAs, mainly from Berlin, Hamburg and Brandenburg were involved.

In the period between October 2006 and April 2007 about 80 observations took place on more than 50 days, most of them in Hamburg done by the local LKA. But the data available about these measures are unsystematical and full of gaps, especially as far as for what concerns Berlin. It has to be assumed that more observations have taken place - additionally to the permanent surveillance through GPS radio beacons and cameras at entrances that happened independent of these.

The number of surveilled telecommunication (TKÜ surveillance), of phone calls, emails and conversations in bugged cars can only be roughly estimated. In the period from September 2006 - March 2007 the surveillance of *one* the main persons accused covered more than 3000 telephone calls, about 1300 talks in the car, more than 1000 emails - plus the websites he visited in the internet. All in all there might have been some 10.000s of *events* included in TKÜ surveillance surveillance.

About 950 names appear in the files. For sure this doesn't mean 950 persons "relevant to investigations", but simply every name mentioned for some reason, for example also parents, brothers and sisters of those accused.

Still there are some hundred names left that are not only marginally mentioned. So the BKA-report "*activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm*" mentions the names of 66 persons already in June 2006, who "*attracted attention in connection to the mobilization against the G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm*", in January 2007 further 25 were added (all in all the two reports mention about 270 names). One report about the video workshop "autofocus" names about 120 people - in this hard work not even the name of the notary is missing who certified the association in 1989. Moreover about 500 *contact persons*⁷ of the accused are listed, mostly without any further explanation - the notes belonging to them are not included in the available files.

1.1. A timetable of the proceedings

The whole misery has been started by the **Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz BfV**, that kept under surveillance some of the later accused for many years.

-- since the year **2000** the BfV leads a surveillance measure TKÜ surveillance against at least four of the later (Berlin) main accused (the so-called order *Anordnung 0253*)

-- in **2002/2004** the BfV follows very much in detail the compilation of the book "Autonome in Bewegung" and tries to sort out the authors of the different texts. In the analysis of the book the BfV comes to the result that the authors would a) not only welcome militant actions, but had actively participated in them, that they would b) describe militant actions as part of campaigns in their text "How to do a campaign?", and that they would plan such activities as well for the future.

-- **end of 2004/beginning of 2005** the BfV thinks to know from TKÜ surveillance surveillance that the four Berlin suspects plan a campaign for the G8-summit 2007. Therefor the surveillance is intensified, among other things meetings (private, resp. small) are surveilled.

-- the first bigger public mobilisation that takes place during the 28th BUKO⁸ in Hamburg **May 2005** in form of an "open network meeting" is ascribed to one of the suspects (he is thought to have "fixed it up")

-- Starting from **July 11th 2005** the BfV concretely sets under surveillance the four Berlin suspects because of the assumed *militant campaign* against the G8-summit (so called *Anordnung 3003*).

-- **July 28th 2005** near Hamburg an arson attack strikes the car of a CEO of the Northern German Refinery "Norddeutsche Affinerie" Werner Marnette. In the Communiqué of the attack this action is also called a "*(...) proposal for a broad, and also militant campaign against the G8 summit 2007*". The BfV supposes this action to be the start of the campaign planned by the four suspects - with the inclusion of a fifth man in Hamburg, against whom investigations start in January 2006. Contacts of the suspects in the days before and after

⁷ the term contact person is very vague - it can be ascribed to close friends as well as to people accidentally met once (or of whom the BKA thinks so according to the files, e.g. because they went to the same assembly of 300 persons).

⁸ Bundeskoordination Internationalismus, Federal Coordination on Internationalism - a left and radical left network of groups, initiatives, journals etc. that evolved from solidarity with the liberation movements of the South.
<http://www.buko.info>

the attack are interpreted as *noticeable, remarkable and very cautious*.

At this point the Federal Criminal Police **Bundeskriminalamt BKA** comes in the first time, starting police investigations "versus unknown" because of the arson attack. From summer 2005 until at least the end of 2006 there are parallel activities of secret service (BfV) and Criminal Police (BKA).

-- the BfV installs video cameras, from **late summer 2005** until at minimum the end of December 2006 the entrances of at least two of the suspects are surveilled (video surveillance of the two others is allegedly not done by the BfV; other measures eventually similar to those of the BKA, meaning direkt observation and bugged cars, are not mentioned in the files). In the time following, each time that an arson attack happens, it is checked when the suspects left and entered their homes, and when and where they made telephone calls in the critical time. This data is transfered to the BKA later on.

-- already at **September 1st 2005** the BKA is of the opinion to be able to make a connection between the Communiqué of the arson attack of July 28th 2005 ("Marnette") and three of the people suspected by the BfV - whether coming completely from their own initiative or fed with hints by the BfV cannot be read out of the files.

-- **October 17th 2005** an arson attack is launched against the guest house of the foreign affairs ministry, the "Villa Borsig". The *SBS*⁹ is focussed at the G8 and followed by extensive investigations of the BKA, department ST (for state security, Staatsschutz), in connection with G8-mobilisations, among these the report of June 16th 2006 (see below).

-- in a *text analysis* of the **November 17th 2005** Communiqué the BKA concretely casts suspicion on one of those suspected by the BfV to be the author of the SBS of the attack on Villa Borsig - different from the BfV itself, who in their own *text analysis* draw a line to the "Federal Coordination of Antimilitarist Groups - War is Peace, Krieg ist Frieden, (KIF)".

-- **March 2006** the BfV talks to BKA and BAW and finally transfers their essential findings about the *militant campaign* to them in a 20-page report, thereby handing over the case to the authorities of police and justice.

-- On **April 12th 2006** the BAW takes proceedings against the five persons from Berlin and Hamburg named by the BfV (called the five mainly accused in the following). The BKA is ordered to lead the investigations.

-- **June 16th 2006** the BKA, ST 11 writes a first report about "Activities of persons and organisations of the extremist left scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm", listing in detail on 120 pages names of persons and groups, as well as diverse (public) meetings of the G8-campaign until May 2006, that were surveilled by the secret service Verfassungsschutz and the respective provincial criminal police units, the Landeskriminalämter. January 22nd 2007 a second, no less detailed report about *Focus Hamburg* follows.

-- **June 23rd 2006** the BKA, ST 12 offers a first report of the proceedings, which in large parts consists of findings of the BfV, as well as older findings of the BKA from former proceedings.

-- **Summer 2006** the BKA mainly investigated in following directions:

- collecting information about the book "Autonome in Bewegung".
- collecting information about the five mainly accused.

9 short version of "Selbstbeichtigungsschreiben", which means something like "self denouncing text".

- getting supplementing current information about the five mainly accused from the BfV (movement profiles, especially of the days of the attacks, contacts between them, G8-activities)
- analysing and comparing the *SBS* of recent arson attacks.
- ordering the forensic department, kriminaltechnische Abteilung (KT 54) to do comprehensive linguistic studies of the diverse Communiqués (they were asked to compare them to more than 150 different texts).
- producing a 70-page report about the video workshop "autofocus", as a connection to the campaign against the IMF-meeting in Berlin 1988 is drawn, and there exist a film of "autofocus" about this event that was shown in the run-up to the G8 2007.

-- From **August 22nd 2006** on the BGH begins to decide about surveillance of the five mainly accused, that means TKÜ surveillance of telephones used by them (including workplaces), emails and webpages; orders to *police observation, long-term observation* including the taking of pictures; installation of *technical means* into cars (Which is GPS), recording of the *word not spoken in public* in cars (which is bugs). Not all decisions are taken at once, some follow in September. They are valid for 3 month, but are regularly prolonged until at least May 2007. The decisions are based on assessments of the BKA, stating that while they were able to confirm the suspicions of the beginning with their investigations, they could not get conclusive evidence without further encroachment rights. Parallel to the decisions one more person from Berlin is introduced into the proceedings (as alleged co-author of the book "Autonome in Bewegung"), but who will play a minor role in future investigations.

-- End of **October 2006** the LKA Hamburg starts comprehensive observations in Hamburg and Bremen.

-- **November 2006** actualised reports about the five main accused are written. They mainly consist of TKÜ surveillance findings about their political and private activities, plus TKÜ surveillance findings of the BfV handed in later. Recent concretely incriminating findings about the meanwhile nine arson attacks referring to the G8 are not included.

-- **Nov 17th 2006**: for an examination of a witness of one of the arson attacks, a map with 78 pictures is produced, that is essentially based on the June 16th 2006 report "*activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm*".

-- **December 18th 2006** department ST12 produces a report "*Crimes in connection with the subject 'Herero and Nama'*". Background is that since 2005 eleven militant actions (among these several arson attacks) dealt with german colonialism in then German Southwest Africa. On 20 pages the report mainly describes the public political activities of antiracist groups in this respect and lists about 40 names.

-- **December 20th 2006** the BKA applies to insert seven persons of the social environments of some of the accused as being accused as well. This results from the findings that the observation of the main accused not only failed to prove their participation in the arson attacks, but quite the opposite gave indications that they could *not* have participated in the deeds. For ST 12 it follows that they might have only initiated and planned the attacks, and formulated the communiqués, but might have *integrated* other persons to execute them. Of these 7 persons six were introduced into the proceedings as accused shortly after, the seventh remains in to be a suspect and will finally turned into an accused only days before the raids. One of these six new accused will be treated only at the margins of the following investigations.

-- Starting from **January 2007** also the newly accused come to enjoy the *measures of criminal trial* that are deployed against the main accused since the beginning of September 2006 (TKÜ surveillance, observations...)

-- **February 26th 2007** the BfV transfers to the BKA their summed up results concerning the whereabouts of the five main accused shortly before, resp. after the arson attacks in 2005/2006, drawn from TKÜ surveillance (place and time of phone calls) and the video-surveillance of two entrances in Berlin. No hints of a participation in the deeds result from it.

-- **March 2007** five more persons from the main accused's circles of friends are taken in as accused one after another. The extension of the circle of accused is only limited by the decision about the date of the raids - the next candidates are targeted already.

-- end of March/**beginning of April 2007** actualised reports about the accused are produced, presenting the state of findings from TKÜ surveillance and observations.

-- **April 5th 2007** it is suggested to bug a flat in Hamburg, as some of the accused would frequently meet there. In the course of the raids of May 9th 2007, the flat is actually bugged, the devices will be de-installed again secretly one month later.

-- **Middle of April 2007** most forensic expert reports about traces (finger prints, DNA, texts, textile fibres) of the 12 mainly mentioned arson attacks (July 28th 2005 until March 6th 2007) are finished. Concerning the accused the reports have no result at all, generally traces are extremely poor.

-- **April 23rd 2007** ST12 presents a summed up report of the previous investigations that serves as the bases for the planned *measures of criminal trial* against the 17 accused (18 one week later), that means that it also lists the objects to be searched, the taking of pictures, fingerprints¹⁰ and DNA; two of the accused that appeared very rarely in the proceedings so far are pushed further to the back. In this note the BKA suggests that the main five and one of the others accused (who is supposed to be a co-author of the book "Autonome in Bewegung", but is also one of the two being spared by the raids) are "*members of a terrorist alliance "Autonome Gruppen" already (allegedly) existing since the middle/end of the 80s"*.

-- **May 2nd 2007** ST 12 presents a 30-page report about the association "so36.net", where various of the accused have email-accounts. The report lists about 40 names. The same time the searching of "so36.net" is suggested to confiscate the mailboxes.

-- **May 8th 2007** the BKA KT 54 presents the up to now last of 8 linguistic expert reports about the *SBS*. Like the previous the result is non liquet, that is a usable statement concerning the accused can not be made.

-- **May 9th 2007** the houses of the accused are searched, pictures, fingerprints and DNA are taken, in the case of some of the accused from Hamburg/Bremen also smell samples.

-- **May 30th 2007** the smell samples are compared to various communiqués by the police of Nordrhein-Westphalen using sniffer dogs. The result is negative. According to the NRW

¹⁰ the so called ED-Behandlung, police records (department) treatment, consists of a physical description of the person, weight, height, distinguishing marks like tattoos or scars, fotos, prints of fingers, hands and sometimes feet as well. Regular ED is done at any expectable or absurd occasion, and does not yet include the taking of DNA, which requires a separate allowance or order.

police the smell samples were destroyed then.

-- June 6th 2007 the department for collecting and analysing DNA, the DNA-Analyse-Datei tells the BKA that the comparison of the DNA of the accused with the DNA in their files is negative. The samples whereupon their DNA is integrated into these files.

1.2 The details of the proceedings

Because of the amount it is hard not get lost in details, as too many things happen the same time. To gain some transparency we split the files in four big subject areas, to which most of the files belong.

Besides there are some side strands like the investigations about the book "Autonome in Bewegung" or the interrogation of an *anonymized witness*, presumably an undercover agent. The extensive chronicle displays some repetitions and for better understanding of the reader some things are mentioned in context, that the police did not know at that time.

A short description of the subject areas

a) Investigating the accused

The investigations concerning the accused with their *reports* and *notes* build the backbone of the proceedings. They are actualized more or less each three month. A first report consists of about 15 pages and contains little more than basic data about the person, later it goes up to 30-40 pages, with single reports reaching 100 pages. These reports sum up the following findings:

- Basic data: Personalia, family members, registered addresses and actual addresses¹¹. Additionally the more general circumstances of life: ID-cards and passports, telephone connections, vehicles and train-cards, income, bank accounts and credit-cards, school and education, profession and workplace, certain skills (e.g. languages), membership in organisations, associations and parties.
Finally previous contacts to the police: police records in the federal central register, Bundeszentralregister, previous ED - pictures and fingerprints being taken, findings from previous investigations (proceedings, sentences, etc.), older persons are checked whether their name is mentioned in connection with the Stasi, resp. in the east german secret service files (BStU - Birthler Behörde).

- related to the case: As far as *membership in organisations* is concerned, the aspects politically fitting to the case are especially looked at. So the known activities in connection with campaigns, especially in connection with the G8-summit 2007 are listed.
Contacts to others accused are listed and interpreted, *contact persons* are named.
Ascertained *travel movements* are described.
Possible connections to arson attacks are investigated: Where did the person stay that day? What did he talk about on the phone? Where was his car? Finally the *measures of criminal trial* deployed against the accused are listed: Court decisions resp. prosecutor's orders about TKÜ surveillance, *long-term observations also with technical devices*, taking of "*pictures outside the house*", and "*recording and tapping of the word not spoken in public*". These measures are ordered by a judge at the BGH mostly for three month and are then prolonged by them after applications of the BAW/BKA.

In the appendix of the reports there are footnotes referring to the TKÜ surveillance, but also to other reports (text analysis, observations, etc.) that should prove things stated in the report. In extreme cases these footnotes consist of some 100-200 pages.¹²These

¹¹ in Germany every person has to register in a certain place. Most of the time, especially in Berlin, this is not taken too seriously, but diverting addresses might be interpreted by the police, e.g. as hiding.

¹² TKÜ surveillance is present in form of *lists of events*, that is protocols of phone calls, sms, emails etc. often as a

footnotes are often full of gaps, some *notes* and *reports* quoted are missing completely.

b) Forensic investigations

The various arson attacks under investigation cause a lot of paper work: first reports of local police from the scene of the deed, investigations and determination of the fire, charges, first interrogations of witnesses, reports of investigations of the respective LKAs. It follows forensic research (BKA KT) of traces found (fingerprints, DNA, textile fibres) and materials used for the arson itself as well as for the communiqué (here it is additionally searched for *squeeze-through-traces*, imprints of handwritings caused by writing on a sheet of paper on top of the communiqué). It takes weeks until all the investigations are done and presented in form of authorized expert reports, sometimes months and sometimes one and a half year - enough time for criminalists to hope for new results.

c) Analysis of the communiqués

As they are decisive for the chain of circumstantial evidence of the BKA, they take a lot of space in the files. The *SBS* that came in are at first examined by the investigating BKA-department in the course of an *evaluation* (sometimes a short *first evaluation* is done after a few days). It is always Detective Superintendent Heck of Dept. BKA ST 11 signing the analysis (though he might have only written parts of them). On an average they are 40-60 pages long, and it takes about 4 weeks to get them done.

The evaluation is split in two parts. First, the *SBS* is examined formally: type of production (e.g. computer or type writer), layout, text structure, font, spelling, punctuation, specific ways to write words (like "G8", or "G 8", or "G-8"), as well as stylistically: stylistic devices, figures of speech, local peculiarities, references, quotes, signatures, slogans. Next the content is examined: Which issues are focussed? Are there connections made to other topics? What is important for the author? Primary aim of this analysis is to profile the author, and to relate deed and group to a larger context (also to come to a prognosis what can be expected of them next).

inside of this *evaluation* there mostly can already be found *cross-comparisons* with other *SBS*, to track down a potential identity of the author. These cross-comparisons take all aspects previously used in the analysis - from typical wording to issues covered - to find similarities (or also differences). Additionally the communiqué is compared with a data bank of the BKA to detect identical terms. This data bank consisted of 11000 texts by the end of 2006, among them ca. 1780 communiqués.

But that is not all. Department KT 54, responsible for linguistic comparisons and analysis, takes the *SBS* to just another analysis. KT 54 was not only ordered to examine several *SBS*, but also to engage in comprehensive cross-analysis - they were told to compare each of the 12 *SBS* to more than 150 political texts. No wonder that KT 54 refused to do that. Up to now only 12 linguistic *official expert analysis* by KT 54 are known to exist, which are way shorter than the evaluations of ST 11 (mostly 10-20 pages).

Thirdly, the BfV offered to the BKA their own *text analysis* for investigations. These analysis refer purely to content, and essentially rely on comparisons with the BfV text data bank. Cross-comparisons are done as well. The analysis of the BfV explicitly aim to identify potential writers on this basis. The BfV is more quick in mentioning names than the BKA. The analysis are not dated and consist of about 15-30 pages.

d) Reports about left structures and groups

Naturally these reports are primarily of immense interest for those not accused. These reports are very detailed and were written in connection with the arson attacks. Their purpose is to identify a larger circle of people, where the offender(s) could possibly be found. There are two ways to proceed: One way is to conclude from the topics covered in one or more *SBS* that the offenders come from a specific scene (the infamous "topic

summary, but also in allegedly important conversations literally.

relevant to attack"). Which first of all and obviously is the G8-summit 2007 in this case, and so resulted in the most detailed report (initial 120 pages, followed by another 80). The other way is to follow hints to certain structures found at those concretely accused, and to investigate more closely in these directions (like "so36.net" that hosts various email accounts).

The method of investigation is comparably banal. The vast majority utilizes findings of files and police measures (proceedings, controls), therefore the LKAs of the German provinces are asked for respective material. More deep insights, e.g. descriptions based on reports of informers and secret agents, can be found only as far as wider areas of discussion on bigger preparatory meetings are concerned. Respective reports of the BfV are not presented in the files.

The in-depth chronicle of the proceedings

Autumn 2000 - July 2001

BfV-Order "0253"

The BfV, Dept. 3A6, tapes the phones of at least two houses of later on accused persons for different reasons (these are not known by us, and are indicated only by the number of the "G10" measure: *Anordnung (AO) 0253*¹³).

Later on six protocols of taped phonecalls are given to the BKA¹⁴ (about the demonstrations in Prague 2000, Gothenburg and Genova 2001), where the accused, following the opinion of the BfV, show their liking of the militant parts of the protests.

January 2002 - June 2003

Right from the beginning the BfV surveilles the communication about the book project "Autonome in Bewegung". They produce a meticulous table: *"Genesis' of the publication 'Autonome in Bewegung'"*, trying to determine the authorship of each single text. This is mainly done on the basis of emails including commentaries on texts and text attachments.

September 25th 2002

The BfV identifies Tomas Lecorte speaking on a press conference of the "revolutionary 1st of May demonstration" from pictures taken of him on that occasion and published in the weekly news magazine "Spiegel" to be Bernhard F., one of the persons who is to become one of the accused later on.

October 17th 2003

Mister Hoppe of the BfV, Dept. 3A7, produces a 13 page *comment* on the book "Autonome in Bewegung". According to the BfV the authors report there *"about their experiences in the [militant] autonomous scene, among others also about their direct participation in diverse acts of violence, including arson attacks since the beginning of the 80s. (...) They focus on the decade of the 80s also regarding the statutory periods of limitation relevant to criminal law. Their intention is to spark off a discussion about the perspectives and 'correctness' of radical and militant forms of revolutionary 'politics' - also in the present time."*

The modest result: *"For scientific work the book has 'practical value' insofar, as it offers authentical insights into patterns of thought and action of the autonomous, and could by this provide 'raw material' for further research."*

Elsewhere the BfV writes *"In a final résumé the authors stress (...) their determination to keep on acting militantly in the future."*

13 This measure was obviously prolonged by the parliamentary control commission responsible ("G10 commission") at least ten times for half a year. G10 measures are named after section 10 constitutional law (secrecy of postal and telecommunication) in which they interfere. That means that G10 = TKÜ surveillance = technical surveillance.

14 Till autumn 2006 these were classified as "secret", by this they could not be used in court. Only after degrading them to "Nur für den Dienstgebrauch" "NfD" (for official use only) could they be utilized, do they appear in the files that the accused are allowed to see.

September 2004

The BfV, Dept. 3A6, continues to tape phones under order *AO 0253*. In connection to the upcoming G8 summit in Gleneagles in Scotland 2005 suggestions are taken to the record, that the G8 summit 2007 in Germany could be interesting. *"We are looking very interested on the G8 in Germany in 2007"* later accused Armin M. writes in an email.

January 2005

As it had been decided that the G8 summit 2007 will take place in Heiligendamm, the BfV registers several talks about this issue. Tenor: *"We will do something about the G8 summit 2007."*

One phone call between two of the later accused seems to be most interesting to secret service. In the protocol it is written:

"M. proposes to meet on Febraury 9th.

F. is positively surprised that there is a concrete proposal for a date already. "Actually (...) we founded ACT! only to prevent this Heiligendamm summit."

M. positively refers to the aim of 'preventing'. He quotes from an english website: 'We will disrupt this conference.' Then he adds 'And the longer we (...) talk about it in advance on the phone, the more realistic it also becomes. These pigs!'

F.: 'You can start to write that down now, listeners!'"

February 9th 2005

Meeting of three of those later accused at the house of one of them in Kreuzberg. The BfV is in front of the door in disguises, filming the people entering and leaving the house.

March 2005

The BfV registers talks about the subject "G8 summit" between two of those later accused from Berlin and the one (main) later accused in Hamburg. The presumption is that by this he *"was integrated into the considerations of a (militant) anti-G8-campaign"*.

May 7th 2005

During the 28th Federal Congress of the "Federal Coordination on Internationalism" (BUKO) a "first open network meeting against the G8 summit" is held in Hamburg, a meeting that, in the eyes of the BfV, was initiated by the later accused Armin M.

June 4th 2005

In the "Open Space" in Berlin a little meeting between "elders" and "youngsters" takes place to exchange experiences of the IMF Congress in Berlin 1988 and the upcoming mobilisation against the G8 summit 2007. Some of the later accused initiated that. The BfV is there as well, hiding across the street, filming the participants. But - according to the files of the BKA - there are no records about contents of communication.

July 11th 2005

BfV-Order "3003"

The BfV starts a new *G10 measure* against the four people mainly accused in Berlin (Hauke B., Bernhard F., Sven L., Armin M.), *Anordnung 3003*. Doing this the BfV follows a simple equation: If the persons in question say on the phone *"we want to do something about the G8"*, they mean by that "doing something militant", which is just another way to say "we want to do arson attacks". This is also how the BfV interprets a phone call of the later on accused from Hamburg Fritz S.: *"Taking into consideration the close 'political' bond of trust of S. to B. and M., but also to L., S. must have known that this was not about preparing a peaceful mass demonstration, but to plan a - militantly 'flanked' - long-term campaign."*

Additionally to the TKÜ surveillance video surveillance is prepared at the entrances of the houses of the accused to be able to - combined with the results of the TKÜ surveillance

and the geographical data of the surveilled mobile phones - narrow down their whereabouts especially during the times of arson attacks to come. The video-camera at the entrance of Hauke B. is installed relatively soon (before June 28th), the one at the entrance of Bernhard F. takes a bit longer, being ready somewhat between August and October. According to the BfV no video surveillance is installed at the houses of the suspects Sven L. and Armin M.

July 27th 2005

Arson attack No.1: Marnette

Near Hamburg an arson attack targets the car of CEO of northern german refinery, "Norddeutsche Affinery", Werner Marnette. The damage sums up to 70 000 €. In the communiqué of the attack the action is also called a "*...proposal for a broad, also militant campaign against the G8 summit 2007*".

* The BfV judges this action to be the curtain-raiser of the campaign planned by the four Berlin suspects. Contacts between them in the days around the attack are interpreted as being *noticeable, remarkable* and *very cautious*. Belonging to this is, for example, that two days before the attack suspect Sven L. invited suspect Hauke B. for supper the same evening, and that Hauke B. "*did not hesitate*" to agree; further that suspect Bernhard F. at the day following the attack announced to visit Armin M. the same day.

Furthermore the BfV assumes that at least one person from Hamburg had been involved in producing the *SBS*, as it contained references to Hamburg local politics. Nevertheless five more month will pass until TKÜ surveillance measures against Hamburg suspect Fritz S. start.

* 9th of August a first evaluation of the *SBS* "Marnette" by Detective Superintendent Heck, BKA ST 12 states a difference to the *SBS* known so far from the Hamburg region, it is assumed that the authors come from the older autonomous scene with contacts to Berlin, and note the remarkably early start of mobilisation for the G8 summit 2007.

It is interesting that the BfV text analysis of this attack is missing in the files (Instead, the analysis of the "Imtech" attack is put in its place - see below - which is of central importance for the whole complex, and also investigates the attack "Marnette"). It cannot be excluded that the BfV already in this phase gives concrete names to the BKA. This can be concluded from the fact that by the end of August the boss of Detective Superintendent Heck, First Detective Superintendent Schäfer, answers a *findings inquiry* of the LKA Hannover in this case not only presenting the findings regarding the details of the *SBS* asked for, but also with long and very concrete comments of four persons being suspicious in the opinion of the BKA, among them three of those surveilled by the BfV - this happens despite the fact that the BKA at this point in time is far from officially opening proceeding against them in this case. From now on the later main accused Fritz S. is held by the BKA to presumably be the author of the *SBS*. In the BKA answer to the LKA, like in their previous text evaluation, the conclusion is drawn, that the noticeable mentioning of earlier militant actions in the area of globalisation in the *SBS* (called "internationalist" at the time) - "Amazones", "Anti-Shell campaign" - that a personal link exists to those being active then. The "Interventionist Left", at that time in the state of foundation, is under BKA suspicion as well, as the term "*radical left intervention*" is used in the *SBS*, and "*as experience shows, attempts to organize in the scene are always accompanied by campaigns and respective mobilisations, including crimes that seem to be useful for that end.*"

* The forensic investigations of the attack done by the lower-saxonian LKA and the BKA, as well as the examination of the *SBS* are in most parts finished by September and show no results.

* The TKÜ surveillance of the four Berlin suspects by the BfV provides at least no evidence for travels to Hamburg: At the evening before the attack they are all at home. Video surveillance of Hauke B. leads to practically exclude him from the list of those possibly participating in the attack.

October 17th 2005

Arson attack 2: Villa Borsig

Arson attack in Berlin-Tegel targeting the guest house of the foreign ministry "Villa Borsig", being under construction at the time, by "autonomous groups / militant people (mp)". Actually everything in this attack should fit into the BfV picture of the alleged "militant campaign": The attack takes place in Berlin, according to the communiqué it was done by "autonomous groups", and the authors explicitly connect it to the mobilisation against the G8 summit 2007. *"We are there as well, we are part of this social movement."*

* Despite this the SBS text analysis of the BfV by December 7th 2005 does not assume that the offenders come from the suspects known; they rather see parallels in content to the texts "Materials for a new Antiimperialism" and other writings of the author Detlef Hartmann, as well as to texts of the "federal antimilitarist coordination War is Peace, Krieg ist Frieden (KiF)". Also it could be assumed that the authors participated in the debate about militancy¹⁵ before under the name "Autonomous Groups"¹⁶.

* In the evaluation of the SBS BKA ST 11 way earlier (November 17th 2005) comes to a bit different conclusion: The text is said to be written by a single person, who - as representative of the group - formulates a *claim of leadership* in the left scene. A personal link to the previous attack in Hamburg is supposed.¹⁷ The more than average comprehensive argumentation of the BKA culminate in the supposition, *"that B. probably is the author of the SBS of "Villa Borsig" under examination."* - which is exactly the Hauke B. under surveillance of the BfV for a long time, who is not mentioned with a single word in the text analysis of the BfV itself.

* The signature "autonomous groups" and the explicit reference to the G8 campaign that is about to begin, is attentively registered, and leads to the assumption that the offenders could be active in the beginning Anti-G8-campaign. This results in comprehensive investigations of the BKA concerning the G8 mobilisation, summed up in the first report of June 16th 2006 *"activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm"*. Also the connecting data of all mobile phones active in the area of the first two bigger preparatory meetings in Hamburg (October 2005) and Berlin (January 2006) were completely surveilled (see below).¹⁸

* The search for traces at the place of the deed and of the SBS is not finished until Spring 2007. Finally two traces promising to the BKA are presented: A fingerprint at a [Backblech] presumably used for the attack (taken April 2006), and two vague photographs of people who might have possibly participated in the deed (Spring 2007).

* Also for this arson the four suspects are more or less out of the woods: As BfV surveillance proves three of the four were on holidays - among them the alleged author of the SBS Hauke B. The fourth suspect, at whose door the video surveillance is working as well by now, was at home at the time the deed was done, and left his house only for about twenty minutes that night. On that the BKA will remark much later, in April 2007: *"It cannot be excluded, that F. used this short leaving of the object where he lives to take the selfdenouncementwritings of the attack in Berlin to a mailbox by bike."*

November 2005

15 In 2002 the latest attempt to start a debate about militancy among militants was fostered by the "militant group (mg)", aiming to convince other groups to become part of a "militant platform". Not many groups contributed to the debate. While the attempt in itself, reflecting at length on militant history, theory and perspectives was welcomed by most of those participating in the debate, few if any agreed on the concrete proposal. The debate is documented at [www...](#)

16 In an old tradition of constructing hierarchical terrorist groups, the German police usually tries to treat this signature, which was used by different groups for various purposes - many but by far not all of them secret acts of sabotage - as kind of an exclusive trade mark.

17 Especially this passage of the *evaluation* is that funny, that no one should miss out on reading the respective paragraph in part two of this text.

18 At least the names belonging to the phones logged in during these weekends, as well as the numbers called from these phones, and the numbers of those sending phone calls or sms received by them.

Linguistic expert analysis of the forensic department

In the investigations of the arson attack on "Villa Borsig" the BKA ST 12 applies for Department KT 54 (Linguistic comparisons and analysis) to search for circumstantial evidence regarding the authorship of the *SBS* for some months. A first application of the end of October to analyse the *SBS* is followed by a second one to compare the *SBS* to the linguistic text collection, and again a bit later by another to compare it to 153 more texts. One after the other additional applications demand the comparison to each of the *SBS* newly appearing in the complex of investigations. Understandably KT 54 is not amused about the perspective to deliver about 2000 text comparisons and takes the liberty to reduce the order, and excludes many of the texts given to the by ST 12 - for example statements given in court by RAF prisoners in the 80s, as well as texts taken from the monthly newspaper "analysis & critique" about a conference on psycho-social interventions in South Africa... February 16th 2007, that is 16 months after the attack, KT 54 presents the last of six comparing linguistic expert reports. In all of them they come to the result *non liquet*, that is that *"the identity of the author of each one of the texts can neither be validated nor excluded"*. This means that the expert reports can not be used as evidence in the juridical line of argument.

KT 54 explains its *methodological basis "in the area of author identification"* as follows: There are three potential tasks, *text analysis*, *text comparison*, and *sample research*.

- In the text analysis a profile of the author is developed (Mother tongue, level of education, occupation, experience in text production, age group, region/dialect, groups to which he or she belongs). The key strata is the *analysis of style and mistakes*. There are numerous factors that potentially influence or disturb the analysis (like dissimulation, prove reading, multiple authors).
- Text comparison should prove the *identity or non-identity of the authors* of different texts. There are five degrees of probability to approve or deny the identity of authorship (starting "with a probability bordering being sure" to *"a slightly [überwiegenden] probability"*), as well as *"non liquet"* for *"impossible to decide"*. Results *"in the sense of absolutely being sure (for example "with certainty", are not possible in forensic text analysis."*
- In sample research a text is compared to the BKA text collection, and *"examined if there maybe exist deed connections to texts in the collection"*. This is done with System *"KISTE"*, probably a special data bank software.

December 8th 2005

Arson attack 3: Tchibo

Arson attack in Hamburg on the company car of "Tchibo" CEO, Thomas Vollmöller, by the "AG heart-attack".

BKA and BfV show a relatively weak engagement. BKA ST 11 writes a quite short *evaluation* of only five pages, the BfV offers no independent analysis, the attack is mentioned only in a cross comparison of diverse *SBS* (see January 30th 2006).

Maybe the BKA does not draw the same conclusion from the up to now three arson attacks (in different cities in 5 months time) that this really is a "militant campaign". It is more than a month later, in Spring 2007, that the BKA supplements the forensic examinations of the Hamburg LKA with own expert reports (a fact that could also stem from high pressure [belastung] of the KT departments) that do not lead to any usable evidence.

This time TKÜ surveillance and video surveillance of the four suspects do not provide a clear picture - for two of them the participation can probably be excluded, while no certain statement is possible for the others.¹⁹

¹⁹ In numerous attacks the BKA derives a certain time span between phone calls before and after the attacks, in which travelling to the place of the deed would have theoretically been possible. Only exceptionally the BKA admits that this might be very unlikely considering the circumstances.

December 14th 2005

Arson attack in Berlin

Arson attack targeting the Berlin District Court in Wedding. Followed five weeks later, at January 24th 2006, by arson attacks on two trucks of the relocation company "Fahrtsmann" and an (attempted) attack on a building of the job agency "Agentur für Arbeit". Shortly after responsibility for all three actions is taken in an *SBS*. It is signed by a "Militant alliance for a class struggle from below!"

* Neither BKA nor BfV understand these attacks as being part of the militant campaign against the G8 (which is not mentioned in the *SBS* either). Rather a local association of different groups especially created for these actions was assumed, with the "militant group" and "Autonomous Groups" as favoured participants.

The attack is meaningful in connection with the G8-proceedings insofar as all data of the mobile phone transmission cells of the respective nights and places were investigated by the BKA retroactively. Doing this the investigators find two phonecalls of one person meanwhile accused by April 2007, that should have taken place near one of the places of attack two hours before the fire broke out. *"Provided that B. was not in the area of the crime for other reasons (e.g. 'private' reasons for staying in the area of the mobile phone transmission cell), a participation in the deed cannot be excluded."*

January 11th 2006

* The BfV expands its surveillance measures concerning the militant campaign on Fritz S., later to become the main accused in Hamburg.

* The investigation judge at the BGH decides to give the permission to retroactively take all mobile phone connection data from the areas around the first two big federal preparatory meetings in Hamburg (October 2005) and Berlin (January 2006). Moreover some participants of the meeting are retroactively identified.²⁰

January 30th 2006

Arson attack 4: Imtech

Arson attack in Hamburg targeting two small trucks of the "Imtech" company, a supplier of the armament production of Thyssen-Krupp. A group "Militant Antimilitarist Initiative - M.A.M.I." claims responsibility.

In the communiqué it is stated that *"Since summer 2005 the militant campaign against the G8 summit 2007 is on the way"*. In the following the three previous arson attacks are explicitly mentioned ("Marnette", "Villa Borsig" and "Tchibo"), and links are made to the soccer world championship 2006 in Germany, to the NATO security conference 2007 in Munich, to the G8 summit 2007 (specifically stressing the political structures of "dissent!" and "Interventionist Left"), as well as the "Mittenwalder Gebirgsägertreffen (Mountain Soldiers)", an event celebrating the traditions of some world war veterans in the south of Bavaria.²¹ This leads to an extraordinary long and detailed *evaluation* (BKA) resp. *analysis* (BfV) of the text.

* Resulting from the cross regional character of the *SBS* "Imtech" BKA ST 11 is of the opinion to link the attack to the existing axis Hamburg-Berlin (personified in the suspects Hauke B. and Fritz S.), but Detective Superintendent Heck remains skeptical of the *militant campaign*. In his 20 page report he draws the conclusion that the effect to create dynamic in other groups hoped for by the association of persons participating *"is not to be expected with a higher probability (...) considering the successes in organizing reached so far."*

* The BfV, department 3A1, is going much further in its text analysis dating from March 6th 2006. They are of the opinion that July 27th 2005 arson attack "Marnette" had been *"the*

²⁰ This data is used by the BKA, despite the fact that the respective persons are neither listed as suspects nor accused.

²¹ The mentioning of the southern Bavarian meeting of this elite army detachment (founded in fascist times and celebrating their unbroken tradition each year) in the Hamburg *SBS* seemed to be very interesting to the BKA - see the "Evaluation report of activities of organisations and persons of the left extremist scene against the planned G8 summit 2007 in Heiligendamm - Focus Hamburg"

first in a row of now 6 actions within the scope of the 'broad and militant campaign' against the G8 summit in Heiligendamm". This is why these six attacks are examined more closely. Two of them - one attack of the "militant group" of November 2006 on the German Institute of Economic Research in Berlin and one attack of December 2006 targeting cars of the promotion agency "Jung von Matt" in Hamburg are excluded again short time later, as "personal overlappings are rather not probable". Retrospectively it is said of the attack "Marnette" now, that this SBS had set "the focus for the course of the upcoming campaign ideologically and contentwise".

This *focus in content* is said to be "Internationalism", "Antimilitarism", "Anticapitalism" and "social Resistance". The analysis of the text comes to the result that " *these cornerstones defined in the communiqué Hollenstedt were put into action in a comprehensively consequent way*" in the four remaining attacks. These correspondences as well as the analysis of the texts are said to suggest that all four attacks "were done by persons coming from structures of the spectrum of the undogmatic left extremism ready to use violent means that might overlap or at least be in contact with each other." Also it is said that these persons are to be found in the structures of the federal coordination "War is Peace" and/or in within the "Autonomous Groups" responsible for attacks on the overhead powerlines of trains.

* Forensic investigations of the case continue until July 2007, which means that the forensic criminalists were not even finished with their expertise by the time of the searches at May 9th. The results are nevertheless negative, that is: no traces.

* BfV surveillance of the by now five suspects shows with relative certainty that one of the suspects cannot have participated in the attack, for two other it is probable that they did not participate, for the other two it can neither be proved nor excluded.

March 2nd 2006

Meeting of BfV and BKA

No protocol exists of this meeting, but in knowledge of the previous assessments of the respective attacks it can be speculated that the BfV suggests to the BKA here to finally start systematic investigations against the *broad and militant campaign* against the G8, which is said to long since have unfolded unnoticed or at least underestimated by the BKA. Some days later the BfV sends their *text analysis* of "Imtech" to the BKA to underline their request. The structural suppositions expressed there, especially in direction towards attacks on overhead powerlines/Autonomous Groups, fit neatly into the suspicions the BKA developed so far against the main suspects B. and S. Apparently it was agreed on informing the Chief Federal Prosecutor's office BAW.

March 15th 2006

BfV hands the case over to BAW

In a secret meeting in Berlin the representative of the BAW, Federal Prosecutor Beck, is informed about the case by the BfV. Federal Prosecutor Dr. Diemer is ordered to check the opening of proceedings. Therefore he is given a 20 page text by the BfV at March 24th 2006 about the collected "*Findings of the BfV about the alleged initiators of the 'militant campaign'*", file number 3A6-073-S-480001, that is classified secret and for this reason cannot be used in court; added to it is a 13 page BfV *note* about the book "Autonome in Bewegung" dating from October 17th 2003.

It contains reports about measures taken by the BfV against the five persons Hauke B., Bernhard F., Sven L., Armin M. and Fritz S. The line of arguments of the BfV is such:

1. The four people from Berlin are said to be the "main authors" of the book "Autonome in Bewegung".²² In the book they would "*describe their own activities - including even selective arson attacks*" and stress "*their determination to militantly act as well in the future*". Moreover, the campaign against the IMF meeting in Berlin 1988 to them is of "*exemplary importance - still valid today*".

2. TKÜ surveillance would have shown that for the four people from Berlin the *more recent*

²² Differing from what the BKA holds true later on, Fritz S. from Hamburg is not mentioned as an author here.

summit events (starting with the IMF meeting in Prague in 2000) were "*starting points for (militant) activities*".

3. The four people from Berlin would have been *concerned* with the upcoming G8 summit already since Autumn 2004.

4. They would have *included* Fritz S. from Hamburg into their purpose on the phone.

5. In May 2005 suspect Armin M. would have *instrumentalized* the BuKo meeting in Hamburg for the planning of his campaign.

6. In the following time they would have "*worked on building up network structures for the 'G8 Heiligendamm' with determination*". It is said to have become clear that the four Berlin suspects would "*not only want to get engaged on a 'legal', but also on the illegal level (attack activities)*". This is said to be backed up for example by the fact that Armin M. was showing interest for maps of the region, or by a statement of Hauke B. in a phone call: "*I will not do something big in the front line. If at all, I will do something from the background*".

7. The arson "Marnette" would have been the start of this campaign. Besides the points previously mentioned the participation of the suspects could be indicated by the following: The *SBS* would contain "*historical reminiscences, that should be present only to few members of the scene in this form*" (this means the "Antishellcampaign" and "Rote Zora/Amazones", which are also mentioned in the book "Autonome in Bewegung"); the *SBS* would contain *detailed information* about the "Northern German Refinery" and Armin M. is said to be known for maintaining a *so-called Economy Archive*. Yet few information were to be gained around the attack of July 28th - namely because of the "*very cautious behaviour of those concerned*". As mentioned above this *cautious behaviour* of the four suspects is "backed up" with five points: A spontaneous invitation of Sven L. for dinner was accepted by Hauke B. "*without hesitation*"; Armin M. mentioned a "*meeting in the A32*" (instead of correctly speaking of "Adalbertstrasse 32"); a day after the arson in Hamburg Bernhard F. announced to visit Armin M. the same day; the day before the arson a google search for GPS jammers was done from the living collective of Hauke B.; and eventually Armin M. remarks in a phone call one day after the arson that now he could *finally* spend his time thinking about a planned vacation.

8. The text of the BfV ends with the note that the suspect Armin M. would have spoken of *our campaign*, and that he holds important that *various actions* happen in the run-up to the summit.

March 17th 2006

Arson attack in Bad Oldesloe

Arson attack in Bad Oldesloe targeting six vehicles of the company Thormählen Welding Technique, "Thormählen Schweißtechnik AG" by "Internationalist Cells" producing a damage of about 250.000 Euro.

* The BfV comes to the conclusion in their text analysis that the correspondences with the other *SBS* in terminology and content would show that this attack is part of the *militant campaign* and that it follows the *guidelines* given in the *SBS* of the attack "Marnette" of July 27th 2005.

April 4th 2006

The forensic department reports a success in connection with the attack "Villa Borsig": A fingerprint of unknown origin could be secured at a baking tray allegedly used in the arson.

April 10th 2006

BKA Detective Superintendent Heck engages in comparing the *SBS* "Villa Borsig" to a text published in the magazine "radikal" March 2006: "An answer of the 'Autonomous Groups' to a written interview with the (mg)". He comes to conclude that the article in the 'radikal' must have been written by "*persons from the leadership of the autonomous scene of Berlin*" involved with the structure of the 'radikal' as well as in diverse attacks of the last ten years. Moreover they would probably be managers of small businesses, be in contact with IT-

specialists, were mainly active in the areas of "Internationalism" and "Antinuclear/Anti-Castor" while being well-disposed towards "Antifascism", would participate in the network "People's Global Action" (PGA), would have co-authored the "militant manifesto" in 2001, and finally were probably to be found in the *immediate environment* of the accused Hauke B. and in *communicative connection* to Fritz S. in Hamburg.

The BfV analyses the text as well in June 2006 (only referred to in the files) and states an *"at least partial identity of authors"* with the SBS "Villa Borsig", as well as *clear indications* that the authors belong to the initiators of the *militant G8-campaign*.

April 12th 2006

Opening of the proceedings

The BAW opens the proceedings under file number 2 BJs 10/06-2 against the five main accused Hauke B., Bernhard F., Sven L., Armin M. and Fritz S., as well as against Stephan M.²³ *"for being suspicious of forming a terrorist alliance under section 129a Criminal Law (Militant campaign to the World Economic Summit (G8) in Heiligendamm)"* and officially orders the BKA ST 12 to do the investigations. In the beginning the proceedings are lead by Prosecutor Dr. Diemer, then for about six month by Dr. Heine, after that by Weingarten. In the beginnings the accusations refer to the *militant campaign* only in an abstract sense, none of them is accused to have participated in one of the previous arson attacks. The proceedings in these cases continue *versus persons unknown* under file numbers 2 BJs 39/05-2 ("Villa Borsig") and 2 BJs 6/06-2 (Hamburg attacks). In the following month the three proceedings were continued parallel to each other, new attacks were then added to one of the later proceedings. It is not until March 2007 that the three proceedings were put together under file number 2 BJs 10/06-2. The investigations in all three proceedings were lead by BKA ST 12, therefore a close cooperation in the respective cases can be assumed.

April 27th 2006

Arson attack 5: HWWI

in Reinbek near Hamburg the car of Thomas Straubhaar, Director of the "Hamburg World Economic Institute" (Hamburger Weltwirtschaftsinstitut HWWI) is targeted with an arson attack, stones and colour is thrown into the house he lives in. Already two days before the house of Sören Schülke, the manager of the Job Agency "Team Work Hamburg - ARGE" was targeted with colour bottles. In their SBS "fight 4 revolution crews" claim responsibility for both attacks.

* The *evaluation* of the SBS of the BKA ST 11 is considerable short (as is the communiqué) and done in a few days. A connection to the previous attacks of the "militant campaign" is not stated there. On the contrary it is finally assumed *"The complex of circumstances suppose that the SBS had been written by a locally acting autonomous group of the Hamburg scene mainly active in the area of social problematics."*

Nevertheless the BKA includes the attack as first concrete deed into the new proceedings 2 BJs 10/06-2, instead of adding it to the "Hamburg Complex" (2 BJs 6/06-2).

* The BfV is by far slower with its *text analysis*. It takes until the end of June that they transfer their 17 page text to the BKA. They take the attack to be the sixth²⁴ of the *militant campaign* of *"overlapping or at least interconnecting structures from the spectrum of the violence-prone undogmatic left extremism"*.

While there were no relevant correspondences with the other SBS found, this could also stem from the fact that they mostly dealt with the issues "Internationalism" and "Antimilitarism", while the present SBS was trying to *"give the social question special emphasis again"*. In the following the BfV concludes that *"relevant correspondences in terminology and*

23 Stefan M. formally is one of the accused, but was - as far as we know - hardly ever affected by the further investigations.

24 The BfV continuously counts the attack on "Thormählen Schweißtechnik" in Bad Oldesloe to belong to the militant campaign, while the BKA will later on ascribe it to different persons.

content" were to exist with 19 texts from the *local data holdings*, of which 14 are said to stem from the groups "FeIS" and "ACT!", resp. from persons of these groups. The BfV especially points at the accused Bernhard F. who is said to be a member of "FeIS" and "ACT!" and to publish under the pseudonym "Tomas Lecorte". Moreover the connection of FeIS/ACT! to the coordination war is peace "Krieg ist Frieden" (KIF) is stressed, from whose circles the initiators of the whole *militant campaign* could presumably come. While the BfV admits that "*Neither FeIS nor ACT! are clandestine organized groups, they do not engage in militant actions*", it is assumed to be conceivable that single persons of these groups could "*possibly be active in an actionistic way as well*". Here again the accused Bernhard F. comes into play, who as an elder autonomous is said to allegedly be experienced in the planning of militant actions, as could be seen in his 1992 novel ("Wir tanzen bis zum Ende", "We dance until the end") that was at the time judged by the BfV to be *obviously autobiographical*. In summary Bernhard F.'s "*participation of the 'attack Schülke/Straubhaar' as well as his role of a co-initiator of the militant campaign are at least to be seen as a possibility*".

* The first orders for forensic research are already given in the beginning of May, but the finishing of the expert reports takes quite a while: Between the end of 2006 and April 2007, which is about a year later, the seven forensic reports about the examination of means used in the attack and *SBS* are finished. No usable traces were found.

However Miss Straubhaar had seen persons in front of the house at night. November 2006 she is interviewed as a witness. A folder with photographs of 55 men and 23 woman is shown to her. Most of these 78 persons are taken from the report "*Activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm*"²⁵, that is persons which the BKA believes to be actively engaged against the G8 summit. Few names are taken from older proceedings, like the one finally finished in the courts against the "Revolutionary Cells", some come from the parallel 129a-proceedings "Bad Oldesloe". Very few names cannot be explained.

* The surveillance of the five accused by the BfV results in the finding that two of them (among them Bernhard F.) cannot have participated in the attack with high probability, while for two others it can neither be proved nor excluded.

June 16th 2006

Assessment Report Activities against the G8-Summit -- Focus Berlin

BKA ST 11 supports their colleagues of BKA ST 12 in their investigations by transferring a comprehensive assessment report ordered from them after the attack on "Villa Borsig" October 2005, called "*Activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm*".²⁶ As this report is of special interest for outside observers and as 180 names appear in it, the report is described very much in detail here.

Starting point of the report is the consideration, "*that the group of offenders or at least parts of them stems from the group of 'G8 opponents' of the Berlin region, and that they also take part in preparatory meetings of the left scene against the G8 summit 2007 in Heiligendamm to initiate/support respective resistance.*" Therefore ST 11 is asked work on the following issues: "*Emergence and development of the 'Anti-G8-Movement'; personal data and findings about 'G8 opponents' of the Berlin region, resp. with connections to Berlin; Photographs of 'G8 opponents' from Berlin; findings (groups, persons participating, etc.) about all 'Anti-G8-events' in Germany known so far (e.g. 'Dissent!' meetings, 'Bundeskongress Internationalismus (BUKO)); organizational findings about groups (emergence/structure/members) of the Berlin region, that are dealing with the issue 'G8'; publications/discussion papers about the 'G8-topic' in respective media (e.g. internet forums, magazines of the scene).*"

25 Including 13 pictures of the 5 accused and the 7 already-not-really-accused (one of who appears two times in the folder)

26 The report was written for the at that time independent proceedings "Villa Borsig" (2 BJs 39/05-2). January 22nd 2007 another, less comprehensive report focussing on Hamburg will be written about the attacks on "Imtech" and other targets in Hamburg (2 BJs 6/06-2)

This report consists of 121 pages.

* It starts with a description of the "Antiglobalizationmovement" in Germany, beginning in 1988 with *"what the autonomous scene itself called 'IMF-campaign', aiming to prevent or at least to seriously disturb the conference through criminal offences."* Via the World Economic Summit in Munich 1992 the report goes on to the foundation of "Peoples Global Action" (PGA) in 1998, and the numerous protests against diverse summit meetings that followed (starting with the WTO meeting in Geneva in 1998, via Gothenborg/Genova in 2001 up to the WEF meeting in Davos 2005). This introduction mainly accounts on 15 pages the summit meetings and the (criminal) events accompanying them. It ends about a year before the report was written, the G8 summit in Gleneagles 2005 is not included any more.

* In the following 20 page chapter a series of meetings of the Anti-G8-mobilization are described, starting with the "first open preparatory meeting against the G8 summit" within the setting of the Buko-congress in Hamburg May 7th 2005, via nine other supraregional meeting, mostly in Hamburg and Rostock, up to the announcement of an "action camp" in the beginning of August 2006 in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. The findings about these meetings obviously stem mostly from the local criminal police departments LKA and internet research (public reports about the meetings), only smaller parts originate from BKA or BfV surveillances. The report mentions the issues covered and participants identified (also a few plates of cars parked in front of the building). In nine out of ten meetings there is not much to say: They are shortly summed up in 10 pages, naming about 30 people, among them some of the accused, as well as other persons that were sitting on panels or were introduced with their names in the internet. Of the Rostock "action conference" that took place in the end of March 2006 for example only six of the 300 participants were identified.

* According to the order to especially examine the *Berlin region*, special attention is given to the second federal preparatory meeting in Berlin (Dissent! meeting) taking place in Mehringhof in January 2006. This meeting and the 200 people participating in it are described on 10 pages. It is mainly surveilled by the Berlin LKA, but also the BKA as well as the BfV contribute to the report²⁷. The BfV secretly films the participants entering and leaving most probably from the top floor of the building Mehringdamm 47, which provides a good view into the first backyard of the Mehringhof. BKA ST 12 delivers a list of 17 persons "that are identified as participants of the meeting with probability"²⁸. Finally the Berlin LKA names 28 allegedly participating persons and 25 participating groups (while adding that the list is incomplete, and that *"members of the so-called 'Fighting group Berlin' did not disclose their identity"*²⁹), Persons from at least 13 bigger cities, as well as from various countries (explicitly listed in detail) would have been present. The content of the meeting summed up on 7 pages supposedly stems from information of the LKA. The meetings would have been facilitated and steered by persons of the groups "Six Hills Berlin" and the "Glocal Group Hanau", as well as partly by people from the "area of the Berlin Social Forum". *"Ringleaders and leading cadres from Berlin" would have "pressed independently and rereatedly for a personal introduction of all persons participating"*, while the same persons would have refused this the same time for themselves. It would have become clear *"that the scene is made unsure by surveillance measures of the state and seemingly assumes that permanent surveillance is taking place."* The report states, slightly struck as being strange by the *"exaggerated seriousness (...) which often ended in overt irritability, and which massively hindered processes of communication and agreement even in most insignificant questions of procedure (...) Attempts to thrash out the differences obviously existing contentwise in a Working*

27 The descriptions are that much detailed, concerning the identification of persons as well as contentwise, that it has to be concluded that at least one undercover agent, or at least an experienced undercover cop of the LKA was present in the meeting. Also present in the meeting was at least one of the undercover agents of the BfV working within the "Berlin Social Forum", whose cover was blown shortly after.

28 The overwhelming majority consisting of people accused in this or other proceedings, that is persons that the BKA could easily identify through TKÜ surveillance or simply by recognition.

29 This "Fightinggroup Berlin" seems to attract special interest by the Berlin LKA for being considered an especially radical group.

Group Critique (...) were not agreed on by the different groupings, as the hopelessness of the idea was all too clear."

The differences in opinions between "Dissent!" and the "Interventionist Left" were respectively described as supporting a *"radical left, autonomous orientation with a confrontative alignment affirmative to violence, and on the other side for a broad mobilization including parties, unions and NGOs, while maintaining a radical left core"*.

After this the report introduces the 12 working groups built in the meeting. It is hard to tell whether informers were taking part in these working groups, or if they just listened attentively to the summaries. It sounds a bit more like the descriptions are rather based on the reporting back of the working groups to the general plenary.

The "Working Group Content" consists *"mainly of Berlin activists"*. It could not present any results, as it would have been occupied predominantly with internal left conflicts. It would speak out for an *"unequivocal profiling and a clear dividing line towards the NGOs and the official protests (Attac, parties)"*.

The "Working Group Camp" would *"likewise be dominated and lead by Berlin leading cadres"* and would have to be seen as radical, meaning that it has to be assigned to the "Dissent!" spectrum. It works *"in a conspicuously conspirate way and clearly cuts itself off the general preparatory acts"*. A meeting of the working group is said to be planned for the beginning of February 2006 *"at a place in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern that is kept secret"*. In the following it reads: *"The camp 2006 is seen as dress rehearsal for 2007. It is explicitly intended to test the limits of state security authorities, while not delivering reasons for dissolving or repression measures though. These activists aim at massive radicalization of resistance and protests in 2007."*

The "Working Group Infotour" is said to be dominated by persons from Berlin as well. Apart from mobilizing for the protests in all parts of Germany, they would *"aim at collecting and coordinating the actual states of preparation of all groups and circles participating in the network."* For this purpose they would also use the internet.

The "Working Group Actions" would have been *"called into being especially after intensive attempts of supporters of the group F.e.l.S."*. The span of considered action forms would reach *"from peaceful demonstrative forms of protest (street theatre, and the like), via actions of civil disobedience (in parts relevant under criminal law), up to clandestinely planned offences. However, according to the present state of knowledge these do not achieve the quality of the arson attacks carried out so far in this context"*.

This working group is said to work *"under strict conspirative standarts, just as the other working groups mentioned before"*.

The "Working Group Practice" would like to plan actions in the run-up and put together maps. While doing so they would also work on *"an overview of all potential issue-related targets (e.g. all Kempinski Hotels in Germany - perhaps actions in the run-up)"*.

The "Working Group BuKo" essentially consists of members of the Berlin BuKo group. Their proposal to hold the third federal preparatory meeting during the BuKo meeting in May 2006 in Berlin, would have been turned down as being *"too much in the long-term and not adequate to the actual needs of coordination"*.

About the "Working Group Homepage" no findings could be gained, maybe it has not been founded yet because of lacking support.

About the "Working Group Repression" there is only the terse statement to be found that they strive for close cooperation with legal teams in the region and "Red Help".

The "Working Group Mobilization" would, unlike the "Working Group Infotour", have its focus more on the international mobilization and would also do a lot of work referring to the G8 summit 2006 in St. Petersburg. They would look for people that can offer *"expert knowledge about the attainment of visa for Russia"*, and moreover thinks about using the European Social Forum in Athens for mobilization purposes.

The "Working Group Communication / Media" would like to cooperate with the left internet port Indymedia and give out press cards *"for their own purposes and possible actions in the region"*. Further details were not known.

About the "Working Group St.Petersburg" no further findings would exist. It is said that

"The resonance to attempts to mobilize for St. Petersburg is weak, according to expected repressive measures there".

Finally there would be the "Working Group Solidarity" that plans various actions to collect financial means.

* Now it follows on 15 pages a list of 14 groups, that are said to have taken part in preparatory meeting according to BKA ST 11, and on which there would exist relevant findings. The information reports given about the groups differ very much in how detailed they are (not being really profound on any of them). Nine groups were mentioned more on a surface level, with few sentences or one page at a maximum, based mainly on public (Self-) descriptions, and without mentioning names of persons. These groups are the "Antifascist Action Berlin" (AAB), and the groups that derive from it, which is the "Antifascist Left Berlin" (ALB) and "Critique & Practice"; "autopool"; "Subversion International"; the network "ACT!"; the "Federal Coordination Internationalism" (BuKo); the network "Dissent!"; the "Interventionist Left" (IL); "War is Peace" (KiF) and "Six Hills". Five groups are given more attention, presumably because some of the persons accused are said to belong to them. These are the groups "For a left Current" (FeLS); the "Barnim Action Alliance against Genetic Engineering" (BAgG); the "Berlin Social Forum"; "Take Radical Action through Public Education and Sustainable Everything" (TRAPESE) and "The Superfluous".

More in detail about the nine groups mentioned first it is written:

"Dissent!" and "Subversion International" are discussed very briefly, little more than their bare existence is mentioned. "Dissent!" would have been founded in 2003 as a network and would consist of *"autonomous local groups"*; naming the federal G8 meetings "Dissent!" meetings is said to be *"disputed within the left scene"*. Also about the group "autopool" there is little to report - in 2002 and 2004 there would have been texts published in the magazine "Interim" that were (co)signed by autopool.

The group "Six Hills" is basically according to its own description in the internet and is situated close to PGA. A bit more in detail is the part about the "Interventionist Left", which is as well mainly described with reference to their own public presentation. The "IL" would, among others, consist of the groups ALB, FeLS, KiF and Libertad! More in detail "ALB", "BuKo" and "ACT!" are described on about one page each. "ALB" is described in general and mainly under formal aspects - foundation, renaming, then the split into two groups in 2003. They are said to have registered 1st of May demonstrations.

For the short description of the history of the "BuKo" beginning in 1977 the text "BfV aktuell Nr.26-2004" is cited. Then there is a long passage about the BuKo 2004 in Kassel, where "Inner City Actions" would have happened, where among others members of "Yomango" are said to have introduced practical utensils for looting and finally would have entered a "H&M" subsidiary to *"distribute the cloths amongst people passing by"*. Also 200 persons would have served themselves from a bar in the state museum. About the BuKo 2005 in Hamburg the "first open preparatory meeting against the G8 summit" already mentioned in the files is described, to which Berlin activists would have travelled, *"who are equipped with years of militant experience"*. Also during the congress in Hamburg a *colour attack* would have been committed against the shipping company DAL and demanded that they should *"finally take responsibility for their participation in the 'genocide' (at the ethnic communities of Herero and Nama) in the former 'German-Southwest-Africa'"* (We will meet again the DAL company in this chronology at October 23rd 2006).

"ACT!" is mainly described by the public presentation of the network of the groups ALB, FeLS, autopool and SI. Three actions in 2004/2005 are mentioned (among these the "Maystones-Campaign" of the 1st of May 2004). ACT! would not have been visible during the last year, the website was not actualized, obviously the groups would not cooperate in this form at the moment.

War is Peace "Krieg ist Frieden" (KiF), a "federal antimilitarist platform" is described mainly by quoting internet publications that carry political statements about the NATO security

conferences in Munich 2002-2004. Participating in KiF would have been the groups ALB, FeIS, autopool and others.

And now the groups of the second list:

1. The "Barnim Action Alliance against Genetic Engineering" (BAgG) gets a one page description. It is said to be founded in 1996, would be *"one of the most active Anti-GM groups [...] trying to create a network of the Anti-GM movement - including the by far non-extremist majority"*. It would be conspicuous that *"the object Genetic Engineering is playing an important role in the mobilization against the G8 summit"*. Belonging to the BAgG would be the main accused Hauke B. and Armin M., as well as Thomas J. (not yet accused at that point in time).
2. The "Berlin Social Forum" (BSF) is shortly described in its self-image. This initiative is said to be supported *"amongst others by circles of left extremist persons, who mostly know each other since the eighties"*, among them the mainly accused B. and F. Moreover the address of the initiative would be the same as a Copy-Shop, that these two would run together. Then 8 more names of persons are listed who could be ascribed to the BSF, among them the domain-manager of the email account. By the way, the name Peter Grottian is not mentioned, but he will appear in a later list of anti-G8 activists.
3. About the group "For a left current" (FeIS) the BKA writes 3 pages, starting at an early point in time. The group would have been founded in Berlin in 1991 and is said to have *"at least in its first years of existence mainly consisted of 'Autonomous' and persons from the 'RAF-milieu'"*. Among others their aim would be to *"newly organize the left extremist scene"*. It follows the presentation of FeIS taken from the website of the group. Furthermore FeIS would have started the "Berlin for free" campaign and called for various actions. FeIS would have participated in demonstrations on social problems. In a public text dating from early 2005 they would have stressed that the group will *"continue to be engaged in the social protests"*. At least in the 1990s FeIS would have been occupied *"also with [...] activities of the bank terror organisation ETA"* and it could be assumed that *"at least some are ready to commit politically motivated crimes"*. And moreover: *"Since its foundation several F.e.l.S. meetings took place. These meetings were connected to the effort to bring together forces ready to use violence, and to push the process of building up a 'counterpower from below'"*.³⁰ After a brief mentioning of the foundation of ACT! and the magazine Arranca 11 names are listed, of which the BKA thinks that the belong to FeIS or the Arranca. However, *"it cannot be said whether they are engaged in the group at the moment"*, as fluctuation must have been great over the years. But after all one of the main accused, Bernhard F. is among them.
4. The group "Take Radical Action through Public Education and Sustainable Everything" (TRAPESE) attracted the attention of the BKA in connection with activities against the G8 summit 2005 in Gleneagles. One address in Friedrichshain and three names of persons allegedly belonging to TRAPESE are mentioned - none of them is accused in the proceedings. Maybe the comprehensiveness is due to actuality. TRAPESE or the people mentioned do not appear elsewhere in the files.
5. "The Superfluous" got known to the BKA for the first time through the occupation of the workers charity organisation "Arbeiterwohlfahrt" in October 2004, and was ascribed to the network ACT! because of the names of 26 persons ascertained then by the police (there are even 27 names listed). Until April the BKA counts 12 actions in the scope of their engagement on *"social political issues related to the introduction of Hartz IV / ALG II"*³¹, seven in Berlin alone, the others done by *imitators* between August 2005 and January 2006 in

30 This presentation derives from the attempts of the security authorities in the middle of the 1990s to construct a link between FeIS and the RAF. We will go into this more in depth in the second part of this assessment.

31 Hartz IV was the name of a series of social cuts, one of the measures - ALG II - was to reduce the amount of money given to people in case of unemployment to the level of social welfare after one year. Even though Germany saw mass demonstrations unknown for 15 years (This was when German state socialism collapsed. The biggest of the demos referred to these 'Monday Demonstrations', I doubt if there ever had been demos as big as those in 2004 before on purely social questions since 1918), the result was a complete defeat. Not even a review of the measures could be gained.

other provinces.

* The fourth and longest part of the report lists 66 persons "conspicuous in connection with the mobilization against the G8 summit 2007 in Heiligendamm". Of these about 50 live in Berlin, 6 in Hamburg, the rest is dispersed about 10 other cities. The dates of birth and places of residence are mentioned, as well as former proceedings and known activities in connection with the G8 (participation in meetings, etc.). A lot of space is given to *contact persons*, registered for example in other proceedings of the respective person. It is mainly through these secondary mentioning that the enormous number of about 180 names included in the report is achieved. About some of the persons nothing more is written than "*(X) is a member of the 'Berlin Social Forum'...Apart from this the BKA ST 11 does not have any findings about (X)*".

The reports about the main accused and their closer social circles comprise about one third of the whole part about persons, but also some others are described very comprehensively, especially if they were publicly engaged against the G8. Certainly conspicuous is the very much detailed research on Andrej H., who was much later (in August 2007) arrested for allegedly being a member of the "militant group". The report spends 5 pages on him. He would be engaged at KiF (War is Peace) and is said to know "*a lot of persons from the leadership of the radical left personally*", while he "*never came to be noticed from a police perspective, as far as it's known*." This fact (or some other knowledge) obviously arouses the suspicion of the BKA Chief Detective reporting, as she continues fraught with significance: "*It cannot be finally judged by now which rating, activity and importance Andrej H. hold in the scene*." As a prove for these insinuations a note of BKA ST 11, dating from January 16th 2006 is quoted³². Comparable statements are not to be found in reports on any other person.

Among these 66 "interesting" persons finally 40 end up in the later *photograph folder* (see below), that will be shown to the witness of an attack.³³

* The report ends with a three page summary, that at first gives a short recapitulation of summit protests before it especially stresses 10 men and 11 women again. These persons would have attracted "*special attention by their more than average engagement in connection with the mobilization against the G8 summit (participation in more than one preparatory meeting, use of the internet)*". On one hand persons who would have already been active against the IMF in 1988 are listed: The four main accused Hauke B., Sven L., Armin M. and Fritz S.³⁴, as well as three people from Berlin and one from Hesse; on the other hand thirteen younger "*persons who attracted attention through special activities (e.g. participation in meetings, spying out places, violent activities in connection to the issue, intense email traffic) and/or by being contact persons of the outstanding persons mentioned above*" (nine of them coming from Berlin, three from Hamburg, one from Braunschweig). The report ends with the words "*The evaluation of the findings on persons and events submitted is not finished yet. Newly gained information will be handed in later*."³⁵

June 23rd 2006

First report about findings on persons, first report about the state of affairs

Two month after the beginning of the proceedings by the BAW, the BKA ST 12 offers first results. Some Chief Detectives present first reports about the five main accused, basically

32 This passage of the report nourishes the supposition that Andrej H. has been in focus of the BKA long before the proceedings against the "militant group" started - for whatever reason.

33 Coming from the reports about the persons the criteria of selection cannot be concluded. Persons coming more from the autonomous scene are missing, while others, of whom one might question their affinity towards nightly arson attacks for reasons of age and/or political orientation, are included. Unawareness and arbitrariness seemingly informed selection much more than planned assortment.

34 Of the fifth accused, Bernhard F., no activities related to the G8 summit got known after January 2005.

35 No additional information like this can be found in the files. The similar G8 *assessment report* focussing on Hamburg (January 2007) was explicitly ordered by ST 12.

consisting of the findings cited above. The *note* about the sixth accused (Stephan M.) is handed in July 31st 2006.

The responsible Criminal Detective Superintendent Noisternigg adds to it an about 60 pages strong *state of affairs report*. He sums up the findings transferred by the BfV in four pages, then turns to have a very close look at the IMF in 1988, in particular listing preparatory meetings held and crimes committed (especially arson attacks), as well as the respective participation of the five recently accused in preparatory meetings. Then 15 pages are spent on the G8 campaign, again - after a short introduction - beginning with the preparatory meetings held so far, but unlike the *assessment report* of June 16th 2006, this time the "network meeting" at the BuKo 2005 and in particular the "first federal preparatory meeting" October 2005 in Hamburg are described in detail. While most of the findings obviously stem from internet research, the BKA still comes to state that "*among the 180 participants would have been 45 persons of different Berlin groups*". Also one "Berlin Circle" attracted the attention of the BKA "*which - organized by 'comrades who prepared the protest against the IMF in 1988, and will contribute their experiences to the discussion' - meets on a monthly basis. This could be the monthly meetings of the Berlin Social Forum*".

Property damages (11) and arson attacks (6) connected to G8 are listed. Then, after the subject has been described in 35 pages, the detective superintendent gets onto the "*Involvement of the accused in the Anti G8 campaign*", mainly based on the findings of the BfV, the previous *evaluations and analysis* of SBS, as well as the *assessment report* mentioned above. Some details are important to the detective superintendent: for example that the accused Hauke B. coproduced the video "Im Herbst der Bestie" [In fall of the Beast] about the "Anti-IMF-Campaign" in 1988, distributed by "autofocus video workshop"; that the "Berlin Social Forum" mentioned would give the same contact address that hosts the copy company that the accused B. and F. would run together; that the BfV in its analysis of the "Imtech" SBS would also aim at "Autonomous Groups", which "*would commit attacks in the scope of the Anti-Castor-Campaign*", and that investigations under section 129a were carried out against Hauke B., Sven L. and Fritz S. in 1997 exactly because of this (the proceedings were shut in 2003); that Bernhard F. would be "*responsible for the whole internet presence of 'FeIS'*", where among other things the "Genocide committed on the Herero in Namibia", spoken about in an SBS as well, would be mentioned; that Fritz S. is said to be a member of the "scientific advisory board" of "Attac"...The report closes with the evaluation that "*the campaign against the meeting of the IMF and 'Worldbank-Group' started in the left scene in 1986 shows noticeable parallels to the campaign currently under way against the G8 summit in 2007. Like today 'preparatory meetings' lasting several days were held back then in regular intervals (...), and the 'BuKo' used as a 'plenary' for the campaign at an early moment (...)*".

Moreover the current 'Anti-G8' campaign - like the 'Anti-IMF/WB' campaign - is militantly flanked, meaning that besides 'legal' and in parts public events, aiming at a broad and manifold mobilization in the scene, property damage and arson attacks are committed against supposed globalization targets, which should have an initial effect on other groups and on the same time aim at public perception of the campaign.

Moreover the initiators of the campaign try (...) to carry some 'guiding principles' into the scene by publishing policy statements in left scene magazines, in order to reach a broad mobilization of the scene and drive other groups to commit militant actions."

Then two texts of "Autonomous Groups" are described, one of 1988 about the IMF and one of 2006 about the G8, both promoting the respective campaign. It is said that "*following the analysis of the BfV the authors of the article, the "Autonomous Groups", actively contributed to the militantly accompanied campaign against the G8 summit in Heiligendamm, and will do that in the future as well*" - just as it is said of the accused. Like in the BfV report only the four Berlin accused are thought to be the authors of "Autonomie in Bewegung". The report is closed with the statement: "*To harden the suspicion of having founded a terrorist alliance, and moreover to find out in howfar the accused - presumably by the involvement of further persons - participated, resp. participate in the realization of arson attacks as well as accomplices,*

besides comparative forensic research, further investigations are necessary, e.g. based on inquiries of contact- and movement profiles."

July 2006

Investigations about "Autonome in Bewegung"

* Already by the end of June, and more concentrated in the first half of July the inquiries into the book "Autonomous in Movement" start. BKA ST 12 sends *questions about findings* to the LKAs of the provinces (of at least Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg) and the respective provincial VS. Additionally they start their own internet research, leading among other things to findings about public lectures, in which some of the accused participated in 2003/2004. Most of the time this is only announcements taken from leaflets or the internet. Somehow different is one detailed description of the provincial secret service LfV Hamburg on one public event (about one page) which obviously stems from information of a secret agent, as it is written there *"that, following the memories of a local access, S. made it clear that he wrote some of the articles in the book."* The assumption continually prolonged in the files, that Fritz S. would be a co-author of the book only rests on this statement.³⁶

Moreover and without being asked the LfV Hamburg calls the attention of the BKA to the "opposition to the system atomic energy-no-thanks, Systemoppositionelle Atomkraft-Nein-Danke" group (SAND), in which Fritz S. would be active.

* After being asked for the BfV presents its 30 pages *"'Genesis' of the publication 'Autonome in Bewegung'"* on July 12th 2006. The table is classified *secret*, therefore it can not be used in court. In October 2006 the BAW asks to level down classification to *for official use only* thus enabling its use in court, which the BfV immediately does.

* As follow up an evaluation of the book concerning criminal offences is given on September 4th. With regret Detektive Superintendent Wolff states that it is not possible to electronically compare the criminal offences described in the book to the existent material of the years 1976 to 1999, *"as for this period no data base exists"*. The assessment speaks of 27 criminal offences and is apparently done without any enthusiasm.³⁷ Meanwhile the question remains unanswered whether and which statutory offence is could have been met by spitting at a police president.

August 1st 2006

Evaluation report "autofocus videowerkstatt e.V."

During investigations BKA ST 12 came across "autofocus videoworkshop" two times between March and June. First of all Detective Superintendent Noisternigg had taken from the writing of the BfV dating from March 2006 that *"the video 'Im Herbst der Bestie, Fall of the beast' of the 'autofocus videowerkstatt e.V.' in which Hauke B. took part and that describes the militant aspects of the 'Anti-IMF-campaign' as well, is shown in scene localities with reference to the 'mobilization Heiligendamm'"*. Secondly research about the accused Hauke B. had lead to the assumption that the copy company in which he is involved might be in some organizational connection to "autofocus": same adress, a shared telephone number. Therefore BKA ST 12, Detective Chief Superintendent Scholz, now draws up a 70 page assessment report about "autofocus" that really looks into the details, including several lengthy footnotes that go into the details of the details. More than 120 persons are listed in a meticulous Index in the end. The report structured in various chapters. The *introduction* limits the reason for the report to the imprint of the video on the IMF 1988 mentioned above. It follows 7 pages about "autofocus", based on internet research about domain, availability, public presentation and history; as well as on the protocol of the founding assembly at March 17th 1989, that gives 12 names (managing committee, treasurer, etc.). In the next chapter *findings on persons* are presented on 40 pages, adding nine more

36 While the BfV in its detailed analysis of the different chapters of the book and its alleged authors do not mention the name Fritz S. at all.

37 Anyways, the initial terms of reference are missed: to find out criminal offences in which the authors claim to have been involved in.

names to the 12, who are either allegedly connected to "autofocus" - including the accused B. and F. - or have no identifiable link to them at all, but somehow got into the files through the report. Because reporting KOK Scholz is sometimes swept along by cross-references. His love for the fine details goes as far as to think it remarkable that one of the founders of "autofocus" in 1989 could perhaps be the translator of the spanish book "Trace to Tierra del Fuego", and that a recession of the book would have been written for the FeIS magazine "arranca" by the left author Raul Zelik; for one adress, where the accused Bernhard F. used to live for a short time in 1988 Scholz looks up the number valid in 2006 in the phone book; of another person, that can neither be put into immediate connection to "autofocus" nor to the proceedings, he tracks down the whereabouts at the world social forum since 2003.

Another chapters explores *further findings*. First a 10 page examination of the website of "Autonome in Bewegung" is given, following all sub-pages and links. Special attention is given to names of accused mentioned, as well as to the "make-up/upheaval picture archive, Umbruch Bildarchiv" and the pen name Sven Glückspilz, of whom several publicly known texts are listed. Furthermore the names and addresses of persons are collected on more than 10 pages that somehow relate to or could be related to the "foundation dissident subsistence - project workshop based on mutuality, Stiftung Dissidente Subsistenz - Projektwerkstatt auf Gegenseitigkeit" - whose relevance for the proceedings cannot be derived from the files.³⁸

August 14th 2006 Reports of the BfV

In August the BfV sends various texts with additional or newly inquired findings on the five accused.

* In the beginning there are about 30 phone calls and emails mentioned, which were taped between September 2000 and June 2005 under *Order 0253* and which (also) build the basis to give out *Order 3003 (militant campaign)*. Some phone calls and emails taped under this new order until January 2006 follow. These TKÜ surveillance protocols had been quoted in parts in the writings of the BfV of March 24th 2006 already, to underline the thesis about the *militant campaign*, but at that point in time they were classified secret and therefore not to be used in court. After they were mentioned now in the August report and opened by the BfV, they can be used in the proceedings.

Three days later the BfV adds recent emails of the accused Armin M., which should prove his engagement against the G8 summit (e.g. a planned "tour, Besichtigung" around Heiligendamm), as well as an 11 page table listing (suspicious) contacts inbetween the accused and their anti-G8-activities between December 2004 and August 2006. The list is pimped up with some current photos of the accused Hauke B., Armin L. and Sven L. made during the BfV observations of the small meeting at the "Open Space" June 4th 2005 and the federal meeting at Mehringhof January 6th/8th 2006. Another file of the BfV produced the same day lists travel movements of three of the accused to foreign countries known through TKÜ surveillance.

* Little seems to be known at BKA ST 12 about the fifth alleged co-author of "Autonome in Bewegung" Stephan M. - a phone call of the BfV at August 22nd is answered with a short written note that mentions a few possible starting points (whereabouts, telephone, email and two contact persons).

* In the end of August the BfV completes its transmission of details with two newspaper articles meant to prove the responsibility of some of the accused for the book, as well as for the IMF campaign 1988 and the G8 campaign 2006. Also it contains the red-hot news that Armin M. was speaking at an info event about G8 in Bad Doberan at July 6th 2006, and referring to an email sent before, that he does not intend to dissociate himself from

³⁸ If there is any matching example for the inquisitory character of section 129a, that is for the confusion of criminal police investigations and secret service surveillance, it is this "report", that has lost any relation to the actual proceedings concerning the arson attacks.

violence there, as he said "...i hardly know an autonomous more friendly than me old grandpa, and I would 'play' on that".

August 22nd 2006

Decision of the Federal Court BGH

The prosecutor leading the proceedings at the BAW, Dr. Heine, now has at least following materials on her table: An introductory *state of affairs report* of the BKA, their *reports* about the five main accused, diverse *SBS evaluations* and first *assessment reports* (G8 activities and "autofocus"); of the BfV a collection of findings about the main accused opened to use in the proceedings and their *text analysis*. The summarices evaluation of the BKA is easy to guess: That the suspicion of a criminal act had been hardened, but that further authorizations in accordance with the code of criminal procedure would be needed for further "inquiry of evidence", mainly orders to telephone surveillance. On this basis the BAW now starts to get diverse decisions from the investigation Judge, Hebenstreit, which are the following, already mentioned above:

Prescription to police tracing *polizeiliche Beobachtung*³⁹;

Telekommunikationsüberwachung (TKÜ surveillance: telephone, email, internet);

long-term observations, also with technical means;

taking of "*photographs outside the homes*";

"Taping and listening in off the word not spoken in public".

Except the decisions for police tracing, which are valid for one year, all of these permissions are given for three months, but were extended by the BGH within the limits of the deadline each time, so that they continually were in function for at least one year.

Between August 22nd and September 1st *police tracing*, TKÜ surveillance and *long-term observation* is ordered for the four accused Hauke B., Bernhard F., Armin M. und Fritz S. Moreover the cars of Bernhard F. and Armin M. should be surveilled with *technical means*, to localize them (radio beacon) and listen in to conversations inside (bugs). In the car used by Armin M. both *technical means* were installed few days after the respective order was given, while in the case of Bernhard F. the BKA waited until the beginning of 2007: "*In the period between 30.01.2007-01.03.2007 several concrete attempts to realize the measures mentioned above were taken, yet were abandoned so far, as the moving habits of the accused Bernhard F. and the places where he usually parks his car result in the fact that the realization of the orders would have been possible only under an increased risk of been discovered.*" But this refers only to the installation of bugs, while a *GPS position-finder Ortungsmodul* is actually put on the car on January 30th 2007, as the BKA will later on state. May 12th 2007, that is few days after the big wave of raids, the device is found and taken off, which lead to preliminary proceedings against Bernhard F. for "suppression of a position finder" (see below).

In the second half of September the missing orders are given against Sven L., as well as the order concerning the *long-term observation* of Fritz S. Finally at November 6th the order for the use of *technical means* (radio beacon, but no bugs) against the car of Sven L. is given.

The number of *events* protocolled in the following eight months is hard to estimate. It can be assumed that for the five main accused some 8000 phone calls and about twice as many emails were taped, plus about 1250 conversations in the cars. This sums up to no less than 25.000 *events*. Added to this later were the surveillance protocols of the other accused.

Hardly any information can be found concerning the observation of the five accused in Berlin - whether this means that there really were nearly no observations taking place, or if

39 Police tracing, *polizeiliche Beobachtung* (PB), which used to be called observing search "Beobachtende Fahnung" is used in a lot of areas today, against Hooligans, organized crime, travelling violent criminals "Reisende Gewalttäter", etc. PB means that each time the personal data of the respective person is registered somewhere, a note is sent to the investigating authorities, for example at border crossings, traffic controls, visits to buildings that employ access controls...

it is just the reports of them missing in the files, will become clear only by the time all files will be handed in to the lawyers. About observations in Hamburg see October 30th. Additionally to the measures described the BKA regularly sent so-called "Pings" or "silent SMS" to the mobile phones of the accused, to find out whether they are switched on and where the resp. persons were at that moment. There is no information in the files about the frequency of this practice though. Anyways, what seems to be sure is, that they were not sent very often over a long period of time, as they were rarely used as an additional source for constructing movement profiles on critical days.

September 10th 2006

Arson attack 6: Märka

In Eberswalde an arson attack is committed on four lorries of the "Märkische Krafftutter GmbH" (Märka). The incendiary devices do not work though, they are found the following morning. One day later "Autonomous Groups" claim responsibility in a communiqué.

* Pretty soon, already at September 28th, BKA ST 11 delivers its *evaluation* of the *SBS*, that is quite comprehensive, mainly on account of cross comparisons with 14 other *SBS* (mainly of attacks with reference to either GM or "Autonomous Groups"). These cross-comparisons do not bring any probable identity of authorship in any case, including the *SBS* of the current case, the communiqué "Villa Borsig". The Detective Superintendent in charge is reluctant to count the attack as part of the *militant campaign*, he just states a *reference to globalization* existing in the text, and - like it is done in all other *evaluations* as well - forecasts further attacks of these group on this area of topics and in connection to *activities and preparing actions against the G8 summit*.

* October 12th 2006 the BfV sends its *text analysis* to the BKA. It is not based on comparisons with other *SBS*, but with eight texts, that would carry "*relevant agreements in terms of terminology and content*" with the communiqué (7 of them deal with Gentech). What these texts have in common is that the BfV believes to be able to connect them to the accused Hauke B. and, partly, to Armin M. Of some of the texts Hauke B. is said to demonstrably be the author, while others were to be found on his computer - and four of the texts stem from the "Barnim action alliance against GM", to which both of the accused belong. From TKÜ surveillance statements of Hauke B. would have become known, in which he positively referred to arson attacks on GM institutions. When he said in one phone call "But these are other people" the BfV judges this as a *reaction noticeably playing down things*.

The BfV ends with findings from *operational measures*, that would show that Hauke B. and Armin M. would "*try to anchor the issue of GM in the movement critical of globalization in perspective of the G8 summit*". Moreover they would have *intensively* informed themselves about the Märka company, starting with telephone and internet research up to the registration of a demo in front of the companies headquarters by B. in March 2006; finally Hauke B. would have stayed at Armin M.'s place two days before the arson, who lives close to Eberswalde (and therefore also close to the scene of the crime). From all this the BfV draws the conclusion that "*it is highly probable that Hauke B. and Armin M. were responsibly participating in formulating the 'SBS Märka'*".

* Surveillance of the five accused by the BfV does not lead to any clear results in this case. For one of the Berlin accused and the person from Hamburg participation can more or less be excluded for sure, about the three others (among them Hauke B. and Armin M.) video and telephone surveillance does not provide any evidence.

* From the perspective of the BKA further incriminating details were found, listed in an alleged note of September 26th 2006, which is itself missing in the files. Also incriminating would have been a phone call of Armin M. and the later on accused Silvio K. five weeks after the attack, in which among other things a fence is mentioned, and to cut open something. So, what in the attack on "Märka" perhaps happened was that a hole would have been cut into the fence, and also this is what happened in the attack on "GbA" mentioned below.

* Forensic investigations are not all finished in summer 2007. But for once the investigations already done at the scene of the crime show some positive results this time: Several footprints are secured from the alleged escape route of the offender/s by taking plaster casts. On one of the batteries used for the fuse a DNA trace is found September 29th, that after comparison to the BKA DNA data base was found to be identical with a DNA trace secured at an attempted arson attack on the company "Securitas" in Berlin August 13th 2004. Moreover at the attack on "Securitas" another DNA trace would have been found that is again said to be identical with a DNA trace found on a fragment of a bottle of a colour-bottle action against the "Property Authorities of the Special Property and Property Development Administration, Vermögensamt der Sondervermögens- und Bauverwaltung" in Berlin on September 5th 2003. However the two people responsible for these traces are unknown - the comparisons with the DNA samples taken off the accused on May 9th 2007 are all negative.

September 28th 2006

Arson attack 7: Hermes

Two attacks in Hamburg target CEOs of the credit insurance company "Euler Hermes": Colour is thrown on the house of the chairman of the board of directors Gerd-Uwe Baden, the car of the head of the Hamburg dependency Stefan Schiebeler is set on fire. In the *SBS* a "Group 'unholy alliance burst the dam', Gruppe 'Unheilige Allianz Dambruch'" takes the responsibility.

* As the *SBS* looks similar to the *SBS* "Imtech" of January 2006 on first sight, BKA ST 11 starts a *cross-comparison*, done by two younger detective superintendants, which is finished a week later already. Because of numerous similarities between the two communiqués it is concluded *"that both SBS were written by the same author with some probability, resp. that the authors of both texts are persons in contact with each other"*. The actual evaluation follows November 10th 2006. It is by far the most comprehensive so far, consisting of 65 pages, and containing *cross-comparisons* with six other *SBS* that refer to the G8 in the area of Hamburg (the two attacks in the Berlin area, "Villa Borsig" and "Märka", are not examined here). Detective Superintendent Heck comes to the result that - like assumed before - that the authors of the *SBS* "Hermes" and "Imtech" would be identical with *some probability*. This, and the assumed *communicative links* to the other attacks leads the Detective Superintendent to the the assumption, that the different (groups of) offender *"were perhaps initiated, maintained and, concerning the promoted objectives, lead by a central force (single person or small circle of persons)"*. He thinks it to be unlikely, that in the wider area of Hamburg *"several groups link their militant actions to one event (G8 summit 2007 in Heiligendamm) independently, without coordinating, coming to agreements and therefore deliberately communicating with each other. Experience shows that such a communication process requires leadership"*. The integrative power necessary for autonomous, as well as anticapitalistically and antimperialistically moulded groups would support the idea *"that the leading personality we talk about comes from the autonomous scene and is active at the interfaces of the different ideological moulds. Seen from a local perspective, in Hamburg this fits best to Dr.Fritz S., resp. a small circle being active around him"*. The more than proportional part Hamburg takes in the attacks of the militant campaign leads Detective Superintendent to guess *"that the relevant forces supporting the campaign are - besides Berlin - in Hamburg"*. He forecasts further attacks, mainly on companies working internationally which have their headquarters in Hamburg, maybe on particular during the turn of the year 2006/2007 (up to now attacks were often committed at the end of the month)⁴⁰.

* BfV 3A1 is not lagging behind: By the end of November 2006 they present their own *text analysis* of the *SBS*, that is on 32 pages also going much more in detail than all the others. From the point of view of the BfV the suspicion is hardening, *"that the organization and realization of the militant campaign is supported and predominantly influenced by a firm circle of*

40 Interestingly enough, as the files let us know, just between the middle of December 2006 and the middle of January 2007 no observations of the accused in the Hamburg area took place.

persons". Already the name "unholy alliance burst the dam, Unheilige Allianz Dambruch" is noticed by the BfV, as the invitation for the "first open network meeting" for the G8 during the "BuKo" in April 2005 would have been signed by "holy burst of the dam, Heiliger Dambruch", and again, this meeting would have been *"started off by the alleged initiators of the 'militant campaign'"*. As in its analysis of the "Imtech" SBS in the beginning of the year, the BfV again comes to the conclusion that all texts analysed *"comply with the 'content guidelines'. The 'initiators of the militant G8 campaign' stick to the 'instructions', which they formulated, and continue the campaign as defined."*

The BfV ascertains an identity of the authors at least in parts with the SBS "Marnette". And the mentioning of the attempted sale of a Siemens plutonium factory to China could, as the local data base would tell, only lead to Fritz S. It follows a text comparison with ten texts that would show *similarities in terminology and content*: Five communiqués of attacks, four texts published by Fritz S. and a call to take action against Castor-transports, of which he is suspicious to be co-author and which is said to have *pointed the way ahead at that time*. All texts have in common that they speak of nuclear power plants, Siemens and/or Hermes sureties, and the BfV all ascribes them - more or less - to Fritz S. The text analysis of the BfV mounts in the conclusion that *"the course of the militant G8 campaign is up to now characterized by 'strategic planning' and consequent realization of the 'content guidelines' formulated in the 'offence declaration Hollenstedt"⁴¹. These 'guidelines' formulated in the 'Hollenstedt declaration' provide the ideological foundation of the campaign ('new antiimperialism'). (...) This 'new antiimperialism' is practically and consequently implemented in the militant G8 campaign right now."*

The BfV is of the opinion, that *"specific 'features' valid for all declarations"* could be drawn from the recent communiqués, and that they should be taken as basic criteria for the evaluation of *"forthcoming self accusations in the course of the militant G8 campaign"*. These features would mainly consist of the orientation on the four *central content lines* of the "Marnette" communiqué, reference to the G8 summit, and *"similarities in terminology and content with texts of persons or groups that were pointing the way ahead in previous militant campaigns"*. The offenders would typically be experienced in *"militant autonomous campaign politics and have previously been active in militant campaigns"*, would take efforts to *"influence current protest movements, as they had previously tried"*, and are said to be *"fond of certain subject complexes"*.

* The forensic investigations proceed quite quickly. Between January and April 2007 seven expert reports are produced, looking for traces at the means used in the attack and the SBS. They are all negative.

* The four from Berlin are all in Berlin in the hours before the attack, one of them could have only made it to the scene of the attack by using a helicopter. The accused from Hamburg is in Bremen in the later evening. This is all that the BfV could say.

October 3rd 2006

The Criminal Provincial Police LKA of Hesse observes a meeting of the "Working Group G8 and Agriculture" in the Commune Niederkaufungen. They identify as participants among others the accused Hauke B. and Armin M., as well as three others who will be accused later on. As far as it is known, this is the first observation of the police in these proceedings.

October 19th 2006

The BKA asks the BfV to reclassify *"Genesis' of the book 'Autonome in Bewegung'"* from *secret* to *for official use only*, in order to allow its use in court. This is quickly done until October 31st.

Already at October 10th the BKA finds out that the application to put the book on the Index (of the "list of texts harmful to young people") was put down by the respective authority on July 10th 2006.

41 which is referred to here as "Marnette"

October 20th 2006

In Strausberg an arson attack is committed on the "Society for professional education and further training, Gesellschaft für berufliche Aus- und Weiterbildung" (GbA). The investigations are done by the provincial criminal police, the LKA Brandenburg. During investigations concerning a car that a witness believes to have seen at the scene of the attack, the owner of a similar looking car gets into focus, who lives in a leftist community, where among others also Silvio K. lives, who is a contact person of the accused Armin M. The LKA Brandenburg is of the opinion that the *parallels*⁴² found to the arson attack "Märka" would be sufficient to propose the integration of Silvio K. as an accused into the proceedings *militant campaign*. This *proposal* is transferred to the BKA February 15th 2007.

October 23rd 2006

Arson attack 8: DAL

In Hamburg-Altona an arson attack on a bureau of the "German Africa Lines, Deutsche Afrika-Linien" (DAL) is committed. The comprehensive communiqué belonging to it has no signature.

* BKA ST 12 only gives a quite short *first assessment*. The reference to the "*ongoing militant campaign*" against the G8 summit in the text, as well as the similarities with other *SBS* already familiar by now - for example mistakes in the writing of "ß" and "ss" - or the mentioning of the "*german colonial history in connection with the Herero and Nama ethnic groups*", which already appears in the communiqués "Marnette" and "Borsig" 2005, suggested to Detective Superintendent Heck to sort the attack in the assumed *militant campaign*.

* On November 3rd the BfV in a short note confirms a concurring assessment. The detailed *text analysis* coming to the same results is handed in as late as January 10th 2007. In this basically the text modules of the previous analysis "Imtech" (January 2006) and "Hermes" (September 2006) were repeated. About the issue "Herero and Nama", resp. German colonial history the BfV has to contribute that already in December 2004 an "Anticolonial Africa Conference" took place in Berlin and that similarities in content of texts published then and recent communiqués were "*owed to the topic*". Comparing three communiqués of recent years from Berlin, Hamburg and Munich the BfV draws the same short conclusion.

* In case of the accused Bernhard F. the BKA is more suspicious: In a note of April 23rd 2007 the suspicion that the accused took part in "*drawing up SBS*" is backed up with the findings that "German colonialism" would also be mentioned on the websites of the groups "FeS" and the "Berlin Social Forum", of which he is said to be a member.

* As in the "Hermes" case the forensic investigations proceed rather quick. By April 2007 five expert reports about the *SBS* are done, all of them negative. Until summer 2007 no notes can be found about investigations of the place and the means of the attack.

* Little can the BfV say about the whereabouts of the accused in this case, as the TKÜ surveillance was temporarily stopped for unknown reasons. Only the camera at the place of the accused Bernhard F. is active and documents him being at home that night.

October 25th 2006

BKA ST 12 sets up a note about the DNA trace found at the attempted attack on "Märka" secured at September 11th 2006 that after comparison to the BKA DNA data base was found to be identical with a DNA trace secured at an attempted arson attack on the company "Securitas" in Berlin August 13th 2004. "Autonomous groups" claimed responsibility for both attempted attacks. Moreover at the attack on "Securitas" another DNA trace would have been found that is again said to be identical with a DNA trace found on a fragment of a bottle of a colour-bottle action against the "Property Authorities of the Special Property and Property Development Administration, Vermögensamt der

42 which are not known, as the respective note of the LKA Brandenburg is missing in the files

Sondervermögens- und Bauverwaltung" in Berlin on September 5th 2003. However the two people responsible for these traces are unknown - the comparisons with the DNA samples taken off the accused on May 9th 2007 are all negative.

October 30th 2006

Observations

In Hamburg and Bremen the provincial criminal police LKA Hamburg starts systematical and long term observations of the accused Fritz S. (being expanded to the other Hamburg accused by the middle of January 2007). About two third of all police observation activities in these proceedings known so far were done from the beginning of November 2006 until the end of March 2007 by LKA Hamburg. According to the files the five main accused were observed: Fritz S. on 22 days in Bremen, Hamburg and Berlin (LKA Hamburg), Hauke B. on 8 days in Berlin and on trips to other provinces (different LKAs), Bernhard F. on 10 days in Berlin (LKA Berlin and BKA), about Armin M. and Sven L. no information concerning observation is given. LKA Hamburg delivered numerous observation reports, mainly identifying *contact persons* of Fritz S. The observations of the two Berlin accused were not described in more detail, only about the accused Bernhard F. it is mentioned that he shows *"a behaviour suitable for recognizing observation forces or making an observation more difficult"*.

October 31st 2006

Autonomous groups

To the BKA the trace "Autonomous groups" by now at latest seems to be worth a more intense investigation. While a participation of "Autonomous groups" in the militant campaign had been assumed earlier, because of the communiqué of the attack "Villa Borsig" 2005 (autonomous groups/militant people) and the text analysis of the BfV (mainly about the attack "Imtech"), more closer considerations who or whatever "Autonomous groups" could be cannot be found until this day.⁴³

In the case of "Märka" the "Autonomous groups" did not only explicitly claim responsibility for the attack but also left behind a DNA trace, which seems to be the most promising track for the BKA. Additionally through this DNA trace a link is established to the (as well failed) attack of "Autonomous groups" on "Securitas" in 2004. From a criminalist point of view this means evidence for a probable continuity of persons and groups, which is of interest for the proceedings, as a *terrorist alliance* according to section 129a demands the proven permanent existence over a longer period of time. So to narrow down "Autonomous groups" in a personal and structural sense is of twofold interest for the BKA: To verify group continuity and to identify possible candidates for future DNA takings.

* October 30th detective superintendent Noisternigg, leading investigator of BKA ST 12 in this case, asks the BfV for findings about *"relations between the 'initiators of the militant G8 campaign' and persons being active in a militant way for years now in different campaigns under the label 'Autonomous groups'"*.

It takes the BfV a month, until the 30th of November to answer. The text is rather short, consists of only three pages. Starting with short excerpts from more recent text analysis, which are on the table of the BKA at that point in time anyways (the most important of them, the one dealing with the attack "Hermes", is sent to them one day before) the BfV answers that *"seen against the background of examinations done so far on texts of the militant G8 campaign" it could be seen as very probable "that the "Autonomous groups" mentioned in the reference text might be the same association of persons that has been active in a militant way in different campaigns for many years and still is."*

The BfV adds excerpts from five different communiqués since 2002 (not all of them signed with "Autonomous groups") that deal with refugee politics and in this show similarities to

⁴³ What is a bit surprising considering the suspicion that they are said to belong to the initiators of the campaign, as it is not only mentioned by the BfV but also by BKA detective superintendent Noisternigg leading the investigations June 2006 in his first state of affairs report.

the SBS "Securitas".

* One day after the letter to the BfV BKA ST 11 gets the order to put together all known *"communiqués and other texts published by 'Autonomous groups' (with or without additional designation)"*. November 15th the answer in form of a list of 76 texts, most of them *communiqués*, which will be supplemented much later - in April 2007 - with a list of 60 crimes, that could more or less be related to these texts. The first text stems from a demonstration on the 8th of May 1982, followed by the first SBS of August 12th 1987 about the demolishing of 58 ATMs in Western Berlin, up to September 9th 2006 ("Märka"); reaching a climax in 1993/94 and 2001/02. Three quarters of the actions happened in Berlin, only 15 are arson attacks. Of these most happened in the Berlin area over the last five years, about half of them failed. The rest is mostly property damage. The spectre of topic reaches from the smashing of windows (of fascist bars), hookclaw-actions (against nuclear transports), up to "car sports, Wagensport"⁴⁴. From the list it gets clear that "Autonomous groups" consist of multiple different associations.

November 6th 2006

Second report of findings about persons

About our month after the first results BKA ST 12 offers the second round of reports of findings about the five main accused on November 6th and 13th. These are way more comprehensive, as now not only basic data but also some results of investigations are reported. First of all some gaps in the basic data are filled, like for example bank accounts and work places, but also findings from earlier proceedings and criminal trials; most important the results from the observations done by the BKA are worked in now. The reports about the accused Fritz S. and Armin M., but also about Hauke B. now consist of more than 40 pages and mainly list a whole lot of political activities: their work in groups, attendance of meetings, conversations, e-mails, contact persons, not only in connection to the G8 mobilization. A lot of room is given to contacts registered between the accused. The findings of the BfV are already integrated in parts, possible references to the respective attacks are mentioned sometimes, but not systematically.

November 21st 2006

Picture map

During the attack "HWWI" on April 27th 2006 Miss Straubhaar had seen two persons in front of the house, of which one obviously was involved in the deed (throwing something against the house). It is as late as now, half a year later, that she is questioned about it as a witness - to do this two detective superintendants of the BKA travel to Hamburg, one of them the head of the department himself, first detective superintendant Krause.

For the questioning a map of photographs is prepared, consisting of the pictures of 55 men and 23 women. By far most of these 78 persons are taken from the report *"activities of persons and organisations of the left extremist scene against the planned G8-summit 2007 in Heiligendamm"* of June 2006, that is persons of which the BKA believes that they are actively engaged against the G8 summit. Some of the names stem from earlier proceedings, for example from the legally finished trial against the "Revolutionary Cells", others come from the 129a proceedings "Bad Oldesloe" lead parallel. Few names lack an explanation up to now.

Being questioned the witness can only give very vague descriptions of the two persons. She does not recognize anybody in the Picture map.

November 23rd 2006

As the BKA is looking for further suspicious persons, Olaf B. came into focus, because he is very active in meetings and presentations about "G8" as well as about "Gentech, GM",

⁴⁴ a "hookclaw" is a metal device put in the overhead power line to stop trains, "Wagensport" is a term used for a competitive approach in burning (mostly expensive) cars. The BKA also lists a *"theft in the [left wing] bookshop Schwarze Risse, Gneisenaustr.2a, Berlin by 'Autonomous groups'"* in their account, dating on April 1st...

and, as follows from TKÜ surveillance, is also said to be a *contact person* of the accused Hauke B. and Armin M.

November 23rd the BfV transfers a text to BKA ST 12 that allegedly answers questions of the BKA about personal findings on Olaf B. ("allegedly" because the respective text is missing in the files). In this text the BfV sums up their findings on Olaf B. (Group memberships, political activities, attendance of meetings, e-mail-adresses, etc.) He is said to write articles for the "ak" signed with the Pseudonym Gregor Samsa and would also be in contact with the accused Fritz S.

December 18th 2006

note "Herero and Nama"

Again detective superintendant Scholz is allowed to unleash his love for detailed internet research, as he did in the *assessment report "autofocus videowerkstatt e.V."* before. At that time already three *SBS* within the scope of the *militant campaign* ("Marnette", "Villa Borsig" and lately in October 2006 "DAL") mention the subject "German colonialism" and especially the non-payment of reparations to the ethnic groups Herero and Nama in Namibia. To the BKA this seems worth further research, which might be less comprehensive than former reports, but still adds up to 20 pages naming 40 persons. In the beginning "*crimes in connection to the subject 'Herero and Nama'*" are listed in detail (on about 4 pages). There were eleven (no suspects are named): Between January 9th 2004 (*colour attack* on a colonial warrior memorial in Düsseldorf) and July 18th 2006 (the same in Braunschweig) the BKA counts 8 actions with colour or property damage in the BRD, nearly exclusively against memorials - plus the three arson attacks from the present proceedings.

It follows two pages of "*Internet research 'Deutsche Afrika-Linien (DAL)'*" that digs out 2 articles of the weekly newspaper "Jungle World" from 2001 and 2004 dealing with the subject "German colonialism" and the website "afrika-hamburg.de" interested in the same topic.

The following "*Internet research 'Herero and Nama'*" builds the 14 page long core of the note, its main content is the "*'Anticolonial Africa Conference', November 11th-15th 2004, in Berlin-Kreuzberg*". This conference would have been co-organized by the "Researchpoint flight and migration, Forschungsstelle Flucht und Migration" (FFM), whose postal adress would be the same as the group "FeIS", for whose website (FeIS) again the accused Bernhard F. would be responsible. Furthermore, within "FeIS" there would exist a working group "International solidarity" and a journal "Arranca" where an occupation with the subject "German colonialism" is said to be noticeable. One of the articles in "Arranca" consists of excerpts from a book about the topic.

The "Antiracist Initiative e.V." (ARI) would have been supporting the conference. A note of the Berlin LKA Staatsschutz, the political branch of the police, dating from December 2002 lists seven persons as members. In 2004 the ARI is said to have "registered three public events in connection to the subject colonialism". On their website the Berlin Social Forum (BSF) would have called for a respective rally on January 13th 2004⁴⁵, and the accused Bernhard F. and Hauke B. are said to belong to the BSF. Texts and pictures of the conference could be found on "unbruch-bildarchiv.de", as well as on "indymedia.org", also naming some people. One of the persons mentioned would be active at "medico international", where three others (mentioned with their names) are said to work as well. One other would work at the "Campaign Smokesigns, Kampagne Rauchzeichen" of the "Berlin Provincial Workinggroup Environment and Developmant, Berliner Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Umwelt und Entwicklung" (BLUE21). There another person, which spoke on the BuKo 2005 in Hamburg about colonialism is said to work, too. Furtheron diverse other persons and groups participating in BuKo presentations and preparations are named, also Fritz S. would have been present in the "Forum Biopolitics". Another participant of this "Forum Biopolitics" is said to be part of "Action Selftaxation e.V.,

45 Probably some dates got mixed up here.

Aktion Selbstbesteuerung e.V." as well, which mentioned the "Anticolonial Conference" in their newsletter. In the following some more names, groups, websites and articles about the "Anticolonial Conference" are listed a little bit less in detail. Finally detective superintendent KOK Scholz dedicates some lines to the book "Morenga's Heirs. A Journey through Namibia" and its author.

December 20th 2006

State of investigations

Half a year after the first *state of affairs report* criminal chief superintendent KHK Noisternigg of BKA ST 12 draws first conclusions on 30 pages. Concerning four of the six accused he argues that the suspicion was hardened, first of all *"by the evidence produced through telephone and observation measures about their involvement in the 'Anti-G8-Scene'"*, secondly by assessments of the diverse SBS, which would respectively point to Hauke B. ("Marnette", "Villa Borsig", "Märka", "Herero and Nama"), Bernhard F. ("HWWI", "Herero and Nama"), Armin M. ("Marnette", "Märka") and Fritz S. ("Marnette", "Hermes"). The accused Sven L. and Stefan M. are not given any further attention in this text. In spite of this the commissioner is of the opinion that eight pieces of circumstantial evidence would proof that the attacks, *"organisation and public explanation of the 'Anti-G8' campaign were committed by a circle of offenders larger than the accused named"*.

1.) It would be written already in the book "Autonomous in movement" under the headline "Campaigns" that *"one has to mobilize resp. integrate further people into the 'work'"*. 2.) Some SBS were written in form of "we" and signed by "groups" or "Working group, AG". 3.) There were several arson devices said to be used simultaneously in the attacks "Märka" and "Thormählen". 4.) In the attacks "Imtech" and possibly "Hermes" people would have acted at the same time in very distant places. 5.) Witnesses spoke of several different allegedly involved persons in the attacks "Marnette" and "HWWI". 6.) Following TKÜ observation a participation of Hauke B. and Armin M. in the attack "Hermes" would be *rather unlikely*. 7.) The attack "Thormählen" is said to have been committed by five other persons anyways, whereby it could not be excluded *"that they committed the attack on behalf or together with them [the accused]"*. 8.) The DNA traces "Märka"/"Securitas"/"Vermögensamt" would prove that *"the three attacks were committed by offenders belonging to one group ('Autonomous groups'), resp. being in contact with each other"*. Also in the action "Vermögensamt" witnesses would have seen five male persons running away. From all this the following conclusion could be drawn:

"As the accused namen above (...) are involved within the left scene for 20 years in an active and leading way and gained respective experience in dealing with criminal prosecution measures, it has to be assumed, that their co-offenders/group members stem from their closest, most familiar circles. In the investigations here therefore (...) those contact persons are especially included who are involved in their field of impact, and attained a respective relationship of trust (e.g for reason of crimes committed together before)."

To narrow down this circle of persons, the note extensively examines on nine pages the political engagement of Hauke B. and Armin M. against "GM technology" and the G8 summit. As interface persons - which means those who were mentioned in connection to both topics, have a close relationship to at least one of the two (e.g. have an incrypted email contact), and additionally *"appeared in connection with politically left offences several times already"* - three people are named: Olaf B., Thomas J. and Anne S. They are moreover said to be members of the *"'Gene-G8-Minigroup' founded in the beginning of the year 2006"* by Armin M. and Hauke B.

Concerning Fritz S. even 11 pages are filled with his political activities and the contact persons that thereby got known. Besides the engagement against the G8 summit mainly the "Systemoppositional Nuclear Energy No Thanks Group, Systemoppositionelle Atomkraft Nein Danke Gruppe" (SAND). Identified as potentially trusted persons, in the sense of the proceedings, are Mattis S., Julian S., Joachim T. und Fabian W.

The note is summed up like this: The seven persons named are said to be *"close persons of trust of the accused Hauke B., Armin M. resp. Fritz S. Some of them already were registered more than once in connection to politically left motivated crimes. The active integration of the said persons into the ongoing militant 'Anti-G8-campaign' by the accused described [in the report] leads to the conclusion that they are linked by a bond of trust and that they are members of the terrorist alliance."*

Detective Superintendent Noisternigg ends with the statement that *"further investigations" would be "necessary to harden the suspicion of membership in a terrorist alliance shown [in the report]"*. Therefore it would be suggested to *"enlist the said persons as additional accused in the proceedings 2 BJs 10/06-2"*.

First notes on personal findings about the seven candidates are finished the same day already. It can be assumed that the realization of the proposal by the BAW doesn't take long and is only delayed by Christmas.

December 26th 2006

Arson attack 9: Mirow

The house of the Ministry of Finance State Secretary Thomas Mirow in Hamburg is attacked with colour bottles. The car of the family standing in front of the garage is set on fire. The SBS that followed is signed by "AG kolonialismus und Krieg in der militanten Anti-G8-Kampagne".

* Two month pass before BKA ST11 presents an *evaluation* of the text, that, consisting of 60 pages, turns out to be quite comprehensive.⁴⁶ Most easy in this case is to prove that the arson is part of the alleged *militant campaign*, as it is mentioned in the signature of the SBS. In detail a single author is assumed, allegedly to be identical with the author of the SBS "DAL" and "Marnette". Conclusion: *"The expositions of the author sound (...) like a kind of summary of the militant campaign mentioned."*

"The indications of the ideological position (antiimperialistically motivated, mature, without recognizable missionary character), and strategic disposition (promotion of the militant campaign by giving moral arguments, endorsement of a broad, overarching resistance) of the authors, as well as the fact that they claim to give a summary of the campaign (...) leads to the conclusion, that the authors are to be counted to the circle of persons who initiated and maintain the militant campaign against G8 summit in Heiligendamm, resp. who at least are in closer relation to those." Moreover there would be a conspicuous parallel with three texts of the "Interventionist Left" in the newspaper "G8 extra", namely the use of the term "mondän" [swank] and the phrase "unconditional cancellation of all debts". The group's name "AG Colonialism and War" could be *"judged as an indication that the authors actually are members of an organisation and a working group active in the sense of the signature in terms of content. Seen against the backdrop of the ascertained sites it is not unlikely that the authors are active within a working group of the organisation "Interventionist Left"*.

Besides these little trips to insanity Detective Superintendent Heck allows himself some further thoughts about the *militant campaign*. Following the course of *assessments* so far, it is not surprising that again the accused Fritz S. is named to presumably be the author, as he is said to be the only person known fulfilling the demanded profile (integrative leadership figure of the autonomous scene, with longstanding experience and weaknesses in spelling). Looking back at - depending on the way one counts - up to 16 attacks, it seemed to be possible now to Detective Superintendent Heck to add some more general reflections. Conspicuous would be the disproportionate distribution of attacks in the Hamburg region. It could be assumed *"that the relevant forces sustaining and promoting the campaign are - besides Berlin - to be found in Hamburg."* Furthermore the actions in the Berlin region could not as clearly be defined as part of the *militant campaign* as the ones in Hamburg.⁴⁷ *"It can not be finally judged how the relatively reserved actions in the Berlin scene*

⁴⁶ The increasing length of the *evaluations* is as well due to the fact that logically each attack adds to the number of SBS in comparison.

⁴⁷ more precisely there had been only one attack in Berlin, where a direct connection to a "militant

have to be assessed in that respect."

* The BfV is more quick in this case and submits its *text analysis* already on February 22nd 2007. It only consists of 12 pages and counts the attack as number 13 within the *militant campaign*. Also the BfV has modified its estimation about the initiators. In the beginning they would have presumed "*that most of the attacks were possibly committed by persons of structures which are at least in contact with each other*". Meanwhile there is said to be the "*reasonable assumption that organisation and realization of the militant campaign is sustained and significantly influenced by a steady circle of persons within the sphere of the violence-prone undogmatic left extremism*". Besides parallels in terminology and content to other SBS in this complex, a similarity to a text by "Autonomous groups" is discovered. Here the BfV points to an "*identity of authors at least in parts*" of the mentioned text taken from "radikal" number 159, already analysed June 14th 2006 with the SBS "Villa Borsig", as well as *significant indication* that the authors belong to the initiators of the *militant campaign*.

Finally the BfV assumes that Mirow would be "*the symbolic figure for the subject G8 par excellence*".

* Most of the forensic reports about means of the crime and SBS are presented in April 2007 already. All of them are negative.

* The investigations of the BfV regarding the whereabouts of the accused at that time are not very meaningful this time. One of the people from Berlin has been at home according to video-surveillance, of the four others no predication pro or contra can be given following the information of TKÜ surveillance and Geo-data.

12 of January 2007

Six new defendants

* Following the request of the BKA ST 12 dated 20.12.06, one will create six new defendants within the investigation (Olaf B., Julian S., Fabian W., sometime later Mattis S. and Anne S. will follow)⁶³.

The main thing one has against them, is actually only the intimate contact they have with some of the main-defendants, all the possible rest one has to investigate by now on. Towards this are coming the first resolutions of the BGH.

One will put the defendants Olaf B., Thomas J, Julian S. and Fabian W. under *police observation*, they will be put under *surveillance of telecommunications* and one can *observe them for longer time*.

For the defendant Mattis S. such resolutions will follow sometime later, on the 26.2, and they refer as well to the "*recording and listening of the words which are not outspoken in public*" within the car he is allegedly making a use of.

One does not find any statement on this within the files in regard to Anne S., since from spring 2007 she will not be any longer part of the circle of defendants which is "*promising some results*"⁶⁴.

*Already on the 15th of January the LKA Hamburg begins with the observation of the "new" defendants.

Until the end of March one will observe 24 days, especially Julian S. and Fabian W. From the beginning on they will get way more attention, in parallel one will produce already actualised *notes on the knowledges about the person*, but which are not going yet to be containing nothing new in comparison to the ones dated 20.12.06.

For the other three new defendants (excluding Anne S.), such report will follow only later: for Thomas J. on the 15.2 (he will be observed for the first time in three days from now by the LKA Brandenburg), for Mattis S. on the 7.3 (he has been observed while in meeting some other persons under observation, but he has not been a main goal of the

campaign" and other attacks was made, namely the attack "Villa Borsig" of October 2005.

6 3 Joachim T. will not be presented as defendant, but kept further on under attention as *suspect* by the BKA

6 4 Since they haven't been met as defendants by the executive measures of the 9th of May, the notes and reports about them are not contained within the files

observation, so in the files), for Olaf B. firstly on the 29.3 (same story as with the former defendant).

16th of January 2007

The KHK Noisternigg at the BKA St 12 begins slowly with the preparation of a summary on the results of the investigation, towards a report about its stand and requests about "executive measures".

*On the 16.01 he send a list of the relevant attacks as the data on the twelve defendants to the BfV, in order to get from them their informations about the whereabouts of them before and after the attacks.

The list itself comprehend the aforementioned 9 arson attacks plus the one against "Thormählen" in Bad Oldesloe, until this moment still considered as part of the *militant campaign against the G8*.

The BfV responds on the 26.02 about the time comprehended until end of 2006, sending a large tabular list.

One collected infos only about the five main-defendants, there are no infos about the other seven.

The BfV is explicitly communicating that the video-material and pictures which has been collected in front of the houses of Hauke B. and Bernahrd F. *"does not have to find a place within the files since it has been produced from inhabited apartments, and its making public might endanger the identity of the apartment owners"*.

The material produced by the BfV has been already documented within the chronicle of the attacks.⁶⁵

One does not find anything in the files about the surveillance-capacities of the BfV in the year 2007.

* On the 30.01 follows a request about the informations owned by the BfV about the attacks "Märka" and "Securitas", since because of the there-collected DNA traces one put the two attacks in connection to "Autonome Gruppen".

On the 8.2 the BfV responds with two pages, and above all show a connection with two demonstration which has been registered by one of the main-defendants few months before the attacks.

Besides this, they dedicate few sentences to the group "autopool", ince they have been also responsible for the demonstration against "Securitas", they are engaged in the anti-G8 resistance and would produce regularly a newsletter with a list of the militant attacks.

*On the 12.02 the BKA ST 12 is phoning with the BfV, asking for several details regarding especially the night of the attack against "Villa Borsig", since during that night the suspect Bernhard left his apartment for about 20 minutes.

The BfV answered right the same day.

22nd of January 2007

evaluation-report about the activities against the G8 summit - with focus on Hamburg

After the evaluation-report from June 2006 with its focus on Berlin, the BKA presents now a similar analysis about Hamburg⁶⁶.

Similarly to the first report, it takes almost one year until the report is going to be ready.

The starting point for this is the communique about the attack against "Imtech", since the latter has been put in connection with the *"Militant Campaign against the G8"*.

Its anti-militarist aspect (Imtech is an arm-trade company) has been underlined, especially

6 5 However one has to underline that the data will be more freely interpreted in this text as done by the BKA. They consider them as explicitly discharging only when they exclude a participation to the concrete actions. When instead there might be a an unclear situation, say when the data result tendencially discharging, but there might be still a theoretical possibility to interpret them in another way, the BKA spares itself an assessment

6 6 This report will be prepared originally for the investigation about "Imtech" and other attacks happened there, which have been a separate investigation

in connection with the yearly meeting in Mittenwald of the "Mountain Soldiers".
The BKA ST 12 reposes of high importance the fact that during the Dissent! meeting one is trying to *"create a link between the daily struggles together with the politic of the G8 and also to plan actions and theoretical discussions in relation to the summit"*.

Since the ones who wrote the communique *"see their action as a contribution to mobilization against the summit, therefore one can be sure that they - or at least a part of them - have been taking part to the Dissent! meeting in Hamburg or in Berlin, or that they are stemming from the city of Hamburg"*.

Therefore this report should mainly try to clarify the anti-G8 activities in Hamburg and surroundings (especially people, pictures of them, groups, meetings, publications...) and *"pay high attention to the already gathered informations about people and groups who became known in relation to any activity against the aforementioned meeting in Mittenwald"*.

This report is about 80 pages long, 100 names are mentioned, its articulation is similar to the first report about Berlin (however it does not mention any link to the former).

* Firstly, the history of the *Antiglobalization* movement is described within 13 pages.

This part is equal to the report about Berlin from 2006, beside the fact that it reaches as well the "security-conference" in Monaco, February 2006.

About Gleneagles 2005 is being mentioned that *"ready-to-violence activists from Germany have attested an high organizational potential"*.

From Germany around 200-300 people have been there, especially from Berlin and Hamburg, and among them around 40 have been arrested, which represented the highest number among all the international participants.

* An equally long report about the several meetings against the summit which took place begins with the note that there are not enough informations about these by cop's side, or that at least one does not know the names of the participants.

All the gathered informations from ST 11 are exposed within the *"picture of the situation produced by the BKA about the G8 summit"*; within the latter *"only meetings where one found out relevant informations or lately some of its participants became known by name by the BKA"* have been included.

The explanations about the meeting are mostly equal to the one of the "Berlin" report. The short text about the first nationwide meeting of "Dissent!" in Hamburg (October 2005) will get few more sentences.

On the 1.12.05 the LKA Hamburg writes on this meeting that *"police does not have any informations about this meeting"*.

One will report shortly about the second meeting in Berlin (January 2006), which had already dominated the "Berlin" report (in this new one the list of names and the results of the AGs are missing).

One will name only four person from Hamburg who took part there, one of them being one of the nine defendants, two others which will later on become defendants as well⁶⁷.

The BKA managed to identify two more people who took part in the "Action conference in Rostock" (March 2006) thanks to pictures found on the web (so all in all 8 out of 300).

Few more meetings, such as the one in Leipzig, will be left aside.

About the fourth one (Berlin May 2006), one find few sentences and the fact that four of the five main-defendants took part in it.

The last report written by the BKA ST 11 is about the preparation camp "Campinski" (august 2006), where *"up to 700 took part in"*.

Here they list few actions, among them the visit of people dressed with white masks (in the style of the "Überflüssigen") at the Arno-Breker exposition in Schwerin.

The defendant Fritz S. and a further person would have become known as participants of

6 7 As source for this one gives a *"note from ST 11 dated 16.06.06"*, as it was already for the "Berlin" report. Since three of the "Hamburg" names which came out from this note hadn't been yet named within the "Berlin" report, one can imagine that the so-called note contains further names and details which have not been included within both *evaluation-reports*

the camp⁶⁸.

* The part about the *“organisation/groups within the anti-G8 movement”* is about eight pages, way shorter than the Berlin's one.

Six groups will be described after a research done on the web, groups which the BKA repute as relevant.

The first is the *“Anti-G8 coordination towards a revolutionary perspective”*, a coordination of different revolutionary-communist groups from different cities (the half from Berlin), which called for *“coming as close as possible to the “Red Zone” or “Security Zone”*.

One mentions two names (one listed on the web as contact person for the *“Hamburg-Eimsbüttel social forum”*), but one would not know further details on them.

Secondly one will describe the *“Avanti-Project for an undogmatic Left”*, using their own description taken on the web.

One will mention a possible link to the *“Interventionistischen Linke”*.

One person became known because has been named within a public protocol from an Anti-G8 meeting.

The LKA Kiel and Hamburg do not present *“any relevant informations about “Avanti”*.

Regarding the BuKo (National coordination for the internationalism), the *“Berlin”* part will be copied.

As fourth group comes *“Dissent!”* - here the KHK Richter has researched a bit more and found out a brochure (*“A look within the inner-life of a mobilization”*), being *“legally”* registered by Carlo Giuliani, who actually got *“shot in a situation of self-defence by an italian policeman during the G8 in Genoa, 2001”*.

Since then, his name *“has been used often as name for commandos who committed attacks”*.

Texts which are to be found in this brochure stemmed from known groups such as *“autopool”* or *“six hills”*, as from 2 people whose names are used as signatures.

As fifth, it is the turn of the *“Anti-G8 coordination from Hamburg”*.

About this one, it seems to be very little to be known.

Within one of the many discussion papers, they will outspoke *“to attack the G8 summit 2007, to block it, to prevent it”*.

The *“coordination”* is supposed to meet once a month (here addresses will be as well mentioned)

The sixth group is the *“Interventionist Left”*, which is described as *“coordination of different leftist groups and single persons from all over the nation”* and does not see itself in competition with Dissent!. Among others, the group *“Avanti”*⁶⁹ is taking part in it

* After this considerations, the BKA ST 11 will open a new chapter: the *“analyses about the “Mittenwald's mountain soldiers meeting”*.

This part comprehends 9 pages, which document the actions against the yearly Easter meeting of the *“Circle of friends of the Mountain troops e.V.”*, happened between 2002 and 2006, and which comprehend about 70 names of people who supposedly participated within.

The LKA München has been here over-productive and has registered well too many names – the BKA has mostly registered only the names which has been put in connection with the G8 summit.

Most of those people live in southern Germany, only six people are living in northern Germany (Berlin excluded), who will not be named anymore within the files.

* In closing, 25 names will be put in connection since *“they have become relevant around anti-G8 mobilization activities”*.

From those, 13 live in Hamburg, 6 in Berlin, the rest in other cities of northern Germany (as Kiel or Bremen).

6 8 That really only two persons have been there identified by name seems quite unrealistic!

6 9 The lapidary treatment of the IL done by the KHKin Richter does not fit at all with the one given by her colleague Heck, who believed to discover some suspicious links while analysing two of the comuniques (*“Marnette”* and *“Mirow”*)

This part comprehends 26 pages, and beside their participation to several political happenings or groups high attention is paid to their previous trials and *contact-persons*. Ten pages are dedicated for the Hamburg defendants (among them also some future ones which at this moment have been classified only as *contact-persons*), of these six only for the defendant Fritz S.

About him, especially his engagement regarding anti-nuclear activities is underlined, but all in all this report is mostly repeating what the other colleagues from ST 12 already wrote. One thing seems very important to be noted for the ST 11, that one person registered in the same house of Fritz S has been controlled many years before while putting up anti-castor posters in Bad Oldesloe together with others, among them one actual defendant within the 129a trial "Bad Oldesloe".

* In the following summary, comprehensive of three pages, it will be stated that the theme of "*anti-globalization*" is becoming "*a main field of interest within the extreme left spectrum*" since the end of the 90s

In the contest of the organization efforts around the G8 meeting 2007, there would be "*parts which would look for a violent confrontation with the G8 meeting*".

Some of the people who have been put in connection with activities around the G8, result particularly interesting since "*their engagement within those activities appear to be extremely over the normal (participation to several preparation – meetings, usage of the internet)*".

Fritz S should belong to these ones, he appear to be involved already in 1988 within the "IMF Campaign".

Beyond it there would be people who "*have appeared as interesting because of their involvement within different activities (such as participation to some meetings, acts of violence linked to the aforementioned themes, spying out, high email traffic) and/or being contact-person with some of the aforementioned projecting persons*"⁷⁰.

Herein nine people will named, among them the defendant Julian S., as the soon to come defendant Sophie F. and Felix S.

At the end, seven more people will be named, who have been linked together with anti-G8 activities as much as with protests against the "meeting of the mountain soldiers" (six from them from Berlin, one from Hamburg); for them, there will not be any further link to the main inquiry.

26th of January 2007

Arson attack n 10: Aly/Klausmann

Two attacks take place in Hamburg, against two main delegates of "Thyssen Krupp Marin System AG" (TKMS): The car from Herbert Aly will be burned, the one from Walter Klausmann will be damaged and his house attacked with bottles full of colour.

The communique' is signed by "revolutionary anti-militarist activists – butter at the fish"

*Already within the *first – analysis* three days later by the BKA ST 11, a link with the "Imtech" communique and a similarity to the complex *militant campaign* will be determinated.

The *analysis* will need a similar time and will have length like the one about "Mirow", it will be ready on the 4 of April, its length being 60 pages.

Its categorization within the *militant campaign* will be fastly done, since even the communique put this action in the contest of a "mobilization against the G8 meeting".

The focus of the *analysis* will be this time even more the *comparison* with the already known communiques (a possible identity with the communiques from "Tchibo" and "DAL" will be at least outspoken) as much as the search for possible *parallel-texts* with the communiques contained within the data bank.

In doing this, the commissar Heck finds out an article stemming from the journal "analyse und kritik" from June 2006, in which actually arsons have been criticised, but this is

7 0 The false use of the plural ("*projecting persons*" even though here one named only a person – Fritz S.) shows that here as elsewhere one used pieces of the "Berlin" report

appearing too tepid to the BKA worker, since he is going to conclude that the article would be rather *“mobilizing towards the campaign against the G8 meeting and challenging its mere journalistic stroke – taking”*.

Two articles signed by a Gregor Samsa about the theme of globalization are resulting to him even more suspect, since they contain the formulation “around the globe”, which would lead to the consideration that *“it can not be excluded that writer of the articles, who is probably using a pseudonym, might have participated in the writing of the communique or at least had an influence on it”*.

All in all ST 11 repeats the conclusions contained in the previous *analyses*, but this time is not presenting names from any defendants as possible authors.

* From the side of the BfV, there is only a small analysis dated 31 of January, which is putting the attacks in connection with the *militant campaign* and is claiming an identity with the authors of the “Imtech” communique upon an *high possibility* (BKA – analysis :*“with a slight tendency to not consider this identity”*).

* The technical researches will be done quickly, for the end of April there will be five reports about traces, above all about the SBS (all negative).

* About the surveillance operations (whereabouts of the defendants) done by the BfV since the beginning of 2007, there is nothing to be found within the files.

The measures taken by the BKA will determined hat two defendants from Hamburg have had a *conspiratorial conversation* on the telephone just three days before the attack (they talked about something calling it “this”, without saying what “this” is).

Olaf B. is also suspected to have participated to the attack, since an hour before the first part of the attack received an sms in which somebody would wish him *“that everything works out good tonight”*⁷¹.

The TKÜ of the five main - defendants shows that at least two of them from Berlin would have had any chance to be involved, the data about the other three are not clear enough, although they do not give any particular interesting information towards their possible engagement.

8th of February 2007

Mattis S. will become a further defendant.

However, the resolutions of the BGH about *police observation, observation of telecommunication and long term observation*, as much as *“noting and listening of the not – openly said words”* within its own car are beginning on the 26.02 (so after the last attack linked to the *militant campaign* in Hamburg).

15th of February 2007

The LKA Brandenburg, which is taking care of the defendants and suspects living in the area of Brandenburg, is strongly suggesting Silvio K. as next defendant to the BKA.

In a note, parallels will be traced *“between the attempted arson against the Trans Maerka GmbH on the 10.09.06 in Eberswalde (...) and the one against the company “GbA” (...) on the 20.10.06 in Strausberg.”*

About how concretely such parallels should look like, it is not explained within the files – the LKA' s note from the 15.02 as also another note about that by the BKA (5.03) are missed in the files⁷².

Their inclusion within the inquiry probably did not happened before the beginning of march.

7 1 Already within the note about Olaf . Dated 29.03.2007 is affirmed that his mobile phone has been all the time in Bremen, so that he would have had to race to Hamburg in order to take part in at least one of the two actions, the coming back to Bremen, take again his telephone on himself, then driving to Berlin on the morning and having longer meeting there.

The BKA knew since longer through the TKÜ that the sms probably *“has been in connection with a completion related to a date for a printing in the night of the 26.01.07”*.

7 2 This allows the speculation that one followed a line of investigation which the BKA have liked to keep a bit longer for herself

23rd of February 2007

Arson n. 11: Dussmann Hamburg

On this morning several autos of the company "Dussmann" will be set alight.

Few days after a communique will be published, although signed anonymously.

* Within its first evaluation on the 02.03, the BKA ST 11 is noting several difference with the precedent communique.

The style of this new one should be different from the ones which until now have been considered linked to the militant campaign.

There will not be any "*necessary proofs that its writers are having in focus to push forward the campaign against the G8*".

As suspect is considered the strong taking relation to actions happened in Berlin, thing that suggest "*a link of its writer to the Berlin's scene*".

A more detailed evaluation should have been expected for the beginning of May, therefore there is no traces of this in the files.

* From the side of BfV, there is only a *short-evaluation* dated 06.03, which is about 8 pages long (on the 14.03 this will be integrated with a *text - analysis* of both communique about Dussmann from Berlin and Hamburg).

The main thing here will be the theorem repeated since the attack "Mirow" (December 2006), that the *militant campaign* will be brought forward not merely from "*structures which are linked among each other*", but rather from a "*concrete circle of people*".

The communique "Dussmann Hamburg" is corresponding to the "*theoretical mainline*" of the campaign, and "*is focussing above all on the theme of migration/anti-racism*".

About the fact, that those themes are to be included within the G8 mobilization, the BfV is quoting a text of the groups "Fels" and "autopool", where already one year ago (between January and March 2006) one would have proposed to make the theme "Migration" central for the Anti-G8 mobilization.

A typical thing of the communiques of the *militant campaign* would be their connecting in a positive way other actions which took place, in order to communicate a "*resoluteness and argumentative continuity*", as much as the fact that "*there should not be a hierarchy among different means of action*".

The BfV declares to have found out a clear similarity between two anti-racist property damages at the AWO happened in October and December 2006, explicitly named and underlined within this one communique.

According to the BKA, it will be concluded that "*the knowledge of the writers in relation to the anti-racist initiatives in Berlin let think that people from Berlin have been at least participating within the writing of the communique*"³.

* Until the summer of 2007, there is very few things to be found in the files in connection with criminal - technical researches.

* As further material for the investigation, the BKA St 12 is using the results of the TKÜ about Bernhard F., which will be defined on the 13.03 and culminate with the fact the Jan – Ole A., who is living together with him, should be also taken as defendant, since he should have made a "*large internet research about Dussmann in January 2007*", written an article for "analyse und kritik" about migration, and having strong connection to people in Hamburg.

* The whereabouts of the main-defendants will be defined mainly through the TKÜ and the Geo – data.

One of them from Berlin has been observed directly by the BKA during this time, and for him was therefore impossible to have been in Hamburg.

Two of the other had some appointments, which lasted until late night, which in the case of one of them has been also confirmed through the GPS installation on his car; at the end, only in the case of one of them is not completely clear what he had done on that night.

7 3 If the wrongly written *Anti-racist Initiative* comes out of a writing-mistake or should mean a connection to the Berlin's "Anti-racist Initiative" (ARI) remains unclear

For Fritz S., who is living in Hamburg, the observation does not offer any pro or contra results. In the same way it has been operating regarding the communique which has been send five days later, and where as well there is no relevant evidences to comment about (beside the fact that during a certain time one of the people from Berlin has been clearly in Saxony, and that the others were doing phone-calls in Berlin during the daytime.

26th of February 2007

The BfV is communicating to the BKA the results on the whereabouts of the five main-defendants during the time of the attacks raging from 28.07.05 (“Marnette”) and the 26.12.06 (“Mirow”).

The chart, long eight pages, is giving results stemming from TKÜ (phone-calls from home, geo – data during the usage of mobile phones) as much as from two video – installations. There are statements only about those five, about the other seven defendants there is none.

The BfV is giving a special value to the fact that the video – observation of the house – entrances of Hauke B. and Bernhard F. have been done from “*private apartments*” and therefore “*the photo material does not have to be included by the BKA within the files, in order to do not put at risk the identity of the apartments owners*”.

The results of these TKÜ has been exposed within the aforementioned chronicle.

By this moment (at least on the level of what can be used on court) the BKA can compare the already prepared speculations about the communique – analysis together with real movement - picture of the main-defendants during 2005 and 2006.

As it has been suspected already long time before, these details are showing that the main-defendants could not have taken part to the actions.

5th of March 2007

The BKA ST 12 brings out a new note about the “*ones from Strausberg*”, which is missing in the files.

One could imagine that therein the thesis of the LKA Brandenburg has been further developed, which say that the defendant Thomas J. and Silvio K. (and eventually other people) might have taken part to the attacks against “Marka” and “GbA”.

6th of March 2007

Arson attack n. 12: Dussmann Berlin

In Berlin – Pankow an attempted arson against a building belonging to the company Dussmann is taking place.

However, this does not produce any damage more than a house – wall becoming sooty through a burned tire.

The arson will be discovered on the 8 of march, as soon as a communique signed by “Autonome Gruppen” appears⁷⁴.

* In the first analysis the BKA ST 11 is recognizing few parallels to the attack against Dussmann in Hamburg, which took place two weeks before.

One can suppose that “*it might exist a link between the writers of this very communique, and the ones who wrote the one in Hamburg.*”

The group - name “Autonome Gruppen” let suppose a possible link to the attack “Villa Borsig” (October 2005).

* On the 13th of march the BfV is presenting its short analysis, which leads to the same conclusion and put the attack in connection to the militant campaign.

A thing which seems to be striking, is the fact that this communique is “containing entire parts from a (public) call towards an action day against the “*forced – stay in the detention lagers*” on the 7.10.06”, which might be a proof that the “*writers of the communique*

7 4 The end-result of “Autonomen Gruppen” in Berlin is sobering up for what concerns *the militant campaign G8*: three attacks in one and half years, from them only one went good...it seems a quite low result for a campaign initiated by a group of autonomen chief-cadres which is supposed to be fighting since 20 years

“Dussmann Berlin” belong to this very group”.

Moreover, the BfV is saying that Fels is the *“leading group within the anti-racism/migration sphere”*, and to this very group the defendant Bernhard F. is belonging.

Already a day later, the BfV is writing a longer text – analysis of both Dussmann SBS, which is deepening the suppositions contained in the previous short – analysis.

Within six texts stemming from the BfV' s data bank, one pretend to have found *“relevant similarities about used concepts and contents.”*

Among them, three communiques about anti-racist acts of damage in Berlin against AWO and IOM, happened in 2006, the aforementioned call towards the action day, one flyer about about a public action against Dussmann, and one stemming from the Fels website. The BfV repeats its theory contained within the *short – analysis*, affirming that quoting from a public diffused text is a proof towards the identity of the writers⁷⁵.

Therefore they come to the conclusion that that some of the aforementioned texts *“have been written by one/more person/s, who belong to the circle of the ones who initiated the militant campaign against G8 and who engage themselves above all with the theme of antiracism/migration.”*

This leads the BfV to the group Fels, and therefore *“a possible engagement of the old – autonome Bernhard F. can be seen at least as a possibility, following the aforementioned considerations.”*

* At this moment, there is almost no results from the side of criminal – investigation.

* Within the investigation about the whereabouts of the main-defendants will be supposed that the date of the action, given within the communique (06.03), is true⁷⁶.

Following such supposition, there are clear discharging results for Fritz S. and Bernhard F. stemming from the TKÜ and observation (both of them are not in Berlin), for the other three defendants from Berlin there are any relevant data.

About the piece of evidence “Dussmann research”, see 13.03

9th of March 2007

Two more defendants

There will be notes about the persons of Silvio K. (from the LKA Brandenburg) and Jan – Ole A. (from the BKA), which will be put in the waiting – list towards obtaining the status of “defendant”.

The BGH' s decision follows few days later (on the 16.03 at least for Jan – Ole A.)

From now on, there will be than 14 defendants, who are going to be under observation by the BKA and the LKA.

13th of March 2007

“Dussamnn – research”

The BKA ST 12, in the person of commissar Noisternigg, produces a note of 13 pages to the BAW, in order to stimulate the inclusion of Jan – Ole A. as defendant.

In order to motivate this, the commissar say that he is in *close relation* to the main-defendant Bernhard F., they have been living together and both members of the group Fels.

He characterises the group using some parts contained within the “Berlin – report about activities from June 2006 (stroking – words *“Autonome and people belonging to the “RAF sphere”*, “Berlin – for – free Campaign, engagement with the *“basque terrorist organization ETA”*, the *“effort to bring together ready – to – violence forces”*, the grounding of “ACT!”).

It will be especially underlined the fact the Fels has been proposing through an open letter from January 2006, the theme of migration to become main point of future campaigns regarding the G8.

In the following time, there have been *“a row of actions”*, which have *“translated practically*

7 5 See on this also the explanations about “Text-analysis” in the part two

7 6 However, the BKA leaves out the possibility that here one could mean the night from the 6th to the 7th of March

such a proposal in the form of property damages or arsons”.

It follows the count of four actions, the one against AWO, Berlin in October 2006, one “*property damage against an AWO building through colour*” in December 2006, and the arsons against Dussmann from 23.02.07 in Hamburg and 6.03 in Berlin.

Jan – Ole A. has to be linked to the attacks against Dussmann, since he researched twice suspicious websites on the net⁷ on the 07.10.06, he researched on “indymedia” and on “stressfaktor” pages containing a call for an anti-racist rally (due to happen few days later) in front of the Dussmann building in Friedrichstrasse.

On the 11.01.07, he would have done “*a large research about the Dussmann group*”.

His goal would have been “*to gather informations about this company, to be used to write than the communique*”.

To proof this, some formulations contained in this very communique will be compared i.e. to the self – description of the Dussmann company, contained in their website (as example the formulation “over 6 different services”⁷⁸ contained in the website seems to be highly suspect because similar to the one of the SBS, “services of all forms”, and so on).

On top of this, comes the same opinion, both from BKA as from BfV, that the two SBS, and therefore the attacks, has been possibly done by the same people.

Jan – Ole A. has strong connections to people in Hamburg, he wrote as well for the newspaper “analyse und kritik” (from Hamburg) articles “*which is approaching the aforementioned theme of anti-racism/migration*” (as proof will be presented two articles from this newspaper dated 2004).

In “ak” there are as well texts from other two defendants (Anne S. and Olaf B.) to be found, as also an article which thematises widely the attack against “HWWI”, and the defendant Bernhard F. is suspected to have had a strong influence to its communique⁷⁹.

15th of March 2007

Folding up within one reference

Through a 10 pages long note, the commissar-in-chief Noisternigg tries to put an order in the formal confusion of the different investigations.

There are many parallel references: the attack “Villa Borsig”, the most of those ones happened in or around Hamburg, are all against *unknown persons*.

Than there is the investigation against the *militant campaign* and the 14 suspects, which is comprehending the attacks “HWWI”, “Matka” and “Dussmann Hamburg”, and the one against 6 defendants about the attack “Thormahlen” (Bad Oldesloe investigation), which the BfV would rather consider as part of the *militant campaign*⁸⁰.

The commissar Noisternigg argues that there is enough evidence in order to bring all these investigation under an only one, beside the “Thormählen” attack, since “*the attacks happened in Hamburg or in Berlin/Brandenburg happened within an anti G8 context, therefore possibly all conducting to the actual defendants and they are also all very similar regarding the modus operandi (arson against cars or companies, actions done during night-time, worldwide known and operating companies/authorities chosen as targets)*”.

Therefore all these arson attacks should come under a common file.

The BAW will support this suggestion.

End of March 07

Preparation of the executive – measures

The notes about the single persons will be updated, in relation to the upcoming *executive*

7 7 The investigated DSL-connection is used by more people, as the BKA is aware of. The contemporary opening-up of a GMX-mailbox will be used a proof to determine who was surfing on the web

7 8 A mistake within the BKA-files, right would have been “over 60 different services”

7 9 The KHK forgets to name that this attack has been heavily criticised within this article

8 0 Even though the BfV already decided to stick to a small circle of participants and there is also a report signed by BKA KT 54 (linguistic-experts) which says that the communique “Thormählen” has huge difference to the other ones, this time people at the BKA are so brave that they can impose themselves over the suggestion of the BfV

– *measures* (raids and so on..).

The reports will be finished within the following two weeks.

The BKA is writing the ones about the Berlin defendants and Fritz S. from Hamburg, the LKA Hamburg and Brandenburg takes care of the others.

In the most cases, this is the third kind of such a *report*.

In the case of Armin M., the main-commissar Arenz manages to gather 115 pages, its 479 footnotes, reaching 2400 pages.

* During the report about Hauke B. the commissar Hammes asks the BfV informations about the pseudonym “Helmut Heißenbüttel”, appeared within the book “Autonome in Bewegung”.

The BfV presents its research from 2001 to the BKA, where among other things is meant that behind such a name there would be Hauke B., who also is supposed to have participated to the Hakenkralle-attacks in 1997.

Within a text by “Heißenbüttel” is written that “it is a common consensus to do not put human life in danger”, a formulation appeared also within two communiques written by “Autonome Gruppen” regarding the Hakenkralle attacks in 96/97.

* The LKA Hamburg presents on the 26.3 a list of 18 places to be raided in Hamburg. 13 meets the already defendants Fritz S., Mattis S., Julian S. and Fabian W.; the other five will meet the already “*proposed to be taken as defendants*” Joachim T.⁸¹, Felix S., Henning O⁸².

2nd of April 2007

anonymized interrogation of a witness

Few weeks before the big showdown of the *executive measures*, the BKA is waiting still with a special gimmick.

The BKA SO 53 (branch for organised and general criminality, central committee) interrogates a witness, to whom BKA and BAW assure “*to keep his/her identity secret*”. Furthermore, the person should be “*known personally and by name by the interrogators*”. All this, and also the character of the 14 pages interrogation’s result, makes thinking that this person is a V-mann (infiltrator).

Even though might be that this person is not clearly used strictly within the political scene, he/she knows also some details about this one, such as ground-notes from different meetings.

The interrogation of this “witness” seems to be prepared since longer time, since he/she has been asked only about the suspects which were on the list until January 2007, but not on the ones who have taken in in march.

The “witness”, after having seen the pictures of the ones, declares to know Hauke B., Olaf B., Thomas J., Armin M., Anne S. and Fritz S. by name, although he also identifies Anne S. wrongly as the “*girlfriend of Hauke B.*”⁸³.

Afterwards, he tries to describe the “*role of these people within the leftist spectrum*”, giving the five men a *leading position*, either in present or past times.

Being then asked, if he can say anything about their involvement within militant activities, he can only recall their declaration about blockades or occupations type of action.

A large part of this interrogation is on 12 or 13 meetings, where both the defendants as the “witness” took part between November 2006 and March 2007.

He tells about the role six people played within such meetings.

It is interesting to note, that he does not have much clue of events preceding the 1st of November.

8 1 Who has been considered as suspect already since the beginning of the year

8 2 There are no reports about these two until this point, but they popped up as *contact-person* of some defendants – Henning O. above the other, since he speak on the phone “*positively about the declaration of one german pop-singer, Jan Philipp Eißfeld, called “Jan Delay” (...) who saluted the committing of arson attacks in connection to the “Anti-G8” field*”

8 3 A mistake which would have been surely corrected by the commissar from ST 12, but the questioning has been by SO 53

The chronicle he has been giving about the meetings he has been to, let people think that he would have been employed by the end of 2006 and through its participation within the anti-biotechnology activities gained access to the preparation of the anti-G8 ones, and therefore being aloud to join a bigger not-public meeting only by the beginning of 2007.

* 1.11.06 he visited an event in Brokdorf between 1976 and 1982", organised by Fritz S. *"there have been no declaration regarding violent acts in the past or in connection to Heiligendamm", reports the "witness"*.

* 11.11.06 took place a big event in Rostock (the 2 action-conference), where there have been also a working group about "G8 and agriculture", where Olaf and Hauke took part in, *"without thematizing any violent actions"*.

* 02.12.06 there has been a national meeting in Witzenhausen about "G8 and global agriculture".

At the working group "G8 and biotechnology" Olaf, Thomas and Armin should have taken part (2 of them as the main *spokepersons*).

There, the blockades of the Rostock airport and the occupation of the "Bombodrom" should have been discussed publicly.

* 17.12.06, Berlin: info-event "The globalised potato or what does have food to do with globalization?" - there Hauke, Thomas and Anne have been taking part. While Thomas there gave a proof *"to be the one of the few able to get the masses on his boat"*, Hauke presented the "Bärnimer action-coordination against biotechnologies"; *"discussions became very loud"*, after that he declared that *"he almost does not leave Berlin since he feels always under observation"*.

* On the 05.1.06 takes place in Berlin an "anti-G8-migration-meeting", which should have been organised and coordinate by Olaf.

* On the 20.01.07 takes place in Bremen a "national "Dissent!" meeting", where Olaf, Thoams and Fritz took part in.

There, should have been declared *"that is necessary to put pressure"* although such declarations did not specify through which kind of action.

The discourse from Fritz received very low attention⁸⁴.

* 26-28.01.07, Berlin: "Anti-Atom spring-conference".

Here Fritz partecipates as well, and the "witness" declared he was not able to *"work on a jointly position about the theme (media-work around the G8)"*, which made him very unhappy.

* On the 03.20.07, there was a meeting in Hannover, the "G8-KO-Circle", where it is not clear if the "witness" took part or only received informations about this.

From the meeting came out clearly hat *"because of the low number of attenders, there would be no interest in further organising concretely the resistance."*

* On the 08.02.07 the "witness" took part in the "Bremer G8-Plenum", where he sees Fritz S.

However, there one has not said anything about the G8 meeting.

* Between the 23 and the 25.02.07 there have been a meeting in Rostock about the "Action-day for the Global Agriculture". There he saw Hauke B., Thomas J. and Armin M.; among other things, one discussed about the *"use of hooks against the security fence and the planing of "further riots"".*

* As between the 2 and the 04.03.07 a further "Dissent!" meeting took place in Hamburg, it seems as the "witness" did not partecipate, since he simply tells that he could recall the presence of Fritz S.

* On the 08.03.07 a big info-event takes place in Groß-Lüsewitz about "globalization and agriculture", where Olaf B. and Armin M. have been seen by the "witness".

One discussed about "field's liberation", *"where one means the destruction of "GMO fields"".*

84 The entire "declaration of the witness" is characterised by the attempts to give Olaf B. and Thomas J. an important role of command, while giving Fritz S. a lower one as "man of the past". If the "witness" has been pushed in this direction by the BKA, or he though to make them a favor, or it is simply his own idea, remains open

Results would have been *“not obtained during such a meeting”*.

* Between the 16 and the 18.03.07 takes place in Berlin one meeting of the “AG Migration”.

There, Olaf B. would have had explained that *“through small groups one can simply achieve a better resistance”*.

Further on, the “witness” declares he would have no clue about the Hamburg's group “SAND” and the activities of Fritz S..

About anti-GMO-resistance and especially the “Barnimer Action Coordination” he also has no clue.

The same can be said for the “NoLager Group Bremen”.

Finally he recalls about the defendant Olaf B. that *“he would be a very important person within the left-scene and above all should be seen as a “driving force”*”, although nobody knows where he lives and how one can reach him via telephone.

Later on within his summary-report dated 23rd of April 2007, the KHK Noisternigg will describe this “interrogation of a witness” as one of the four main sources from which *“a detailed presentation about the situation of suspicion came out”*⁸⁵.

3rd of April 2007

Evaluation of the Data from Mobile Cells

The evaluation of the radio-cells data regarding three dates, in relation to the suspect Olaf B., will be presented within a note by the BKA ST 12.

It is about the aforementioned directive by the BGH on a retrospective investigation of the radio-cells in three cases.

Firstly, regarding the attack “Villa Borsig” it will be suspected that the authors might have participated to a meeting of the G8-mobilization, therefore the data about two nationwide meetings (Hamburg 7-9 October 2005, Berlin 6-8 January 2006) ⁸⁶will be asked for.

About an investigation of the mobile cells during the time of this attack, one can not find any BGH-resolution in this note, which makes one thinking that those data – in the case that they have been investigated for – did not give any relevant results.

In this case, the goal of the mobile cells investigation can not be to get concrete proofs about any authors of the attack, but instead to identify the participants to the meeting in Hamburg and Berlin.

In the second case, it is about the investigation *against unknown ones* around the arson attack happened on the 14.12.05 to the local court in Wedding (Berlin); the commissar who is investigating on this thought out the thesis that *“the authors could have been in contact among themselves during the attack through a mean of communication”* and therefore already at the beginning of February 2006 he asked for a resolution by the BGH regarding the data of mobile cells⁸⁷

At the beginning of March 2007 it will ascertain that the mobile telephone of the suspect Olaf B. should have been close to the area of the attack on the 14.12.05, two hours before the attack happened

“Considering that B. was not close to the area where the attack took place out of other possible reasons (as example “private” ones), one can not exclude his participation to it”, resumes the commissar.

5th of April 2007

New defendants within the Hamburg's investigation

The LKA Hamburg will be shortly before the *executive measures* really active for one last time.

8 5 Even though he turns

8 6 Within the BKA's note one is falsely giving twice the dates of the Berlin meeting

8 7 It is not too bold to assume that such seizures are nowadays a normal praxis within investigation on attacks and that during the criminal search one would compare new telephones numbers with older, already saved data from mobile cells

The local commissar in chief Rautenberg is writing a daily report about the accused and suspects.

The reports about the already accused ones will be actualised.

On the 2 of April a report about cognitions on the suspect Joachim T. will be compiled.

Above all it is about his activities within the lefty radio from Hamburg called "Freies Sender Kombinat" (FSK), but also about some meetings which has been under observation, where he as well as some others defendants from Hamburg have been taking part in.

Through this report one is probably trying to proof a close contact of Joachim T. with the other defendants, moreover the suspect that also some political meetings took place in his apartment.

Following this report, two others will be compiled about *contact-persons* of the defendants (Felix S. and Shopie F.), who the LKA Hamburg believe should be considered now as defendants, a thing which will happen by middle April.

Based on the reports of LKA Hamburg, the BKA KHK Igelmund is asking the BAW a court resolution regarding the observation of Joachim T. apartment.

Within the seven pages annotation about him, one is specifying that in there political meetings would regularly take place, to which also some defendants would participate and where supposedly "*one would plan and wrap-up actions against the law happened in relation to the G8 and also bring together and share relevant informations towards further actions as well the writing of communiques*".

However, sometimes such meetings would take place in the "Rote Flora", but the place would be "*not ideal for installing the technical devices needed for an observation, because the high sensibility of the people who attend this place*"⁸.

On the 24.4, a second note about the necessity of installing devices for the observation of Joachim T, will be compiled, which is not contained in the files, therefore it is not known, where and what should be listen to.

One can not find anything regarding any decision by the court-in-charge within the files, therefore one can imagine that at least before the 9th of May raids there has not been any application of such measures⁹.

At the same time it will proposed once again (as it was already on the 20.12.06) to take Joachim T. as defendant within the trial, which happened then at the end of April.

In parallel to this, the LKA Brandenburg finishes a report about their informations on Christoph L., linked to the proposal of taking him as well as defendant (probably because of his personal and political contacts to the defendants Armin M. and Silvio K.).

Same as with the two new Hamburg's defendants, one has also to assume here that since the middle of April he will be taken as defendant.

By now, 17 of the final 18 defendant are now assembled (Joachim T. is still missing), who will be met by the *executive measures* on the 9 of May.

19th of April 2007

The BKA investigates about the fact that Joachim T. bought a copy-machine on eBay.

Knowing the "member-name" of someone is enough to find out their operations within the last two months.

Already few days before, the LKA Hamburg made known that is "known"¹⁰ that there would be few copy-machines in the "Roten Flora".

8 8 In this text one finds as well a supposed piece of evidence in regard to a "conspiratorial behavior" acted by two other defendants, which one can not justify whether logically nor in connection to the main aim of the note

8 9 As one will see later on, one will install bug devices in the apartment during the raids on the 9th of May, which will be secretly removed around a month later

9 0 Common informations which here the police acquires through covered-up agents or inner secret service (Verfassungsschutz)

23rd of April 2007

Stimulation towards Resolutions and Measures

The chief-commissar Noisternigg (BKA ST 12) presents to the BAW 47 pages of results of the investigation produced by his commissariat and proposes on its base different “measures for the upcoming trial”, which then should be signed with a resolution by the BGH.

Put is shortly, the argumentation paradigm looks like this:

The main defendants are supposed to be members of the “*(alleged) terrorist organisation “Autonome Gruppen”*”⁹, existing since 1987 and therefore they all should be involved in arson attacks and (militant) campaigns since many years; the book “Autonome in Bewegung” represents clearly expression and evidence of the politic done by the “Autonome Gruppen”.

Regarding the *militant Campaign* against the G8 meeting, they would have connected “*different people from their close, confidant circles*”.

Towards a *corroboration* of the *circumstances of suspect* one would need now some raids. Three people, which until now played one role within the investigation, will be by now separated:

Raid should take place at Joachim T. place, but under the §103StPO paragraph (“raid at other people”).

The goal would be to find out “*documents about the structure of the terrorist organization and means of action regarding the happened actions*”, since in his *apartment* one would have had *meetings prepared in conspiracy*.

Besides this, the fact that Joachim T. bought a copy-machine in march 2007 produces the assumption that one would have been already in his apartment, “*with which one might have had produced copies of the communiques*”.

However, Joachim T. will be made defendant few days later.

Stephan M., defendant of the first hour, would be “*with high possibility a member of the (alleged) terrorist organization around Hauke B. (“Autonome Gruppen”), but since he neither did appear too connected with the ongoing Anti -G8 campaign, nor he seemed to have had a suspicious behavior*”, it does not seem as a raid would produce any *positive result*.

However, his DNA should also be taken, since one can also assume that “*he participated to militant actions and will participate further*”.

Anne S. will be also further presented as a defendant, but one should spare her all the measures, since she “*would be rather active within the branch of the Anti-G8 campaign working about “Biopiraterie” and within such a context would organise “actions” which clearly do not carry any militant character and therefore are not relevant for the actual trial.*”

About the situation of the investigation, KHK Noisternigg presents in 16 pages the material acquired about the defendants and the attacks.

The BKA sees their suspects on the involvement of 15 persons within the militant campaign against the G8 2007 *getting higher*.

This would be explained especially within four longer reports: the *first stand of the things from 23.6.06*, the *note dated 20.12.06* about the entry of new defendants, the note dated 15.3.07 about linking the three different proceedings and finally the interrogation of the witnesses dated 2.4.07.

By now around 50 notes have been produced regarding the informations acquired about the defendants.

9 1 Pay attention that the reducing *alleged* used by Noisternigg is not referred to the association itself, but to its character as *terrorist* – the existence of an *association* it is instead clear enough in his eyes

On the basis of the communiques analysis made by the BKA and the BfV, there would be 12 arson attacks for which *“the (alleged) terrorist group build around Hauke B.”* would be responsible.

Noisternigg goes further, *“there would be the following results produced until now by the investigation about a possible classification of the attacks, based on the analysis done by the BKA and the BfV about the group active around Hauke B., results which indeed would make the suspects stronger.”*

- Attack “Marnette”: the comparison of the texts indicates Fritz S., Hauke B. or Armin M. as possible authors.

- Attack “Villa Borsig”: the communique might have been *possibly* written by Hauke B. Besides this, the defendant F. would have rendered himself suspect since the day before the attack he would have left his apartment during the daytime, for about four hours, and the night of the attack he left the house one and half hour after the attack, for about twenty minutes, therefore *“one could not exclude that F. might have used the short going out with his bike to put the communique of the action in a postbox.”*

- Attack “HWWI”: regarding the communique, there would be *“the suspect that Bernhard F. would have had at least participated in its writing.”*

- Attack “Märka”: the BfV believes that the defendants Hauke B. and Armin M. *“would be the responsables of the communique.”*

Such a suspicion would be *“made harder by the note produced on the 29.6.06”*².

Herein, the defendant Silvio K. would have outed himself during a phone call with Armin M., five weeks after the attack:

“K.: (...)”regarding the fence, I thought about it recently...(not understandable)...now, as soon as I will bring the bus, I just...”

M.:”Aha”K.:”...will go there and cut it”

M.:”Aha.”

Four days later, an arson attack has been made in Strausberg (“GbA”), during which a fence would have been cut.

Also at the attack “Märka”, the authors would have *“probably come on the field through a hole in the fence.”*³

- Attack “Hermes”: the communique has been possibly written by Fritz S.

One could identify the typical mistake therein, such like “ß” and “ss” - which would be the same as in the communique regarding “Marnette”, “Tchibo” and “Imtech” - , and the TKÜ would have proofed that also Fritz S. would have some unsureness while writing.

- Attack “Aly/Klausmann”: three days before the attack there has been a phone call between the defendant Julian S. and Fabian W., where they would have *“discussed in a conspiratorial way about a thing”*:

“W.:”Ähm, you will find it.”

S.:”What?”

W.:”You will find it, that thing you wanted from me.”

S.:”Ah, ok, I understand.”

Relating to the actual suspicions one could assume that *“they would have related to things needed for the preparation of the aforementioned arson attack.”*

Olaf B. would be suspected of writing the communique, since he would have received an sms on the night of the attack, where one would wish him *“a good result for tonight”*, which possibly would relate to the *“sending of the communique.”*

However, a *final evaluation on it* could not be *“find out yet”*⁴

9 2 One won't be able to find such results within the files

9 3 Pay attention: one is whether saying that the fence would have been “cut”, nor that the hole would have been done by the authors of the attack

9 4 Which makes one wonder, since the sms in question has been known already by the end of January and the ascertainment if a letter has been thrown in in Bremen, Hamburg or another city normally does not represent a problem at all for the BKA

- Attack "Dussmann" Hamburg/Berlin: the defendant Jan-Ole A. is suspicious to have taken part in, since he *"would have done a large research about the group Dussmann and would be active in the left scene between Hamburg and Berlin."*

- From this on, there would be further attacks where single defendants could have taken part in, like in September 2005 against some police barracks in Wendland (in the proposal for a flyer, the defendant Fritz S. would have described such an action (ndt: over an hundred police barracks have been torched down where the Castor transport takes place) as part of *"our resistance"* as much as flyers and sit-in blockades) and in October 2006 against a sending-tower of the police also in Wendland (at the time of the attack Fritz S. would have been *"only few km away from the area"*), finally the arson attack against the local court in Wedding (Berlin) in December 2005, where the mobile phone of the defendant Olaf B. would have been used in the surroundings only two hours before the attack.

* Few criminal-technical traces have been produced in connection to two attacks.

Regarding the "Villa Borsig", one *"fingerprint"* would have been found out.

For what concerns the attack "Märka", one would have found a trace of DNA on a flat-battery, which would be the same of the one found after the property damage at "Securitas" (August 2004), where again a second trace of DNA would have been found, which would be the same as one found after an attack against the "Property-Office" (September 2003).

* The second part of the text, eleven pages, is dedicated to *structure of the organization*. Here it is about constructing a triangle among the defendants, "Autonome Gruppen" and the arson attacks.

The three attacks in Berlin would have been done by the "Autonome Gruppen".

The original six defendants would be the authors of the book "Autonome in Bewegung"⁹⁵

They describe their 27 militant actions, *"among them also property damage and arsons, as much as campaigns or "movements", as a proof of a successful Autonome-politic"*.

Afterwards they clarify that *"the will to act further is unchanged"* and they try hard to *"keep the structure of the militant campaigns – as of their organization – secret and clandestine, better said consciously "outsider" in its unclearness"*.

Considering all these things, the result would be that they *"would be member of a (alleged) terrorist organization acting from the middle/end of the 80's, would use the name of the group for different militant actions but also sometime avoid this or use other names in their communiques in order to guarantee the so-called "inscrutability"⁹⁶"*.

In order to do that, *"they would mobilize other groups and persons within campaigns and try to animate them to commit criminal acts"*.

Surely, there have been also attacks in the past carried out by other groups.

"Autonome Gruppen" would have committed over 60 criminal acts since 1987, above all in Berlin.

Moreover, there has been a text signed by them in the journal "Radikal" in the spring 2006, where many criminal acts, also arsons, have been described as positive examples.

"In regard to this self-presentation, one could understand that the authors have been taking part in at least few of the criminal acts".

The BKA and the BfV would agree on the conclusion that the authors of this text would have been involved within the G8-campaign and especially in the attack "Villa Borsig".

Moreover, they name as well the text "militant manifesto", the book "Autonome in Bewegung" and the one by "Autonome Gruppen".

There would be more similarities between the communique on the attack "Securitas" and a public text written from the "Mai-Steine" campaign (ndt: a campaign which took place in 2004 and tried to thematize the "unsocial" changes within the politic of the city Berlin, there

9 5 Indeed the five main-defendants – Fritz S. is by now ennobled as one of the "main authors" - and Stephan M.

9 6 The *inscrutability* mentioned herein is not a quote from the book itself, but instead a self-quote of the commissar, through which he try to proof his wrong interpretation of the book's passage o

have been also two weeks of actions before the usual 1 of May), possibly written by the group “autopool”, to which one of the defendant is part of.

Three of the defendants have been considered as suspects already in connection to the Hakenkralle-attack (ndt: militant sabotages done in the 90's against the Castor transport)⁹ 7, and the anti-castor resistance is appearing also in the book to *have a constitutive role*.

The BfV would have found out that *“again and again some concepts and theoretical agreements (“argumentative strategy”) on the old “pointing the way” discussion papers and communiques from earlier campaigns and initiatives would appear in the communiques in the context of the “Anti-G8”, therefore one could assume that such texts would have been written by the same people.*

Already during a raid happened in 1999 at the house of the defendant Hauke B. one would have found a text on his computer which partly *“would appear word-for-word”* within a communique about an arson attack happened in Berlin-Gatow against the “Museum of the Airforce” (May 1999)⁹8.

* To harden the conclusion on *further members of the group* (five pages on this) one would firstly refer to the book “Autonome in Bewegung”, where in the chapter “How do I make a campaign” would be repeated that *“one should mobilize more people or rather integrate them within the “work””*.

The suspicion that more than the five main-defendants would have been involved in the attacks will be motivated through several results of the investigation⁹9.

In this sense, one would find such formulation as “WE” within the communiques,,, and some would signed by “Groups” or “AG” (ndt: work-group).

There would have been also some attacks where there have been parallel arsons or which took place in different places at the same time.

Regarding the attack “Imtech” one would have observed a person, but *“.assuming he would have been the author of it, considering the calculation of the distance between the two different places he (around 25-40 years old) could have not reached the second point where the other attack took place in time”*⁰⁰.

Now that one put the suspicions of further people and the defendants *“as it is known, disposed of the necessary knowledge on how to defend themselves from measures of criminal prosecution, one should assume that their partners in crime would come out their intimate sphere”*.

Therefore, in the investigations *“one wanted to especially put an eye on their contact-persons, who are bound within their field of activity through a necessary relation of trust (as example, because of their earlier involvement in committing some actions)”*.

One has also to confirm that the defendants support themselves mutually and *“one should not assume that they would only act upon a close cell-system (as example Hamburg-cell or Berlin-cell)”*.

Instead, there would be an agreement as regards content of some of them for *specific themes*, therefore would of high suspicion the fact that the ones who are specialized in genetic engineering stuff would also show interest for Nuclear-energy and the other way around.

Some of them did not remain in the same place, but they also moved to other ones such as Wendland.

* On the end, one *have to assume* that the defendants did not only *initiated the militant campaign against the G8 meeting 2007, but also – as already made known in their book – will initiate new militant campaigns in the future and would want as well to keep on*

9 7 The investigation about these sabotages have been abandoned in April 2003

9 8 The investigation about these facts have been abandoned in March 2004

9 9 Does KHK Noisternigg want to mean that five people are *yet* a group? Or that his further arguments might proof a group with *more* than five people? He simply forgot to name the main argument which would proof the involvement of further people – indeed, the lack of any kind of signs for a practical involvement of the original main-defendants

1 00 If would have been possible that also a person under 25 might have cover the distance, this remains the secret of the calculation about time-needed-for-the-way of the BKA

militantly representing other themes such as "global agriculture/genetic engineering" or "migration/asylum" further on behind the end of the G8 meeting 2007".

This is confirmed, in accordance to the TKÜ, already in connection to a planned flyer *"where the authors of it consider that the criticized situation will not change after the end of the G8 meeting, therefore announce further actions in connection to other meetings, which will take place after the G8 one".*

* After it follows the request towards *"resolutions for putting in act the announced measures".*

During the raids one *"should look for proofs of the grounding and participation within the (alleged) terrorist association (especially part of texts/draft version of texts signed by "Autonome Gruppen"; texts for the book "From the first 23 years – Autonome in Movement": documents for financing the militant campaign against the G8 as the organization of info-events; plan of communication and proofs; people/addresses lists); also, proofs of any participation to criminal actions groups-in-foundation "against the G8" (especially draft version/original copies of communiques; communication plans in relation to the actions; documents concerning the preparation of the actions/material needed for the observation of the targets/possibilities of escaping; proofs of pgp communication; means of action as example detonators, timing devices, working tools...)"*.

As proposal for the raids, the following places will be named: 18 apartments from the defendants, five apartments from contact-persons or suspects, eight workplaces, six cars and five further objects of different nature ("Rote Flora" and "Radio FSK" in Hamburg, the editorial collective "Assoziation A", the bookshop "Schwarze Risse" and the "Umbruch Archiv" in Berlin).

Indeed, the BKA believes that even *"from the draft version of texts written by the defendants for the book or from unpublished internal messages, hosted in the publishing house or in the photo-archive, one could find out more about the structure of the (alleged) terrorist association "Autonome Gruppen" and about their militant actions".*

One should not take the DNA of the defendants merely towards a comparison of the DNA traces linked to the actions, but also with a preventive scope.

Indeed, firstly *"about 180 attacks have been (muss noch), among other in view of the DNA traces found therein", from which only 40 have been properly analysed.*

Already within those there have been some DNA traces which would require a further analysis and *"are not yet comprehended inside the BKA DNA-analysis-databank".*

One is expecting that in the future *"one will find out more still-open (not yet catalogued) DNA traces"* which could be put in connection with already happened attacks.

But this is not enough yet, *"since in regard to the high possibility that the defendants will be likely to act militantly also in the future, to save their DNA in the BKA's DNA-analysis-data could make possible the identification of the defendants as the ones who possibly will leave further traces".*

At the end it follows a suggestion towards *erkennungsdienstlichbehandlung*, a normal measure against criminals, which does not need a further explanation.

24th of April 2007

The LKA Brandenburg produces documents about the investigation-complex "GbA", among other things an up-to-date interrogation of a witness about the car of one suspect (20.10.06).

Afterwards, the BKA ST 12 will make a *note* to the StA Weingarten at the BAW which asks towards a resolution for a raid also at the apartment of the witness in Strausberg.

The LKA Brandenburg is sending further files in connection to this on the 26 of April (protocol of the interrogation).

This question is coming clearly too late to be taken in consideration.

26th of April 2007

Resolutions of the BGH

The requests produced by the StA Weingarten and the files belonging to them are now at the BGH. Therein - as usual – the requests of the BKA will be made theirs and translated in a juridical formulation (allegedly) free-from-any-objection.

The classification of the investigated criminal acts as *terrorist ones* had created already few problems to the KHK Noisternigg, as one had seen in advance.

The BAW is helping itself a bit, sticking close at the wording of the StGB paragraph. Close, but not literal.

Indeed, it argues that *“the criminal acts have been committed in order to shake the present society's and economical order and could especially lead to horrible damages for the image of the German Republic as trusted partner of the eight most important economical nations”*.

In the paragraph §129a Abs. 2 StGB, where one is referring in this context, the talk about actions which are meant to *“eliminate or relevantly interfere with the economical and social ground-structures of a State (...)”* and through their perpetration or their results *“damage relevantly for a State or an international organization”* is easily abweichend.

Further on one is affirming that the main-defendants would have rivendicate some arson attacks within the book *“Autonome in Bewegung”*¹⁰¹.

Now they would prepare *“since sometime a “militant campaign” against the G8 meeting 2007”*.

With such an aim, they would have hosted few *conspiratorial meetings* in Berlin, already at the beginning of 2005, to which Fritz S. had participated.

Afterwards, they would have mobilize *“further parts of the left scene”* against the G8 meeting and organized *“detailed maps of Heiligendamm and its surroundings”*.

The judge at the BGH signs immediately such a resolution.

Further resolutions about the take of DNA and ed beandlung follow on the 3rd of May.

Here the BGH-resolution is slightly differing from the BKA request, since for two of the defendants there will not be any take of DNA.

2nd of May 2007

Notes about the cognitions on “so.36.net e.V.”

The KOK Scholz is finishing another report in the last minute which is resulting particularly interesting out of his love for details, being 34 pages, – as it was for the ones about “autofocus” and “Herero and Nama”.

The main thing is the ascertainment that at least seven of the defendants have an email account on “so.36.net”.

Beside this, different internet websites from political groups are hosted on it, websites which appeared in connection to the investigation – the BfV *“describes “so.36.net” as “hidden web-presence” or as “provider-system which is used by all relevant violent groups of Berlin for internet activities”*.

The investigations will be conducted firstly via internet, partly through the evaluation of the datas on the website, partly through “Denic” requests¹⁰² about the responsables of the website; on the other side, through *an investigation at a financial level* in form of requests to the “BaFin” for the operations of certain accounts.

But time is running fast, therefore this time the commissar Scholz has to try to stay shorter and can gather only 40 names, which are linked to “so.36.net” and companies also connected to it.

Also a link to “Nadir e.V.” will be proofed because of the group “Fels”, since the latter owns sub-domains by both servers¹⁰³.

1 01 The formulation of the subjunctive-tense here are by now to be intended as past-tense

1 02 The DENIC (German Network Information Center) is the central place for registration of domains under the top-level-domain “.de” and organises the data (names, addresses, bank accounts..) of the domain-owners, who are possible to be online investigated after through the so-called “whois” requests.

1 03 A sub-domain is a kind of subtenancy at a bigger domain, as example “fels.so36.net” at “so36.net”

On the end of the report there is a list if emails and sub-domains considered relevant by the commissar.

He is counting 22 email addresses and 8 sub-domains (not only of defendants, but also from groups with which they are supposed to have a close connection, such like "Fels", "SAND", "Barnimer Aktionbundnis gegen Gentechnik" "Interventionistische Linke" "Radio FSK").

He suggests to raid three place in order to seize email-addresses and subdomains, in where one should find the necessary machines.

Goal of such a raid should be also "*take possession of technical documentation of "so.36.net e.V."*."

In the case that one would not find anything in these three addresses, there are other four which might be raided as well.

KHK Noisternigg is sending such a report very fast on the same day to the BAW and suggests to ask for the needed resolution of the BGH for the raids and confiscations, although he limits it to the three "promising" places.

The StA Weingarten is again doing this immediately.

3rd of May 2007

During the time following the decree of the BGH-raid-resolutions, few more details will be worked on and the BKA sends them fast to the StA Weingarten.

A defendant from Hamburg is manifesting moving-out plan, as the TKÜ let know.

The shop "Fusion", also used by Fels, should also be raided.

By now, DNA should taken also from the defendant Joachim T.

9th of May 2007

Raids

The *executive measures* will be carried out int around 40 places, in Bremen, Hamburg, Berlin and Brandenburg.

They begin early on the morning and partly will keep going until night – in Berlin some raids will be even stopped because demonstrations are coming too much in their near.

Hundreds of officials from BKA, LKA and riot-police will take part in.

Above all one will seize electronical data carrier: computers, Cds/DVDs, memory sticks, mobile telephones.

Beside these, one would look into documents, above all the ones written by hand, even though they would not have any direct refer to any G8 activity.

In some situation it comes out quite clearly that the official of the BKA do not have clue what they are actually supposed to look for (much to their superiors disappointment).

The defendants will be transported to the local LKA for ed-behandlung, take of the DNA and in five cases 8in (Hamburg and Bremen) for odour-proofs.

In regard to the DNA-take, the necessary resolutions of the judge are not yet ready, in some other one would refuse to show such resolutions.

If such raids had been of any use for the BKA, it is only a matter of speculation.

Surely, one collected informations about social contacts and political activities of the defendants and could be used further on for *any report on information about a person*.

In relation to the accusations about concrete facts, the bad mood shown by the investigator-in-chief at the end of the day let – and the absence of any further step by repressive authorities (both in form of any measure for a trial or a public declaration) - let imagine that one did not find anything which might have contributed to "*hardening the suspects*"¹04.

In the following days, few data carrier will be given back, the ones which have been described by the defendants as "important for their jobs".

1 04 Here this should have been further *hardened already* since a year through each *note* or *stimulation towards a measure* from the side on the investigator-in-chief, is actually supposed to be hard as a diamond by now or what!?

Some other things will come during the summer from Meckenheim (where the BKA ST 12 has it sit), a lot is still laying at BKA months later.

12th of May 2007

The GPS-locating module

One finds out that in the car of the defendant Bernhard F. from Berlin some unknown persons placed gps-locating module, which will be consequently taken out.

This will be then immediately made known through Indymedia and the press.

Few days later, the StA Weingarten from the BAW reclaims this module as *property of the german republic* and asks for its handing back.

However, they will not declare to which specific authority the module belongs to.

The BKA does not make any public declaration on the fact.

On the 7th of July, a party will take place in “Kato” under the motto “Karaoke against police violence – I cannot sing, I am not able to do anything, give me an uniform”.

During this party the GPS direction finder of the BKA will be sold at the auction for 3.800€ (the finder is *with high possibility only a false, says the BKA* – and one does not really know if money had been really paid for it).

Because of this situation, the BKA is getting active on the stage again: on the 13th of July one clarifies at the Berlin LKA that they would be owner of an *locating module which got lost*, and is therefore asking for an investigation.

The LKA investigates now against the defendant Bernhard F. because of *misappropriation of a discovery* and against three other persons because of *receiving of a stolen good* (since they organised the auction and sold the module).

On the 20th of July KOK Fabian, responsible of the investigation, suggest to raid the apartments of the four suspects, in order to find the module of any documents about its whereabouts.

All the thing seems to be so important (or funny) that the highest state attorney of Berlin, Raupach, does not let others deciding on this, but reserve such a decision for himself.

To regret of the LKA, on the 30th of July he decides that *one could not consider any operative measures such as raids because of reasons of appropriateness*”.

30th of May 2007

Comparison of the odour-traces

* On the 9th of May one forced five people to give their odour-tests (four from Hamburg, one from Bremen).

These have been giving to the police of Nordrhein-Westfalen in order to be analyzed in the local “institut für aus- und fortbildung” (IAF), field 1., dogs section¹⁰⁵.

The analysis will be done between the 14 and the 24th of May at Gütersloh, where the official dogs “sunny”, “skip”, “branca”, “pepper” and “zoey” will have to give their noses at disposal.

The procedure of such kind of analysis is to be found within a four pages document “*law-lines towards the usage of dogs for the comparison of odour-traces within criminal investigations*” signed by the inner ministry NRW in January 2002.

There one affirms as well that “*those would not represent any kind of proof on a scientific level, but might add more value to already gathered proofs*”.

The comparison works in a similar way to a police comparison: the dog will have to pass a *pre-test* before, in order to proof his capacity to distinguish.

In the case that he would pass the test, the real test will follow, where firstly he will odour an odour-trace, which he will have to track down – in such a case “*smell-copies of communiques (partly closed in plastic bag)*”, afterwards one would give him seven odour-traces, where six would belong to neutral persons (officials of the LKA Hamburg) and one to a defendant.

All the procedure will be carried out by three dogs pro-person and it need up to two hours

for each person.

On the 30th of May 2007, the commissar-in-chief of the police, Kamp, finished his report on the analysis.

Its result are negative in all the five cases: *"In the main-test none of the dogs showed any positive reaction to the tubes of the defendants"*.

The PHK Kamp adds that *"one can not exclude the some of the defenadants might have got in touch with the proofs (sic)"*.

The *incapacity to identify the traces* might have had the following reasons:

"- The supposed odour-trace left on the proof might be not strong enough to be clearly identifiable from the dogs.

- On the proofs there are too many different odour-traces and the dogs did not concentrate on the ones which are relevant for the investigation.

- The suspected odour-trace is not any longer on the proof itself, perhaps because the authors used gloves or similars".

Within a new writing dated 20.6.07, the IAF communicates further on that with the *"comparison of the traces-bearers should be properly destroyed through a ceramic oven after the closure of the investigation"*.

6th of June 2007

Comparison of the DNA-tests

BKA ZD 22, responsible for the analysis of the DNA, gives on the 6th of June their result to ST 12 (three of the defendants had not given any DNA tests).

Results in the 15 cases: *"One could not find any positive result during the analysis of the DNA-samples in terms of DNA-samples contained within the databank. In case that in a second moment one would get a positive result, we will communicate this immediately"*.

On the 10th of June the BKA gives such a result to the StA Weingarten at the BAW.

The aforementioned evaluation of other 180 attacks remains unknown until this moment.

End of June 2007

There are few changes on a juridical level following few complaints produced by the lawyers: against the take of DNA, against the raids, against the seize.

The BAW produced a declaration in where gives here view on the thing, partly clearer than the one given out on the 26th of April.

In relation to the present cognitions there mainly two new points: firstly that two of the defendants *mainly because of their already old age, intended to produce developing effects within the militant campaign (...) rather from a background position than through an active partecipation within the attacks*; secondly, on the 25th of March few people, among them some of the defendants from Hamburg, have been controlled in the nearby of Heiligendamm, and a police official should have made a declaration which would have made clear that one of the defendant would be under *police observation*.

Afterwards, noticeably there have not been anymore attacks – whether in Hamburg nor in Berlin.

This again would show that *a communication about the attacks would have taken place with the defendants from Berlin*.

Postscript

17th of October 2007

The BGH communicates to the BAW that one does not see the conditions to allow an use of the paragraph 129a (terrorist association) within the present trial.

1st of October 2008

Cessation of the investigation

At the end of september, the investigation cessates.

The first reaction by some of the defendants, in their words:

“Hamburg, 1st of October 2008.

The investigation for building a terrorist association (129a), which became known through the nationwide raids on the 9th of May 2007, ceased on the 24th of September.

18 have been accused of “taking part within a militant campaign against the G8”.

The BGH decided already on the 20th of December 2007, that an involvement within a terrorist association in accordance to the §129a StGB should be ruled out, but also that there would not be an enough high suspicion in regards to the building of a terrorist association.

Therefore, the BAW gave back the proceeding to the Hamburg's State Attorney.

The latter hesitated for nine months on its cessation.

Only on the 24th of September it has been communicated to the defendants that the proceedings ceased, without giving any motivation for it.

History's wheel does not let herself easily turn back – and this is also not really intended.

BAW, VS, BKA and LKA partly gained what they looked for.

They gathered data, they shined through structures, lead a nationwide manoeuvre in order to coordinate their apparatus and try its functionality, moreover they tested the capability of reaching consensus through their strategy.

And they tried to widen an atmosphere keen to total control and surveillance.

The results on us – the persecuted ones – and on the entire society are not to be ignored and are not to be reversed or undone by the BGH's or State Attorney's decision.

The largest part of the investigation has been done by the VS and its results, as much concrete proposal on how to act, given to the BKA.

One can see this clearly in reading the files.

The close work of secret services and police becomes clear.

Not by chance, the work of secret services and police had been separated by decision of the Allies in 1949 – as reaction to German Fascism and the unspeakable experiences with the omnipotent “Mainoffice for the security of the Reich”.

Nowadays, this seems to play no role at all.

Furthermore, one brought into play also ways of investigating used by the Stasi.

It comes out clear within the files, that the BKA worked together with the social-office, job-center, finance-office, office for order, divisional railways office, insurance-companies, immigration-office, banks and so on

There isn't another paragraph which opens up such large possibilities for the Staatsschutz towards surveillance and investigation like the 129a or b.

During the current investigation, it explored all possible technical possibilities.

Blanket coverage observations, surveillance of telecommunication means, email's surveillance, post's surveillance, gps systems, video recording, dragnet investigation, use of infiltrators, analyse of informations obtained by the secret service (following the G10-Law), ending of letter, post and telecommunication's secrecy, acoustic room-surveillance, large bugging operations and so on.

Such measures of surveillance met way more people than just the defendants.

However, to us it seems that at least their aim to intimidate, create insecurity and division inside the resistance did not work out.

A large part of the public opinion reacted with lack of understanding and protests.

We got a lot of support. One expression of it might be the various declaration of solidarity, the discussion-events and demonstrations, such like the one on the 15th of December 2007 in Hamburg under the motto “against the capitalist normality, against surveillance state and repression”.

The mobilization towards the G8-summit in Heiligendamm got a new kick in the ass.
The stone they lifted upon our feet, falled back down on theirs.
Let us try to keep it going this way.

One of the defendant – our friend and comrade Joachim T. - died in our full surprise.
He suffered especially such measures of State's surveillance as the bugging of its flat and
video observation of its flat's entrance.
We still feel closely linked to his political ideas and activities.

Solidarious greeting to Axel, Florian and Oliver.
Right now, they are on trial in Berlin because of §129 StGB (criminal association) –
membership in the MG (Militant Group) – and attempted arson against military trucks.
In relation to a resistance which has the aim to attack the violence of war, of war's
economy and the army, in order to put an end to a situation of occupation, of killing of
civilians and the destruction of their life conditions.

Some defendants of the by now cessated §129a inquiry.