

Culture, Class, and Communism: The Politics of Rock in the West German 1968

Timothy Scott Brown

Rock and communism were uneasy bedfellows in 1968. This was true in every country in which they came into contact, but nowhere more so than in West Germany, where the student movement and counterculture had a particularly strong Marxist flavour, and where the proximity of the Cold War frontier forced young nonconformists to grapple more forcefully, than was typically the case elsewhere, with competing conceptions of the nature and proper goals of revolutionary struggle.

As a still-fresh cultural innovation widely imbued with subversive, utopian potential, rock music was a key site of the political in 1968. Not only did it become the centrepiece of a longstanding debate about the relationship of art and politics – a debate stretching back to the Weimar Republic in Germany and earlier – but it occupied a conspicuous position in contests around issues of subcultural authenticity, the dangers of capitalist recuperation, and the validity of, respectively, communist and anarchist approaches to the revolution. Through these various debates, rock music in the West German 1968 became intimately connected with *the* fundamental questions of the revolution: what revolution, for and by whom, and how?

The world-historical anti-authoritarian upsurge of 1968 was neither unified nor monolithic. It was characterised by a profusion of goals, causes and actors. Some of its key underlying imperatives – a global and transnational orientation; a questioning of authority in all its guises; an

impetus toward self-organisation and the DIY ('do-it-yourself') principle – intensified, rather than lessened, centrifugal tendencies. Far from being an unproblematic vehicle of cultural and political revolution, rock music mirrored the conflicts and dichotomies at the heart of the anti-authoritarian project. This essay will examine three such areas of conflict and dichotomy where rock music was central.

The first is class. In its initial iteration in West Germany, 1968 was a heavily student-driven phenomenon, and thus – given the structure of West German higher education – very middle-class in character. Yet, to the extent that youth rebellion centred on rock and its subcultures, the revolt also had a strong working class component, since (as we shall see shortly), it was young workers who were most likely to be attracted to the new sounds and subcultures. More importantly, the inadequacies of a political rebellion centred in the universities quickly became apparent, leading students and other left-wing activists to begin a search for a more 'authentic' revolutionary subject. This search led to workers, especially young, politically-militant and culturally-forward thinking workers, who became the focus of recruitment efforts at the intersection of competing social preconceptions and political claims.

The second is culture. Rock bands faced the dilemma of the extent to which it was desirable, or even possible, for art to be political. The more explicitly political a rock band, the stronger the dilemma. To be sure, as Detlef Siegfried has pointed out, rock music *always* functioned politically to the extent that its political content was imputed by fans, as opposed to coming from the bands themselves (who, in many cases, were political in only the vaguest, countercultural sense).¹

But questions about the validity of popular music as a vehicle of politics applied to artistic intentions and audience reception alike; that is, they were on the table whether bands were attempting to be political or not. Activists questioned whether rock music and its attendant subculture – involving unconventional fashion, drug use, and so on – was a legitimate vehicle for revolutionary struggle. This area of conflict, linked as it was to questions about the identity of the revolutionary subject and the content of a legitimate revolutionary politics, was also intimately connected to the issue of class.

A third area of conflict lay at the intersection of the first two. Even

assuming that rock music represented a legitimate site for socialist politics – and that associated activities such as taking drugs or rioting at concerts represented forms of political activity, as some argued they did – how could anti-capitalist art exist within capitalist modes of production and distribution? Was it legitimate or even possible to challenge the system in cultural terms whilst leaving it untouched in the socio-political realm? Could the ‘underground’ be a challenge to the system whilst simultaneously being part of the market economy? This question about the danger of capitalist recuperation, like related questions about class and culture, did not just pertain to rock music. Rock music was a central component of the sixties ‘cultural revolution’ in West Germany, to be sure; but even more so, it was a site at which the fusion of the politics and culture characteristic of 1968 – and the debates this fusion engendered – stands out in sharp relief.

Culture

As important as questions about class, culture and recuperation eventually became, they were by no means the priority for the anti-authoritarian revolt in West Germany. Developing at the confluence of several streams of activism – citizen’s movements from the 1950s, the student movement, Situationist art radicals – referred together under the rubric of the ‘extra-parliamentary Opposition’ (APO) – that revolt contested a range of socio-political issues from university reform, to the American war in Vietnam, to issues of press freedom and press monopoly. Above all, the revolt grappled with the unresolved legacy of Germany’s (very recent) Nazi past. For the ringleaders of this radical challenge to the establishment – the Socialist German Students League (SDS) and its key figure Rudi Dutschke – the status and meaning of popular music was of little immediate concern. This was, in part, a matter of timing: the high period of the SDS (1965-1968) mostly predated the massive politicisation of popular music that was just getting started toward the end of the decade of the 1960s.² More fundamentally, the serious and highly-theoretical orientation of the movement’s leaders left little room for a consideration of the potential emancipatory power of rock ‘n roll.³

This position was due, in part, to the influence of critique of popular

culture by the Frankfurt School that saw popular music, in particular, to be a debased product of the 'culture industry'. Theodor Adorno, who worried in an early essay that the repetitive rhythms of popular music threatened to turn human beings into 'insects', continued to vehemently insist, even at the height of the student movement, that popular music possessed no emancipatory potential whatsoever, admitting in an interview on West German television that he found the idea of 'protest music' – in this case the protest songs of the American folksinger Joan Baez – 'unbearable.'⁴

The student intelligentsia generally did not, of course, hold such draconian views; there was wide acceptance of the notion that popular music conveyed a new life feeling that was anti-authoritarian both in intention and effect. Even the relatively straight-laced Dutschke could praise the Rolling Stones and Aretha Franklin as important harbingers of revolution, alongside Malcolm X and Frantz Fanon.⁵ Yet Dutschke does not seem to have had any deep understanding of the appeal of popular music. A Rolling Stones concert he attended in Hyde Park 'was relatively boring', Dutschke wrote in a diary entry of July 1969; but 'these "musicians" of the "young generation" are in the position, without any politically-defined "evaluations" of the societal situation, to bring 70,000...[people] out on "their" side, [whereas] the "left," working mostly with concepts and content of "tradition," are simply not in the position to find something in [Marx] that will...capture the "new generation."⁶

Many middle class German students retained high-cultural tastes in music, even if they embraced pop music as well, but it was among young workers that popular music evoked its greatest resonance. The insurrectionary potential of young rock fans was demonstrated in spectacular terms in September of 1965, when a concert by the English group the Rolling Stones in West Berlin's *Waldbühne* degenerated into a pitched battle between young fans and police. The protagonists, many of them so-called 'rockers' from Berlin's working class *Märkisches Viertel*, had earlier in the day burst through police lines to enter the concert grounds without tickets.⁷ After the Stones' performance of 'Satisfaction,' the short concert came abruptly to an end. A pitched battle developed between the police and concert-goers, the former making liberal use of truncheons and water cannons, the latter tearing apart the stadium stands and

pelting police with debris. This battle represented, for some of the concert-crashers, a sort of political mini-awakening. ‘In 1965 the Stones came for the first time to Berlin,’ recalled one; ‘and for many of us came also a small breakthrough.’⁸

The *Waldbühne* riot, like the riots around the performance of Bill Haley in 1958 – or the East German Leipzig riots of October 1965 – indicated the extent to which the performance of popular music could provide an arena for conflict with authority.⁹ But they also showed the capacity of popular music to serve as a vehicle for anti-authoritarian longings that could, under the right circumstances, find concrete expression. It was little surprise that it was the Rolling Stones who prompted the *Waldbühne* riot because the group was accorded a political influence out of proportion with its actual political engagement. The Stones’ music became a powerful vehicle for a feeling of rebellion that was connected, in the minds of both protagonists and commentators, with left wing politics, even if this rebellion transcended the critical categories of student Marxism.¹⁰

As the Cologne photographer Jens Hagen put it: ‘Satisfaction’ became ‘a type of anthem for the anti-authoritarians. There’s definitely a difference whether one listens to [the Beatles’] “Yellow Submarine,” where it’s about a nice old man in a fairytale world telling beautiful stories, or whether [in “Satisfaction”] you don’t want to be hassled by some...advertising man. Leave me alone with your shit! And with a rhythm that goes into your bones – music to riot by.’¹¹

As Hagen’s comments suggest, the subversive power of rock derived from more than just its sonic qualities; its radical charge also arose out of the range of behaviours, social interactions, beliefs and visual markers with which it was associated. Clothing, personal appearance, subcultural affiliations – all played a role in marking out rock as a special category of cultural phenomenon.

Beginning in 1966 with the so-called ‘Beat Wave’ – the importation of the music of British bands like the Stones, Kinks, and The Who – analysts had to reckon with a new social force. By 1968, with the birth of a West German counterculture patterned on Anglo-American models, the belief that rock was a liberatory force, political in effect if not in explicit intent, became widespread. This belief fuelled efforts to make

explicit rock's implicit utopian potential, either through attempts to link it with countercultural projects of various types, to connect it with left-wing political projects, or even to create political rock bands for whom ideological struggle and cultural provocation were one and the same.

Rock music also held a central position in attempts to define a sphere of oppositional activities and institutions labelled variously 'subcultural,' 'countercultural,' or 'underground'. *The Internationale Essener Songtage* (International Essen Song-Days) of September 1968 was one of the most visible of the attempts to define and codify this new sphere of activity. Inviting musical acts from all over the world to perform in the Ruhr Valley city of Essen over a five day period, for an audience estimated at upwards of 40,000, the festival presented a cultural extravaganza featuring light shows, experimental films, and a psychedelic happening. In addition to international performers ranging from Frank Zappa's Mothers of Invention to the English singer Julie Driscoll, the festival showcased new German experimental rock bands like Amon Düül, Can, and Tangerine Dream, marking the breakout of German performers onto the world stage. For the festival organisers, chief among them, the music journalist and countercultural impresario Rolf Ulrich Kaiser, the festival was meant to codify the centrality of popular music for the youth revolution and express its fundamental connectedness with other emancipatory forms of cultural expression.

The rise of this new German scene was connected with a re-evaluation of the value of popular music. No longer simply entertainment directed at teenagers -no longer just 'Beat Music' – popular music was being recognised as a serious artistic and social force in its own right. This re-evaluation was carried forward in the new West German music periodicals like *Sound* and *Song*. The decision of the latter, in 1967, to begin covering pop and rock as 'serious music' alongside jazz and folk was indicative of the new direction.¹² It is easy to forget that, until the late-sixties, it was folk and avant-garde jazz that represented, for the young intelligentsia, the primary site of musical innovation. A key goal of the organisers of the *Essener Songtage*, which included, alongside Kaiser, Martin Degenhardt (brother of the singer Josef) and Thomas Schroeder, was to transmit this new evaluation of the worth of pop music to a mass audience.

The valorisation of popular music along with the broader lifestyle and artistic experimentation with which it was connected, was expressed by the organisers of the *Songtage* through the idea of the ‘underground,’ a term gaining a new currency in the 1960s as it was applied to aspects of the cultural explosion (e.g. ‘underground film’). The *Songtage* marked one of the first times that the idea of ‘the underground’ was systematically propagated as an antidote to the artistic and spiritual deficiencies of the ‘mainstream.’ The use of the term was part of an attempt to legitimate the festival and the youth revolution it claimed to represent. This focus was evident in the organisers’ trumpeting of the ‘Brain Trust’ of experts involved in choosing acts for the festival and the inclusion of panels and seminars during the festival to discuss the social significance of popular music.¹³

The assertion of popular music’s artistic merit complimented the attempt to establish its political credentials. The two were indeed linked, for the claim to rock music’s artistic significance – and the attempt to connect rock music with a lineage embracing folk, jazz, and political song – were part of a larger attempt to establish and legitimise a sphere of cultural activity autonomous from traditional spheres and producers of culture.¹⁴ This autonomous sphere of culture – the ‘underground’ – was not a site of ‘conspiracy and criminality,’ argued the organisers of the *Songtage*, but rather a sphere in which it was possible ‘to produce... without worrying about the commercial potential, that which is fun, which corresponds to one’s own convictions, which the established producers can’t and don’t want to do, and which is therefore not available in the [mainstream] market.’¹⁵ The idea of the underground was linked, in short, with the right to produce an alternative culture from below, a right linked with the assertion of artistic and social worth. That this alternative culture was far from fully independent of the cultural mechanisms of capitalist society was a point that would provoke bitter debate.

Class

The nature of radical left wing politics in West Germany began to shift toward the end of the 1960s. In the second half of 1968, after the twin failure of campaigns against the Springer press monopoly and the

Emergency Laws (laws supported by the government as a necessity in the case of future incidents of civil unrest), the broad-based APO began to splinter into its component parts. Cast adrift by the failure of signature campaigns, activists began to cast about for an authentic revolutionary subject. This search led to workers, especially young workers who might be expected to share the cultural-revolutionary assumptions of the anti-authoritarian revolt. This shift was associated with the rise of two new political entities, the *K-Gruppen* ('Communist Groups'), and the *Basisgruppen* ('Rank and File Groups'). The former were Marxist-Leninist and/or Maoist groups that began to rise to prominence in 1968 seeking a reorientation of left-wing politics towards a greater discipline and tighter organisation together with a more thorough theorisation based on classic Marxism-Leninism and a re-orientation towards the working class. The latter were neighbourhood and city district groups in which members of the young left-wing intelligentsia sought to connect with the working class on the basis of concrete local struggles. In practice, members of the two groups often overlapped but both represented part of the frantic search for the revolutionary subject that characterised the anti-authoritarian revolt from 1968 onwards.

For young radicals, there would often be little separation between an anti-authoritarianism centred on rock music and countercultural style and a more general anti-capitalist attitude. In 1968 a *Verfassungsschutz* (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution) report noted that agitation among school pupils and apprentices had considerable success, with demonstrations attracting significant numbers from these two groups. These pupils, noted authorities, did 'not shrink from altercations with the police,' and indeed, counted for some 20 percent of those arrested at demonstrations.¹⁶ The *Verfassungsschutz* noted the particular appeal of the left's focus on sexual questions; but it also acknowledged that a general sense of discontent with the allegedly authoritarian nature of school, especially among older pupils, easily dovetailed with the revolutionary aspirations of the SDS.¹⁷

Rock music came increasingly to stand at the forefront of efforts to capitalise on this wave of youth radicalism, in no small part because of its appeal to young workers and apprentices who might normally lie outside the ambit of student Marxist politics. Clubs like the Lila Eule in

Bremen and Ca Ira in Berlin sought to win over youth through mixed programs of left-wing politics, rock concerts and other cultural events. Rudi Dutschke spoke at both Ça Ira and the Lila Eule, the latter in November 1967, just as a wave of protest centred in the city's secondary schools was beginning to take off. The club played a central role in this and later mobilisations, acting as a launching point for various actions. Similarly venues like the Zodiak Free Arts Lab in West Berlin became sites where the student and artistic intelligentsia mixed with denizens of a subcultural underground heavily inflected with a self-conscious proletarian militancy.

Rock music became both a vehicle for cross-class mobilisation and an explicit tool in the search for the revolutionary subject. Indeed, West Germany's two most important political rock groups, the Cologne group Floh de Cologne, and the legendary West Berlin group Ton Steine Scherben, took as their explicit goal, the mobilisation of young workers and apprentices. The first group was founded in 1966 by a group of theatre students at the University of Cologne: Jürgen Alleff, Udo Weinberger, Britta Baltruschat, Markus Schmid, and Gerd Wollschon. Members of the student APO scene, they represented a self-confident, theoretical and didactic brand of politics. The group's first album, *Vietnam* (1968) directly took on the American war, while subsequent works focused heavily on capitalism's colonisation of daily life. Floh de Cologne emphasised the importance of singing in German, forcefully taking up the cause of young workers and apprentices. The band collected accounts of abuses and indignities suffered by apprentices – Employer: 'An artist-mane (Beatle haircut), big sideburns, or a so-called philosopher's beard [goatee], are not worthy of a fresh and lively apprentice and therefore cannot be allowed' – publishing them in a collection of lyrics and other writings.¹⁸

Reaching out to young members of the proletariat was part of a larger project of supplementing the class struggle by the means to which the group was best suited. Declaring its intention of highlighting the conflict between 'exploited and exploiter' the group nevertheless noted that young workers and apprentices required a different approach than their parents. Because '[y]oung workers and apprentices have little interest in theatre and cabaret, but ... do have interest in music', a manifesto

declared, 'we use pop music as a transfer-instrument for our political texts. We take this to be more effective than, for example, lectures.'¹⁹

Floh's performances tended to feature less 'songs' *per se* than political rants spoken or shouted over musical grooves. In '*Die Luft gehört denen, die sie atmen*' ('The air belongs to those who breathe it') a series of populist political declarations were accompanied by a call and response exchange between 'employer' and 'employee.' In '*Fliessbandbaby*' ('Assembly-Line Baby') a domineering interlocutor berated the protagonist over a hypnotic groove with the claim: 'Work is fun' (*Arbeit macht Spaß*). Overtime is double fun. Holidays are triple fun!

From the beginning of the 1970s, the banner of political rock was carried forward by another even more radical group, Ton Steine Scherben. Founded in August 1970 in West Berlin, the band was comprised of singer Ralf Möbius, (later Rio Reiser), drummer Wolfgang Seidel, guitarist R.P.S. Lanrue, and bassist Kai Sichtermann. The group was an outgrowth of the musical theatre troupe *Hoffmanns Comic Teatre*, a creative alliance between Ralph Möbius and his brothers Gert and Peter. Founded in 1969, the troop performed in colourful costumes and fanciful masks, accompanied by a live band for which Ralph wrote the songs.²⁰ The troupe's explicit goal was to liberate the consciousness of young workers and apprentices in order to facilitate their political action. Their pieces depicted the conflicts of daily life, several of which would later supply the basis of Ton Steine Scherben songs. The flagship piece 'Rita and Paul,' was performed for the first time at a youth centre in the Naunynstraße in Berlin Kreuzberg in the fall of 1969.²¹ A sort of Romeo and Juliet tale revolving around a young worker, Paul (portrayed by Ralf Möbius), and Rita, the daughter of a factory owner, the piece featured the performance of a song with a soon-to-be legendary refrain: '*Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht*' ('Destroy what destroys you').²² An iconic expression of rage and violent resistance against the multiple oppressions of daily life, the song would be recorded a year later as Ton Steine Scherben's first single.²³

Audience participation was a critical element in the performances of *Hoffmann's Comic Teatre* – masks were laid out on a table and young workers were invited onto the stage to play out scenes from their own lives.²⁴ Central to HCT's conception of theatre was that the boundary

between performer and spectator must be broken down, and that the contribution of the latter was equal to, if not more important than that of the former. A group of young apprentices who first appeared on the evening in the Naunynstraße, performed with such verve and assurance that they were invited into a creative alliance with the members of *Hoffmann's Comic Teatre*. In early 1970 the group split off to perform on their own as the *Rote Steine, Proletarisches Lehrlingstheater* (Red Stones, Proletarian Apprentice Theatre).²⁵

As singer of *Ton Steine Scherben*, Ralf Mobius helped pioneer the singing of rock in the German language, employing a rough local dialect meant to express the concerns of its audience of young workers and left-wing radicals. The group's first single '*Macht Kaputt Was Euch Kaputt Macht*,' captured in a rough-clipped prose the frustration of man caught in a world of inexorable and impersonal forces. The first stanza – 'radios play, records play, films play, TV's play, buy vacations, buy cars, buy houses, buy furniture, what for?' – expressed a deep scepticism about consumer capitalist society and the happiness that possessions were supposed to bring.²⁶ Both a collective refusal and a call to arms, the refrain 'Destroy what destroys you' was expressive of the new level of combativeness with which this critique was being pursued at the beginning of the 1970s.²⁷

Floh de Cologne and *Ton Steine Scherben*, despite their common radicalism, embraced differing sorts of left politics. Floh de Cologne gravitated in the direction of communism, its members joining the German Communist Party (DKP), a party founded in 1968 as a successor to the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) that had been banned by the government over a decade earlier. *Ton Steine Scherben*, by contrast, was most well-known for its association with the West Berlin anarchist scene, particularly its role in the seizure of vacant buildings by the nascent squatter movement. Above all, the Scherbens' role in the creation of West Berlin's legendary squat, the Georg von Rauch Haus, helped cement their reputation as the radical West German band par excellence. The seizure of what would become the Georg von Rauch Haus at the end of 1971 was actually the second of two building seizures with which the Scherben were connected. The first took place in July after a *Ton Steine Scherben* concert in the Mensa of the Technical University. The concert was part of an informational event organised by Peter Paul Zahl, editor of *Agit 883*, in

cooperation with the *Rote Hilfe West Berlin* ('Red Help West Berlin,' the name taken from the Weimar era organisation of the KPD). A contingent of young workers, students, and radicals from the West Berlin anarchist scene were present, as well as activists from the *Basisgruppen*.

The activist Lothar Binger intended to use the concert as a jumping-off point for the seizure of an empty building in Kreuzberg, to be used for the creation of a self-organised youth centre. After the Scherbens' performance, as agreed upon ahead of time with Binger, Rio Reiser called upon the crowd to go into action. The result, the seizure of an empty factory building at Mariannenstraße 13, was only the prelude to a prelude to a more spectacular event, one with which the name Ton Steine Scherben would become indelibly associated.

By the end of 1971, tensions between the radical milieu and the state were coming to a head. The Red Army faction militant Petra Schelm had been killed in Hamburg in July, only a couple of weeks after the Mariannenstraße building seizure, leading to terrorist reprisals. On December 4, the anarchist militant Georg von Rauch was killed in Berlin in a shoot-out with police. The 'murder' (as the radical left understood it) of von Rauch symbolised the increasingly pitiless struggle between terrorists and the state and lent even greater urgency to the struggle over urban space in West Berlin. A 'Teach-In' scheduled at the Technical University on December 8 was to deal with the issue of the Bethanien, specifically the Martha-Maria-Haus, the former nurses' dormitory on the north-west side of the complex facing the Berlin Wall. Rio Reiser and his friend Anne Reiche, a leading figure in the Berlin anarchist scene and shortly to be a member of the terrorist *Bewegung 2 Juni* (Movement 2 June), envisioned the seizure of the Martha-Maria-Haus as the prelude to a seizure of the entire hospital complex, forming the basis of a 'Free Republic Bethanien.'²⁸

Fuelled by anger over the death of Georg von Rauch, the Teach-In on December 8 resulted in quick and decisive action. After the performance of Ton Steine Scherben, accompanied by massive flyering and public announcements, some 600 militant youth descended on the Bethanien by automobile and subway. The Martha-Maria-Haus, seized by young workers, apprentices, runaways – aided and abetted by anarchist and communist activists – was quickly renamed the 'Georg von Rauch Haus.'

The house became a major scene location, not only for runaways and drug users, but for members of the proto-terrorist groups. Police raided the house on 19 April, 1972, on information that Michael ‘Bommi’ Baumann, a friend of the deceased Georg von Rauch, member of the anarchist scene and later the Movement 2 June, was living there.²⁹ The purported discovery of a ‘bomb laboratory’ in the house was reported with relish by the conservative *Bild Zeitung* (West Germany’s largest circulation tabloid) and the CDU agitated, without success, for the house’s closure.³⁰ The seizure represented an initial blow in the struggle over urban space in Berlin, giving rise to a battle between squatters and authorities that raged in the 1980s and continues in less spectacular form today.³¹

Ton Steine Scherben’s association with the seizure of the George von Rauch Haus cemented its reputation as West Germany’s leading radical rock group. This was by no means an easy role. After the release of the group’s first album, *Warum geht es mir so dreckig* (Why am I so miserable) the sleeve of which bore the band’s phone number:

the telephone at the [group’s communal flat] was never silent. Twenty-four hours a day. Most of the calls had to do with requests for the Scherben to appear in connection with a school strike, a college strike, to help prevent an announced increase in public transit fares, for planned building seizures, Knasthilfe, Rote Hilfe, Schwarze Hilfe, or in connection with a student government election. In between all that there were offers to perform at discothèques, youth homes, [for] Catholic or Evangelical youth groups, Falken, Jusos, the SDAJ.³²

Pressure for the band to make its presence felt on the political scene came especially from Reiser’s friend Anne Reiche. ‘We were to become the rock and roll fighting battalion,’ writes Reiser, ‘and to make music that would bring people shouting into the streets.’³³

Communism

A common commitment to anti-capitalist struggle by no means dictated a common ideological line. Ton Steine Scherben immortalised the seizure

of the Rauch Haus in its famous 'Rauch Haus Song,' which appeared on its second LP, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, released in October 1972. But the unity among anti-authoritarians celebrated in the song was far from a reality: At the very time at which the song was being recorded, with residents from the house invited to sing on the rousing chorus: '*Das ist unser Haus—Ihr kriegt uns hier nicht raus*' ('This is our house – You won't get us out of here') – the members of Ton Steine Scherben were on far from friendly terms with the people in control of the Rauch Haus. Accused of having written a song that, as Rio Reiser paraphrased it, had 'nothing to do with reality,' the group was prohibited by the leaders of the Rauch Haus from appearing at a teach-In against a threatened eviction in March 1972.³⁴

This falling out between the Scherben and the people in control of the Rauch Haus was emblematic of a more fundamental conflict between the band's anarchist-bohemian orientation and the dogmatic authoritarianism of many of its fellow leftists. Rio Reiser, for one, was repelled by the theoretical jargon of the student movement. 'I had problems with the students,' he writes. 'I found what they said and how they said it boring. The fliers, the language, it was all Greek to me. The revolutionising of the *Lehrbetriebe*. That always smelled a little too much like school.'³⁵ The conflict between the Scherben and what Reiser called the 'political managers' had already reared its head in the wake of the Scherben gig proceeding the seizure of the Mariannenstraße 13 property in July 1971. According to Rio Reiser it was his co-conspirator Lothar Binger ('Lothar X' in Reiser's account) who, after instigating the seizure, called the police to make sure that a conflict with the authorities would ensue.³⁶ Here, Reiser observed, 'ice cold Leninism had shown its face.'³⁷

The tension between the band's bohemian anarchism and the left-wing cadres stretched back to the earliest performances of the group's predecessor formation, *Hoffmanns Comic Teater*. 'The revolutionary cadres rejected the review out of hand,' writes Gert Möbius, 'because in ideological terms it ended too resignedly.... [But] who can say what 'resigned' is?' Who? Was not Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* also resigned, but also revolutionary?³⁸ Gradually members of the band began to see the relentless politicisation of their music within the scene as stifling. 'Playing at a Teach-In was all but a duty,' complained Rio

Reiser; 'we were required [to do it], it was like in [East Germany]... That was happening even before *Keine Macht für Niemand* came out.'³⁹

Even the song that Reiser wrote for the movement at the urging of Anne Reiche became a problem. One of the group's best-known songs, '*Keine Macht für Niemand*' ('No Power for Anyone'), challenged ideological and Cold War *bloc* boundaries ('*Im Süden, im Osten, im Norden, im Westen, es sind überall die dieselben, die uns erpressen*' – 'In the South, the East, the North, the West, it's always the same ones who oppress us); called for the destruction of walls both literal figurative ('*Reißen wir die Mauern ein, die uns trennen. Kommt zusammen, Leute. Lernt euch kennen*' – 'Tear down the walls that separate us, come together people, get to know each other'); and repeated again and again a refrain rejecting authority in all its forms ('*Keine Macht für Niemand!*' – 'No power for no one'). Yet its anarchist sentiments were not universally appreciated on the left; it was rejected, for example, by the leadership of the Red Army Faction as 'useless for the anti-imperialist struggle.'⁴⁰

Such conflicts unfolded against a backdrop of increasing conflict between the bohemian-anarchist subculture and the new Communist cadre groups founded from the end of the 1960s. Other suitors for the political affections of young workers and apprentices included the SDAJ (Socialist German Worker Youth), the Red Guards of the fledgling KPD/ML (Communist Party of Germany/Marxists Leninists), and the trade unions themselves, which in some cases leaned left in the direction of apprentice militancy. The authors of the Hamburg periodical SEXPOL-Info complained in 1974 of the continued growth of the dogmatic groups, 'each one more left than the next,' who attracted members precisely because, in contrast to other groups, they looked not like 'long-haired hippies' but like 'proper revolutionaries.'⁴¹ But many of the long-haired countercultural types who populated the Pupils' Apprentice, and rank and file groups naturally gravitated into the K-Gruppen; but many just as quickly left when it became apparent that the anti-authoritarianism that had fuelled their overall orientation to politics had no place there. In particular, the austerity of the K-group approach repelled those for whom non-conformist personal appearance represented a central component of resistance and rebellion. For the K-Gruppen, the need to win over the working class trumped the needs of individual self-

expression; serious Marxism-Leninism demanded a corresponding seriousness of fashion and comportment.

The question of the value of countercultural style was taken up by the KPD/ML, one of the sternest of the K-Gruppen. 'Our position toward long hair, hippie-clothes, Beat and pop-fashion,' read an article in *Roten Morgen*, the official party newspaper, 'is decided according to the question of whether these aspects of fashion serve the capitalist class or the working class, the reaction or the revolution.'⁴² The generational revolt, the paper argued, was part of capitalism's attempt to divide the working class. 'The bourgeoisie know very well,' the article continued, 'that youth are the most active and combative part of the people. For that reason, they wish to hinder youth from recognising that their freedom is inseparable from the freedom of the working people, and that only under socialism, under the rule of the working class, are youth really free.'⁴³ The most important task was to prevent youth from being driven by capitalism into the 'dead end of individual protest.'⁴⁴

By contrast, the reformed Communist party (DKP) founded in 1968, displayed a much more open attitude toward countercultural deportment in an attempt to win youth. The party profited from the disintegration of the student movement, picking up many of the former 'traditionalists' in the SDS. It sent condolences to the wife of Rudi Dutschke after the assassination attempt against him in April 1968, and senior party figures spoke approvingly of the hippie movement as a welcome turn away from the values of bourgeois capitalism.⁴⁵ The KPD/ML scorned this position, noting: 'It is no accident that it is precisely the modern Revisionists [the DKP] who propagate long hair on their placards and try to trap youth with Beat music. The propagation of bourgeois youth culture by the DKP revisionists is an important factor in its desperate efforts to hold the working class back from the socialist revolution, to chain it to the capitalist system.'⁴⁶

Against this backdrop, a group like Ton Steine Scherben felt it increasingly necessary to justify its artistic intervention in political terms. The Scherben's stage presentation evolved to include more explicit political references. Performing under a banner bearing a slogan by the nineteenth century humanist dramatist Georg Büchner - '*Friede den Hütten! Krieg den Palästen!*' - Rio Reiser sometimes read excerpts from Chairman Mao's

little red book between songs. Other band members joined in.⁴⁷ And yet, the ideal nature of the relationship between music and politics was not easy to establish. A manifesto published in *Agit 883* in December 1970, attempted to codify it. Entitled 'Music is a Weapon' (an obvious appropriation of the Communist dramatist Friedrich Wolf's Weimar-era 'Art as a Weapon' concept), the piece sought to cast the creation of music in essentially political terms, as a key component of the political struggle:

Music can become a collective weapon when you stand on the side of the people for whom you are making music! When you say something with your lyrics, describe a situation that everyone recognises, but about which each eats themselves up inside about in isolation, then everyone will hear that they are not [alone] and you can demonstrate the possibility for change. Music can also become a weapon when you recognise the causes of your aggression. We wish that you do not internalise your rage, that you are clear about where your discontent and your doubt come from.⁴⁸

It continued: 'Our public are the people of our generation: apprentices, Rockers, young workers, 'criminals', people in and out of group homes. Our songs deal with their situation. Songs exist to be sung together. A song has impact when a group of people can sing it. Our songs are simple, so that many can sing along.'⁴⁹ It concluded: '[O]ur aesthetic lies in political effectiveness... We have learned to make songs from our public, only from them can we learn in the future how to write songs for the people. We belong to no party and to no tendency. We support every action that serves the class struggle, no matter which group organises it.'⁵⁰

This understanding of the role of music, in its collectivism and in its privileging of political effectiveness over aesthetics (or in its attempt to elide the distinction between the two) was not new; it would not have been very out of place, indeed, in the mouth of Bertolt Brecht. Yet it was also very clearly the product of a distinct conjuncture marked by the collectivist claims associated with the anti-imperialist struggles of the Third World, and the intense politicisation of every sphere of life in the West Berlin left-milieu.

The tension between art and politics, which in the eyes of the Scherben had become a tension between fun and sterile dogmatism, came increasingly to expression in the group's live performances. Whether harassed for adding 'good time' rock and roll standards to their set;⁵¹ called out for strewing glitter across the stage ('we threw glitter over the revolutionary masses,' writes Kai Sichtermann⁵²); or challenged for engaging female background singers who committed the sin of dancing on stage, inspiring a heated discussion with audience members about the role of women,⁵³ the Scherben increasingly found themselves the focal point of highly politicised and emotive debates. 'The Scherben were expected to be politically correct,' writes Kai Sichtermann, 'and it was the others who decided what politically correct was. The Scherben were [seen as] the *Hochkapelle* of the left, and so everyone believed they had the right to have a say in what the Scherben did.'⁵⁴

Capitalism

Floh de Cologne faced somewhat less of a dilemma, affiliating itself as it did with the DKP, and performing regularly at party functions designed to win over youth to the banner of Communism. Yet, whatever the challenges facing artists, political activists -with the exception of some of those in the more dogmatic K-Gruppen discussed above – had little doubt that rock music represented a critical mobilising force. Left-wing social projects of various types increasingly sought to use rock music to capture the imagination and energy of youth. Such initiatives were often explicit about their goal of striking back at the monopoly of the mainstream culture industry. The left-wing drug-treatment group *Release*, for example, included among its many rehabilitative efforts a project called 'Rock-Lib' ('Rock Liberation Front' or 'Association for the Promotion of Modern Rock Music'), an initiative whose goal was to 'support new music groups and, at another level, to cream off the demand artificially created by the large profit-oriented pop-music manufacturers.'⁵⁵

In Hannover, activists of the group 'Music Initiative Hannover,' in cooperation with activists involved with underground newspaper *Agit 883*, launched a campaign for an independent youth center. The two groups drew an explicit link between the status of leisure time and the

status of work. ‘The bosses have institutionalised our leisure time, and program it in their sense,’ read an article in *Agit 883*; ‘Leisure time has been torn away from us, we don’t have any influence over it, we must accept authoritarian house-rules, home-leaders, and so-called “youth workers.”’ Like everything else in capitalist society, leisure time had been ‘commercialised and institutionalised’ for the benefit of the ruling class. It was therefore no mere side issue, but reproduced the conflicts at the heart of capitalist society.⁵⁶

Yet, the political status of rock music and its related subcultures was a product of fierce debate, no matter how much groups like Floh de Cologne and Ton Steine Scherben might agitate among young workers and allow themselves to be deployed on the musical-political fronts of various left-wing organisations, or however much left-wing cultural impresarios like Rolf Ulrich Kaiser might try to carve out an independent (and lucrative) sphere of cultural production with political implications. The possibilities of liberation through popular music and subculture were a frequent topic in *Agit 883*.⁵⁷ While recognising that subcultural identity could play a role in freeing consciousness and strengthening resistance to capitalism’s demands at the level of daily life, the paper also criticised the role played by hippies in the commercialisation of the underground,⁵⁸ and warned against supposedly ‘left wing’ pubs that, with a few radical posters on the wall, tried to capitalise on APO trade.⁵⁹

Belief in the emancipatory power of rock music dovetailed with warnings of capitalist recuperation, the underground press treating bands according to the seriousness with which they were believed to represent the interests of ‘the revolution.’⁶⁰ The American group Grand Funk Railroad, for example, was dismissed as ‘the prototype of a capitalist pop group’⁶¹ while other performers like Jimi Hendrix, the American radical rock band MC-5, and Ton Steine Scherben were held up as praiseworthy examples of radical art.⁶² Meanwhile, the music industry was criticised for exploitation of bands and fans.⁶³ The revolutionary power ascribed to rock music was symbolised visually by the frequent juxtaposition of the guitar and the gun as dual instruments of revolution. In this depiction, the rock musician represented a parallel insurgent, making up the cultural wing of a two-pronged guerilla assault on capitalism and all its works.

Simultaneously, terms like ‘underground’ and ‘subculture’, despite

efforts to popularise it by hip-capitalists like Rolf Ulrich Kaiser and theorist-participants like Rolf Schwendter, came increasingly into disrepute with many of the people they were meant to represent. Schwendter himself criticised Kaiser in connection with the Essener Songtage, and though he refused to condemn him outright, wondered in print if Kaiser's involvement in the more political-theoretically oriented approaches to the question of counterculture could be divorced from his wider efforts to profit from it.⁶⁴ Others recoiled from the increasingly commercial overtones of terms like 'counterculture' and 'underground.' 'Underground has become such a perverted term that we feel distinctly uneasy when we are labelled with it,' noted the editors of the underground newspaper *Dig..it*:

[i]t is no longer possible to speak of the underground as the counterculture, the psychedelic youth movement, let alone as [part of] the new potential for social change. Rather, the ideas of the underground are absorbed and interwoven into a consumption-oriented lifestyle ... with the aim of awakening the already near-dead culture business to an illusory existence....⁶⁵

This attempt at recuperation had proven itself all-too successful in 'simulat[ing] freedom while in reality hindering its realisation. In place of the original idea of reducing (pseudo-) necessities...the underground has, more or less unwillingly, supplied entire industrial sectors with new impulses through which millions of young people are brought to the point – with U-fashion, U-Musik, U-Literature, U-porno – of buying their lifestyle instead of creating it themselves.'⁶⁶

The co-option of the counterculture became the target of direct action on more than one occasion. In West Berlin, members of the anarchist scene attacked the West Berlin premier of the musical *Hair*. 'We are well aware,' read a flier distributed in connection with the action, 'that 'Hair' only appears in the guise of the subculture in order to gratify capitalist demands.'⁶⁷ The flier went on to link the protest against *Hair* with resistance to the pressure of the authorities on meeting places like the Zodiak, thereby juxtaposing the make-believe counterculture of peace, love and inclusiveness with the reality of police raids and arrests:

The performance of 'Hair,' this Pseudo-Subcultural troupe, attempts to demonstrate the outward impression: West Berlin, the 'free city', has a place for everyone! We demand the giving over of the Beautyfull [sic] balloons to the real subculture.⁶⁸

Ton Steine Scherben's manager, Nickel Pallat, made this sort of point in a more spectacular manner during an appearance on the WDR television program '*Ende offen...*' Pallat had been invited to take part in a round table discussion on '*Pop und Co—Die andere Musik zwischen Protest und Markt*' (Pop and Co.- The Other Music between Protest and the Market). Other panellists included the sociologist Heinz-Klaus Metzger, the journalist Wolfgang Hamm, and Rolf Ulrich Kaiser. After abusing Kaiser for several minutes – 'you work for the oppressor and not against the oppressor – Pallat attacked the studio table with an axe (for some 13 seconds), afterward stuffing the studio's microphones into his pockets.⁶⁹ This striking bit of direct action underlined, more than a dozen manifestos, just how little agreement could exist about the relationship between rock music and radical left politics.

Conclusion

The activist impulses of groups like Ton Steine Scherben and Floh de Cologne unfolded in the context of a widespread belief in the revolutionary power of rock music. This was often fuelled less by the music's lyrical content (the explicit politics of groups like Ton Steine Scherben and Floh de Cologne being an exception to the rule) than by the qualities ascribed to the music by listeners.⁷⁰ Even for the *Scherben*, as we have seen, 'revolutionary' spirit was as much as imputed by fans as it was embodied by the band itself. The revolutionary valence of rock music as a whole aside, 'political rock' was itself an inherently unstable category. As an art form expressing individualism and extreme subjectivity, rock music sat uneasily with the more objective demands of revolutionary Marxism. Yet, the sonic qualities of the new music (discordance, volume, rhythmic allure) and the personal appearance of musicians and fans (long hair, unconventional clothing) marked out popular music as a site of symbolic challenges to the existing order, prior to any explicit politicisa-

tion. These symbolic challenges could, under the right circumstances, be transformed into a manifest threat to order, whether in the propensity of music-oriented subcultures to gather in public spaces, or in those moments, like the Rolling Stones riot in the *Waldbühne*, when popular music brought masses of young people face to face with the authority of the state in the presence of masses of police.

In attempting to create an independent, highly-politicised sphere of cultural practice at least partly independent of the mainstream, bands like Ton Steine Scherben and Floh de Cologne carried out one of the signature manoeuvres of the anti-authoritarian revolt; for 1968, far from just a matter of street protests, was an explosion of cultural production in music, literature, publishing, film, theatre. Activist debates about the proper revolutionary course – about whether unconventional lifestyle and ‘hedonism’ represented legitimate means of struggle, for example, or about the correct relationship between spontaneity and organisation – were as central to these cultural-productive initiatives as they were to political agitation and party-building. In this way, the political and the cultural were inextricably linked, and rock music was no exception.

Rock music could never become the unproblematic force for revolutionary change that bands or fans might wish it to be, but it reflected splits running through the heart of the anti-authoritarian revolt as a whole. The differing approaches of Floh de Cologne and Ton Steine Scherben – the former comfortable within the confines of an old-wine-in-a-new-bottle communist party like the DKP, the latter closely linked to anarchist youth subcultures – was only one of the more obvious examples of this basic fact. Both bands sought to mobilise young workers and apprentices, a goal they shared with the Basisgruppen and K-Gruppen. Rock music both reflected, and participated in, the search for the revolutionary subject around 1968; but it also reflected the diversity of aims and means with which this search was conducted.

At the same time, rock music was connected to key debates about the political status of art and popular culture, especially the question of whether revolutionary art could exist within capitalist modes of production and distribution. A ‘hip-capitalist’ populariser of the ‘underground’ concept like Rolf Ulrich Kaiser argued that it could, while others, espe-

cially in the radical scene of which Ton Steine Scherben was a part, vehemently disagreed. This debate was intimately linked to another one about the danger of capitalist recuperation – that is, the danger of political and, especially, cultural rebellion being turned into a commodity. This danger was a central concern of the anti-authoritarian revolt, inflecting debates about the status of film, literature, and the visual arts, as well as – especially – music.

The debate about recuperation bore directly on the question of whether an art form that was normally (with rare and partial exceptions like Ton Steine Scherben) fully integrated into the machinery of capitalist production/distribution/promotion could possibly have revolutionary import. That this question admitted of no easy solution was characteristic of the anti-authoritarian revolt as a whole; for it bore directly on the central dilemma of 1968: what *was* politics, actually? Who was it for, who had the right to pursue it, and for what ends? Rock music could serve as a projection-field for the utopian dreams of young rebels; it could inspire and draw inspiration from the uncompromising militancy of bohemian anarchists; it could even ally itself formally with communism—but it could offer a definitive answer to the basic revolutionary questions no more than could the larger anti-authoritarian revolt of which it was a part.

Notes

1. See Detlef Siegfried, 'Music and Protest in 1960s Europe', in Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth eds., *1968 in Europe. A History of Protest and Activism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, 57-70. See also Detlef Siegfried, *Time Is on My Side: Konsum und Politik in der westdeutschen Jugendkultur der 60er Jahre* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006).
2. See Wolfgang Seidel, 'Scherben...', in Wolfgang Seidel ed., *Scherben. Musik, Politik und Wirkung der Ton Steine Scherben*, Mainz: Ventil, 2005, 69-114.
3. 'In the Socialist German Student League,' writes Detlef Siegfried, 'Beat Music as mass culture was looked at sceptically, because, as Theodor Adorno postulated in connection with the Beatles, it 'represented in its

- objective form something backward;’ Detlef Siegfried, ‘Unsere Woodstocks: Jugendkultur, Rockmusik und gesellschaftlicher Wandel um 1968,’ in *Rock! Jugend und Musik in Deutschland*, Berlin: Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Zeitgeschichtliches Forum Leipzig, 1995, pp52-61, 53.
4. Where jazz is concerned, Adorno was almost wholly ignorant of that about which he wrote; for the historian Eric Hobsbawm -an avid jazz fan and critic – Adorno’s writings on jazz represented the ‘some of the stupidest pages ever written about jazz;’ Eric Hobsbawm, *The Jazz Scene*, New York: Pantheon, 1993, pp300.
 5. Rudi Dutschke, ‘Die geschichtlichen Bedingungen für den internationalen Emanzipationskampf,’ in Rudolf Sievers ed., *1968. Eine Enzyklopädie*, Frankfurt am Main 2004, pp260.
 6. *Diaries*, entry for July 5, 1969. ‘[Dutschke] no doubt failed to understand this enthusiasm,’ writes Wolfgang Seidel, ‘because there was a social disparity, but also a difference in age, between he (and the protagonists of SDS) and the young workers who were suddenly turning the demonstrations into mass events;’ Wolfgang Seidel, ‘Berlin und die Linke in den 1960ern. Die Entstehung der Ton Steine Scherben ,’ in Seidel ed., *Scherben*, pp25-50, 44.
 7. Wolfgang Kraushaar, ‘Berliner Subkultur: Blues, Umherschweifende Haschrebellen, Tupamaros und Bewegung 2. Juni,’ in Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth eds., *1968. Handbuch zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Studentenbewegung*, Stuttgart/Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2007, pp261-275, 262.
 8. Ralf Reinders and Ronald Fritsch, *Die Bewegung 2. Juni. Gespräche über Haschrebellen, Lorenzentführung, Knast*, Berlin and Amsterdam 1995, pp15.
 9. On the Leipzig riots see Dorothee Wierling, ‘Beat heißt schlagen: Die Leipziger Beatdemonstration in Oktober 1965 und die Jugendpolitik der SED,’ in Rolf Geserick, ed., *Unsere Medien, Unsere Republik 2: 1965: Warten auf den Frühling*, Heft 4, Marl, 1993.
 10. Siegfried, ‘Music and Protest in 1960s Europe,’ p59.
 11. Jens Hagen, quoted in Benedikt Geulen and Peter Graf, *Mach mal bitte platz, wir müssen hier stürmen. Als der Beat nach Deutschland kam. Fotografien von Jens Hagen*, Cologne: M7 Verlag, 2007, p80.

12. Uwe Husslein, 'Heidi Loves You!' in Knallgelb—oder: Pyschedelia' in Germania, in *Summer of Love. Art of the psychedelic Era*, German edition, Stuttgart, 2006.
13. Each day of the festival included a morning seminar on "The song as a means of expression in our time;' *Internationale Essener Song Tage (IEST 68) veranstaltet;*, (Press Release—English Version) Sammlung Uwe Husslein, Cologne.
14. Frank Gingeleit, "The 'Progressive Seventies' in South Western Germany: Rock in the Rhein-Neckar Area. Nine Days' Wonder, Kin Ping Meh, Twenty Sixty Six and Then, Tritonus,' in *Aural Innovations* #21, 2002.
15. *Internationale Essener Song Tage (IEST 68) veranstaltet;*, (Press Release—German Version) Sammlung Uwe Husslein, Cologne.
16. Verfassungsschutz: Über 'Linksextreme Schuler' in West Berlin, reprinted in Berliner EXTRA Dienst 5.10.1968, Nr. 80/II, p.5-7; from: http://www.trend.infopartisan.net/1968/remember68_21.html.
17. *ibid.*
18. Floh de Cologne, *Profitgeier und andere Vogel: Agitationstexte, Lieder, Berichte*, Berlin: Wagenbach, 1971, 7. The passage was quoted by the band out of a *Spiegel* article; "Jugend Lehrlinge. Dampf machen,' *Der Spiegel* Nr. 12, 1969.
19. *ibid.*
20. The troupe was named after the 18-19th-Century poet and dramatist E.T.A. Hoffmann; see 'Informationen. Hoffman's Comic Teater. Prospekt Programm,' Rio-Reiser-Archiv, Berlin.
21. Kai Sichtermann, Jens Johler, and Christian Stahl, *Keine Macht für Niemand. Die Geschichte der 'Ton Steine Scherben'*, Berlin: Schwarzkopf & Schwarzkopf, 2000, p16.
22. The lyrics to the song were written by Norbert Krause.
23. For a first-hand account by a member of Hoffmanns Comic Teatre see Achim Müller, "Eisen erzieht,' in Wolfgang Seidel ed., *Scherben. Musik, Politik und Wirkung der Ton Steine Scherben*, Mainz: Ventil, 2006, 115-124. See video of the band performing "Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht' at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UwE8dlRnsio>.
24. "Informationen. Hoffman's Comic Teater. Prospekt Programm,' Rio-Reiser-Archiv, Berlin.
25. Kai Sichtermann, Jens Johler, and Christian Stahl, *Keine Macht für*

- Niemand. Die Geschichte der "Ton Steine Scherben"*, Berlin: Schwarzkopf & Schwarzkopf, 2000.
26. 'Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht,' *Warum geht es mir so dreckig* (David Volksmund, 1971).
 27. For a detailed analysis of the lyrics of "Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht" see Werner Faulstich, *Zwischen Glitter und Punk. Tübinger Vorlesungen zur Rockgeschichte Teil III, 1972-1982*, Rothernburg-Oberdorf: Wissenschaftler Verlag, 1986, chapter twenty two.
 28. Rio Reiser, *König von Deutschland. Erinnerungen an Ton Steine Scherben und mehr*. Erzählt von ihm selbst und Hannes Eyber, Berlin: Möbius Rekords, 2001, 239.
 29. See 'Terror-Zentrale ausgehoben. Bei 'Bethanien' eingerückt,' *Der Abend*, April 19, 1972. See also D. Discher, 'Bethanien: Terrorzentrum oder Experimentierfeld mit Fehlern? Bei Razzia in Wohnkollektiv Materialien für Attentate gefunden,' *Berliner Morgenpost*, April 20, 1972.
 30. Evelyn Köhler, 'Kontroversen um Bethanien. CDU löste heftige Debatte aus,' *Berliner Zeitung*, January 7, 1972.
 31. Spode, 'Zur Sozial- und Siedlungsgeschichte Kreuzbergs,' XI-XXIX, XXVII.
 32. Reiser, *König von Deutschland*, p244.
 33. *ibid.*
 34. Reiser, *König von Deutschland*, p246. 'This didn't hamper the same people,' recalls the Scherbens' bass player Kai Sichtermann bitterly, 'from showing up two months later in Klaus Freudigmann's studio in the Admiralstraße to chant along as the song was being recorded for the LP;' Sichtermann et al, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, p87. On the leadership factions within the house see J. Grabowsky, 'Die drei Interessengruppen waren zu keinen Kompromissen bereit,' *Berliner Morgenpost*, December 15, 1971.
 35. Rio Reiser, *König von Deutschland. Erinnerungen an Ton Steine Scherben und mehr*. Erzählt von ihm selbst und Hannes Eyber (Berlin: Möbius Rekords, 2001), p114.
 36. *ibid.*, p221.
 37. Quoted in Sichtermann et al, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, p54.
 38. Gert Möbius, "Hoffmanns Comic Teater, Rote Steine, Ton Steine Scherben, 1969-1971.'

39. Quoted in Sichtermann, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, p87.
40. See Hartmut El Kurdi, *Schwarzrote Pop-Perlen. Keine Macht für Niemand. Ton Steine Scherben. The Essence of Rock Volume 2*, Wehrhanverlag, 2001, p37.
41. *Sexpol Info*, February 1974.
42. 'Sind lange Haare fortschrittlich?,' *Roten Morgen* (RM) Nr.2 (vgl. 5.1.1974, 19.1.1974); http://www.mao-projekt.de/BRD/KUL/Lange_Haare.shtml.
43. *ibid.*
44. *ibid.*
45. See Timothy S. Brown, 'Richard Scheringer, the KPD and the Politics of Class and Nation in Germany: 1922-1969,' *Contemporary European History*, August 2005, Volume 14, Number 1.
46. 'Sind lange Haare fortschrittlich?'
47. 'This glorification of Mao at that time was terrible,' Kai Sichtermann remembers. 'We were naïve and starry-eyed;' Sichtermann et al, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, pp50-51. The Büchner slogan was used by the Rauch Haus Kollektiv as well; see Georg-von-Rauch-Haus-Kollektiv, *Frieden den Hütten, Krieg den Palästen. 6 Jahre Selbstorganisation*, Berlin: Selbstverlag, 1977.
48. 'Musik ist eine Waffe,' p883, December 24, 1970. The piece was re-published in *Schwarze Protokolle* Nr. 1, July 1, 1972. A very different piece under the same heading appeared in 1972 in the group's fanzine *Guten Morgen*, p23.
49. 'Musik ist eine Waffe.'
50. 'Musik ist eine Waffe.'
51. This took place at another Rauch Haus Teach-In, in March 1972; Sichtermann, *Keine Macht für Niemand*,p97.
52. This was the infamous (in the band's lore) 'glitter gig' of April 1974; Sichtermann, *Keine Macht für Niemand*,p124.
53. Joachim Hentschel, 'Spur der Steine,' *Rolling Stone*, März 2005.
54. Sichtermann et al, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, p124.
55. *Der Release Trip*, Hamburg: Release-Verlag, 1973; HIS, 'Der Release Trip,' p 5.
56. '883 Hannover für ein unabhängiges Jugendzentrum,' *Agit 883* Nr. 85 vom 15.11.1971

57. See Weinbauer, *Der Westberliner 'Underground'*, 82-3.
58. See 'Sind Hippies Kulturrevolutionäre?', Nr. 35, 9.10.1969.
59. Heidi Rühlmann, 'Eine linke Kneipe in proletarischem Milieu: HIPETUK,' 883 Nr. 26, September 7, 1969.
60. Klaus Weinbauer, 'Der Westberliner 'underground.' Kneipen, Drogen und Musik,' in Rotaprint 25 eds., *agit 883*, pp73-84, 81.
61. *Fizz*, Nr.1, reprinted in *Fizz Re-Print 1-10*, Berlin, 1989.
62. "Ton Steine Scherben,' in: 883, Nr. 73, 24.12.1970; *Scherben machen auch Musik*, 883, Nr. 83, 3.7.71, reprinted on DVD in *agit 883*.
63. See "Stones, Spooky-Tooth, Broughton etc.: Macht Schluss mit der Ausbeutung der Veranstalter!,' 883, Nr. 71, 15.10.70.
64. "Zur Gegenmedien Tagung am 11.-14 Juni in Remscheid,' *Roter Mohn* Nr. 1, July 15, 1970 HIS ZR 563.
65. *Dig..it* Nr. 1, in Wintjes and Gehret eds., *Ulcus Molle*, p92.
66. *ibid.*
67. "Ist 'Hair' Subkultur?' in *Gefunde Fragmente 1967-1980*, p 24.
68. *ibid.*
69. See Sichtermann, *Keine Macht für Niemand*, pp66-69. Also present at the roundtable discussion were the sociologist Heinz-Klaus Metzger, the journalist Wolfgang Hamm, and Conny Weit, a member of the group Popol Vuh.
70. Siegfried, 'Music and Protest in 1960s Europe.'