THE REPRESENTATION OF TERRORISM AS DEFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN

VOLKER SCHLÖNDORFF'S *DIE STILLE NACH DEM SCHUSS,* GREGOR

SCHNITZLER'S *WAS TUN WENN'S BRENNT*, LEANDER SCHOLZ'S *ROSENFEST*

AND ULRIKE EDSCHMID'S *FRAU MIT WAFFE: ZWEI GESCHICHTEN AUS*

TERRORISTISCHEN ZEITEN

by

SANDRA I. DILLON

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of German and Scandinavian
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December 2011

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Sandra I. Dillon

Title: The Representation of Terrorism as Defective Communication in Volker Schlöndorff's *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, Gregor Schnitzler's *Was tun wenn's brennt*, Leander Scholz's *Rosenfest* and Ulrike Edschmid's *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten*

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of German and Scandinavian by:

Susan C. Anderson	Chairperson
Alexander Mathäs	Member
Dorothee Ostmeier	Member
Bonnie Mann	Outside Member

and

Kimberly Andrews Espy	Vice President for Research & Innovation/Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded December 2011

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Sandra I. Dillon

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of German and Scandinavian

December 2011

Title: The Representation of Terrorism as Defective Communication in Volker
Schlöndorff's *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, Gregor Schnitzler's *Was tun wenn's brennt*,
Leander Scholz's *Rosenfest* and Ulrike Edschmid's *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten
aus terroristischen Zeiten*

The attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001 prompted scholars in a
variety of fields, such as history, philosophy and literature, to re-examine the topic of
terrorism, including the emergence of terrorism in West Germany in the 1960s and
1970s. The challenges that arise when dealing with the topic of terrorism derive in part
from a lack of consensus on a definition for terrorists and terrorist attacks. One element
that I found in my research is that there is a connection between terrorism and
communication. This dissertation examines that connection in Volker Schlöndorff's film
Die Stille nach dem Schuss (2001), Gregor Schnitzler's film *Was tun wenn's brennt*
(2002), Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest* (2001), and Ulrike Edschmid's biographical
narratives *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* (1996) in the
context of Speech Act Theory. The films and texts show how West German terrorism is
represented as a form of communication, through which fictional terrorists are trying to
accomplish the impossible statement "I hereby persuade you." The act of persuasion has
an element of freedom, because one can either be persuaded or not. However, the
terrorists represented in the works mentioned above want to eliminate the element of
choice and force the interlocutor to be persuaded. In order to achieve this they introduce

violence, which in turn causes them to be labeled as terrorists. The more they try to use violence to achieve their goals, the more they cement their condemnation as terrorists. This dissertation frames its investigation within ideas about performative speech acts, concepts of power, violence, identity and discussions about "terrorist" narratives in German literature and film.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Sandra I. Dillon

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
University of Colorado at Boulder
Idaho State University, Pocatello

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, German, 2011, University of Oregon
Master of Arts, German, 2002, University of Colorado at Boulder
Bachelor of Arts, German and Spanish, 2000, Idaho State University

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

The Representation of the Holocaust in film, literature and art
Representations of terrorism in German literature and film

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Visiting Instructor, Idaho State University, 2006-present.

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS

Graduate Teaching Fellow, German, 2003-2006

PUBLICATIONS:

Dillon, Sandra I. "Audacious Rhetorical Devices in Paul Celan's 'Todesfuge' and Nelly Sachs's 'O die Schornsteine.'" *Rocky Mountain Review* 64.1 (2010): 32-46.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In memory of my mother (1950-2002)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: TERRORISM AND COMMUNICATION

If we start our story with the line, "[i]t began on June 2[1] 1967,"[1] and we are

unfamiliar with the significance of that particular date, the question would immediately

be asked, what is 'it'? In contrast to this, if we start our story with the line, "[i]t began on

September 11th, 2001," no explanations would be needed. Because of the date, the 'it'

would immediately be linked with the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center Towers

in New York. "Es begann am 2. Juni 1967" is the title of a chapter in Willi Winkler's

book *Die Geschichte der RAF* (2008), where he provides an overview of the emergence

of the Red Army Faction and its connection to German history. On that date, during a

student demonstration against the Shah of Persia (Aust 56), the student Benno Ohnesorg[2]

was shot by the police (Aust 58). Winkler describes the impact of Benno's death as,

"[d]er Tod Benno Ohnesorgs wird als Begründung für den deutschen Terrorismus

dienen" (87). This date was such a definitive moment in the split of the student

movement that even a terrorist organization appeared with the name the "Bewegung 2.

Juni"[3] (Aust 190).

The need to understand and re-evaluate terrorism, even in Germany, reemerged

after the terrorist attacks of September 11th. Terrorism in the German context, especially

---

[1] This phrase has been taken from the title of a chapter in Willi Winkler's book *Die Geschichte der RAF*. The translation provided is mine.

[2] Benno Ohnesorg was a twenty-six-year-old university student, who was a pacifist. The demonstration he was shot in was the first demonstration he had taken part in (Aust 59).

[3] The wide-reaching effect of the *2 June Movement* is described by Hans Josef Horchem in his article "Terrorism in West Germany" as follows, "German terrorism has recently consisted of three main centers of activity: the Red Army Faction (RAF), the 2 June Movement, and the Revolutionary Cells (RZ). At the beginning of 1980 the 2 June Movement abandoned the 'armed struggle,' but the RAF assimilated its activities in June 1980" (1). Stefan Aust also points to the importance of June 2nd in his book *Der Baader Meinhof Komplex*. Aust describes that those impacted by Benno's death include the Berlin mayor, who later on stepped down because of the events of June 1967 (59).

the role of terrorist organizations such as the Red Army Faction (RAF), is an issue

addressed in literature and film since the 1970s. Authors who dealt with the topic of

terrorism in a German context twenty or more years after the controversial death of the

RAF members Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, Ulrike Meinhof and Jan-Carl Raspe

were not subject to the same kind of political scrutiny as the authors in the 1970s. In this

dissertation, the films and texts I interpret were written/filmed in the late 1990s/early

2000s and allow for a critical approach of the topic without being compromised by the

problems authors had writing during the RAF years. The films *Was tun wenn's brennt*

(2002) by Gregor Schnitzler and *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* (2001) by Volker

Schlöndorff, the novel *Rosenfest* (2001) by Leander Scholz, and the biography *Frau mit*

Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten (1996) by Ulrike Edschmid will show

how terrorism is represented as a form of communication, through which fictional

terrorists are trying to accomplish the impossible statement "I hereby persuade you." The

act of persuasion has an element of freedom, because one can either be persuaded or not.

However, the terrorists represented in the works mentioned above want to eliminate the

element of choice, and force the interlocutor to be persuaded. In order to achieve this they

introduce violence, which in turn causes them to be labeled as terrorists. The more they

try to use violence to achieve their goals, the more they cement their condemnation as

terrorists.

This dissertation will frame its investigation within ideas about performative

speech acts, concepts of power, violence, identity, and discussions about "terrorist"

narratives in German literature and film. The first chapter will address these issues in

connection with debates over how to define terrorism and terrorists. The second chapter

will then show how terrorism is linked to communication, specifically to language. The third chapter will highlight the problems in achieving persuasion through language. The fourth chapter focuses on how violence is used as an alternative means to communicate after language fails. Finally, the fifth chapter will illustrate how violence fails to communicate the message of the fictional terrorists, which is highlighted through the condemning power of the use of the word "terrorist" to refer to the groups represented in the films and texts under analysis.

To discuss terrorism, be it in literature, philosophy, politics, history, or other disciplines, is problematic because there is not just one definition that can be used as a point of departure. Finding a common ground in order to discuss terrorism continues to be filled with challenges because of the growing number of definitions and theories that have emerged since September 11th. These definitions range from official definitions, provided by several government branches such as the FBI or the US Department of Defense, to theories from historians, philosophy professors and political scientists.

The problem of the growing number of definitions further escalates, because even if one would choose to focus on how one of those named above defines terrorism, over time these definitions also change within the organizations themselves. This can be illustrated through the definition of terrorism provided by the US Department of Defense. In 2002, it defined terrorism as follows,

> the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological. (United States 531)

In comparison to this definition, the definition of "terrorism" as provided by the US Department of Defense in 2010 seems at first glance to be unchanged. In 2010, it defined terrorism as follows,

> The unlawful use of violence or threat of violence to instill fear and coerce governments or societies. Terrorism is often motivated by religious, political, or other ideological beliefs and committed in the pursuit of goals that are usually political. (United States 374)

As mentioned above, at first glance, both definitions seem unchanged; however, there are some significant variations that impact interpretations based on the earlier definition. These variations ultimately change how the goals of terrorists are perceived. The first difference between the above quoted definitions is that the later one drops the word "calculated." This word speaks indirectly to the intentions of the terrorists because the terrorists' use of violence is not random but carefully planned out. The last lines also change the terrorists' motivation; where in the earlier version the goals could have been political, religious or ideological in the latest definition the goal is purely political.

In contrast, philosophy professor Igor Primoratz developed his theory of terrorism in his book *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues.* In the chapter "What is Terrorism?" he concludes that terrorism is "the deliberate use of violence, or threat of its use, against innocent people, with the aim of intimidating some other people into a course of action they otherwise would not take" (24). On the other hand, C.A.J. Coady defines terrorism as "the organized use of violence to attack non-combatants ('innocents' in a special sense) or their property for political purposes" (5). Again, at first glance, these definitions have in common the violence that is being perpetrated against some innocent; however,

Coady's definition lacks a specific addressee, which is included in Primoratz's definition. Even though there seems to be no consensus in the definitions of terrorism, Coady provides two aspects that seem to unify these, which is the negative connotation that arises when using the term "terrorism" and its connection to violence (5).

The first aspect, the negative connotation, can be traced throughout the historical development of the word. According to Walther Laqueur, the word first appeared in 1798 in the supplement of the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie Francaise* and was defined as a "system, regime of terror"[4] (Laqueur, *History* 6). Laqueur traces the dictionary definition of terrorism as a "system of terror" to the French Revolution where the word terrorism meant "reign of terror." In addition, Laqueur points to the role of the terrorist. He explains that, "a terrorist was anyone who attempted to further his views by a system of coercive intimidation" (Laqueur, *History* 6). As already mentioned above, Laqueur is in agreement that since then many different forms of terrorism have emerged and "no definition of terrorism can possibly cover all varieties of terrorism that have appeared throughout history [...]" (Laqueur, *History* 7).

The problems of defining and gaining insight into "terrorism" became more complex during the 1970s because theorists were unable or unwilling to understand terrorists. During this period there was a move to try to explain the motivations of the terrorists, which only added to the negative image of them, because the explanation for their existence also rationalized the end of terrorism. Laqueur explains,

> The misunderstandings about the nature of terrorism in the 1970s were
>
> founded, in part, on political reasons [...]. It was argued in these circles

---

[4] The Jacobins used the word "terrorism" in 1796 to refer to themselves in a positive sense; however, this was an isolated case of the use of the word (Laqueur, *History* 6).

that terrorism always occurred where there was oppression, social or national, that the terrorist had genuine, legitimate grievances – hence the conclusion that once the grievances were eradicated, terrorism would also disappear. Terrorism, in brief, was seen as a revolutionary phenomenon; it was carried out by poor and desperate human beings and had, therefore, to be confronted with sympathetic understanding. (Laqueur, *History* ix)

This explanation failed not only to account for the terrorists who continued their acts of terrorism even after their "revolutionary" activities were successful. This explanation also failed to account for the emergence of terrorism in West Germany during the 1970s. Many of the members of the Baader-Meinhof Group, later known as the RAF, were educated individuals who came from middle-class families. For instance, Gudrun Ensslin, one of the founding members of the RAF, after finishing high school in 1960 studied at the University of Tübingen (Ensslin 185), or Ulrike Meinhof, another founding member of the RAF, had been not only the chief editor of the magazine *konkret,* but had also been elected speaker of the Socialist German Student Union (SDS), the student organization of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) (Aust 36-38). These and other members of the Baader-Meinhof group and the RAF do not fit the descriptions of terrorists in the 1970s.

The absence of a unifying definition of terrorism and the inability to rationalize the existence of the Baader-Meinhof group further complicates the discussion of terrorism in literature. In German literature, there were efforts during the 1960s and 1970s to try to explain the terrorists' situation. Gerrit-Jan Berendse further describes the difficulties writers faced in Germany during the 1970s when writing about the Baader-Meinhof Group in his book *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle*

Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF- Terrorismus.
Berendse claims that,

> Die 1970er Jahre wurden von einer Sprachskepsis überschattet, unter
> anderem verursacht durch ein offensichtliches Dilemma. Sobald sich die
> Schriftsteller dem Terrorismus zuwandten, vergrößerte sich die Gefahr,
> dass ihnen das Wort genommen wurde. Entweder mussten sie selbst
> monosemisch werden in der Kritik am Terrorismus und damit rechnen,
> dass ihre Texte von den Genossen in die Rhetorik der Springer Presse
> eingereiht wurden. Gingen sie jedoch in ihren literarischen Texten
> differenzierter mit dem Thema um, waren sie den Vorwürfen des
> Sympathisantentums aus dem rechten Lager ausgesetzt. (Berendse,
> *Schreiben* 52)

Berendse highlights the link between terrorism and the inability of authors to critically
deal with this topic. Berendse asserts that when authors dealt with the topic of terrorism
they were in danger of losing their "words," in other words, depending on the point of
view of the authors they were either seen as supporting terrorists or as supporting the
writings of the tabloid press.

This binary situation that writers were confronted with was also mirrored in the
ideology of the terrorists themselves. Stefan Aust in his book *Der Baader Meinhof
Komplex* shows how this binary construction can be seen in a letter RAF member Holger
Meins wrote to Manfred Grashof[5] who had stopped his hunger strike[6]. The letter reads,

---

[5] Manfred Grashof was accused of desertion and was defended by Horst Mahler (Aust 109).

[6] At the end of August 1974 Ulrike Meinhof and the members of the RAF incarcerated in Stammheim
decide to begin a hunger strike in order to protest against the treatment of the incarcerated and make

7

"Entweder Schwein oder Mensch / Entweder überleben um jeden Preis / oder Kampf bis zum Tod / Entweder Problem oder Lösung / Dazwischen gibt es nichts" (Aust 302). This binary construction used not only by the terrorists but also by the press did not leave any gray area for authors to investigate or criticize through literature what was happening in Germany during the 1960s and 1970s. Authors found themselves unintentionally allied with the Springer Press or with the terrorists.

Writers Bernward Vesper and Rolf Dieter Brinkmann attempt to deal not only with the political climate of the 1970s, but also with the binary division between two opposites that cannot come together. These authors try to avoid the opposites by dealing not with actual terrorism, but the "topic of terrorism." Berendse interprets Vesper's and Brinkmann's intentions as follows,

> Statt sich in das polarisierte ideologische Handgemenge zu stürzen, versuchten beide Autoren [Vesper and Brinkmann] das Verstummen zu bekämpfen, indem sie die Auswirkungen terroristischer Aktionen auf Psyche und Physis der Opfer, Täter und Zeugen verbalisierten. Der Terrorismus-Stoff wird dabei nicht in den realen Ereignissen gesehen, sondern in der "terroristischen Zurückweisung des Ideals des kommunikativen Einverständnisses" eine für die Literatur nicht nur inhaltliche, sondern an erster Stelle ästhetische Herausforderung, bei der die sprachliche Darstellung physischer Erfahrungswelle im Mittelpunkt steht. (Berendse, *Schreiben* 79-80)

---

demands to change their condition. In the beginning of October Grashof stops the hunger strike, but resumes it a couple of days later (Aust 297; 302).

Berendse reiterates the connection of "terrorism" to the inability to communicate when he points to the quest of Vesper and Brinkman to fight against the "silencing" effect when trying to speak about terrorism. According to Berendse, authors such as Vesper and Brinkman try to resist this "silencing" by not dealing directly with the topic of terrorism, but with the effects of terrorism on those involved, be it victim or terrorist, where the emphasis lies in the "aesthetical representation of the physical experience" (80).

Not only did the authors during that time have to deal with problems such as the political situation, the binary constructions, and the difficulty alone in dealing with the topic of terrorism, but they also had to decide how they were going to approach the subject and the consequences of their approach. The author Ulrike Edschmid, who wrote the biographies of Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll in her book *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* in 1996, did not have to make those kinds of decisions and was not scrutinized in her endeavor due to the fact that almost 30 years had gone by.

One of the aspects that seems to bring unity to the notion of "terrorism" is the condemnation that arises through this word. However, this further complicates the use of the word, because the groups referred to by that term will not use it to describe either themselves or their actions. Fritz B. Simon asserts this in his book *Terror im System: Der 11. September und die Folgen.* He explains that the word terrorism is an evaluative term with negative connotations; therefore, terrorists never use it to describe themselves (13). The word is only present when the terrorists are defined by entities within the system against which they are trying to fight. Even though the terrorists never use the word to define themselves, they will use it to refer to the violence exerted against them by entities

within society, such as official government policies, the police or the press. Berendse describes the absence of the word "terrorism" in the writings of Ulrike Meinhof and Horst Mahler as follows,

> In den von Ulrike Meinhof und Horst Mahler geschriebenen drei
> öffentlichen Erklärungen – "Die Rote Armee aufbauen", "Das Konzept
> Stadtguerilla" und "Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa" -
> kommt das Wort "Terrorismus" kein einziges mal vor. "Terror" wird im
> Zusammenhang mit Konsum-, Erziehungs- und Mietterror erwähnt,
> letztendlich im Zusammenhang mit der Demonstration gegen den Besuch
> des Schahs von Persien am 2. Juni 1967, bei der Benno Ohnesorg
> erschossen wird, mit Staatsterror gleichgesetzt. Der Begriff Terrorismus
> wurde der Staatsmacht zuerkannt. (32-33)

The negative connotation of the word "terrorism" that Simon and Coady describe in their theories is illustrated by Berendse's example of how terrorists themselves use the word. The Baader –Meinhof group not only avoids using the term to refer to themselves, but they use it to describe those against whom they are fighting, which are the West German government and West German capitalist society.

The second aspect that further complicates the use of the definitions on terrorism is violence. Walther Laqueur points to the connection of terrorism and violence in his book *The New Terrorism* where he provides the following definition of terrorism, "[t]errorism is violence, but not every form of violence is terrorism" (8). This open-ended statement adds to the challenges of discussing terrorism, because for one thing there has to be an agreement on which types of violence are going to be counted as terrorism and

10

which are not. In addition, theories on violence are not unproblematic as shown by Wolfgang Sofsky in *Traktat zur Gewalt* and by Hannah Arendt in *On Violence* and "What is Authority?" Both Arendt and Sofsky illustrate that the discussion about violence is filled with complexities and depending on the approach different points of view arise.

One of these approaches can be seen in Arendt's *On Violence*. Arendt divides her book into three sections where she discusses not only different aspects inherent in violence but also aspects that problematize the discussion of violence. In the first section, she discusses the philosophical and political history of violence. Arendt breaks down some of the philosophical notions on violence in theories developed by Georges Sorel, Jean-Paul Sartre, Karl Marx and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. These philosophers, the later ones basing their ideas on the theories of the earlier ones, did not realize the basic disagreement they had with the others' philosophy. For instance, Arendt describes these disagreements as follows,

> Sartre is unaware of his basic disagreement with Marx on the question of violence, especially when he states that "irrepressible violence... is man recreating himself," that it is through "mad fury" that "the wretched of the earth" can "become men" (12).

Arendt explains that this is an example of Sartre being unaware of Marx's philosophy on the "idea of man creating himself" (12). In contrast to Hegel, who believed that "man produces himself through thought" (12), Marx believed "it was labor, the human form of metabolism with nature, that fulfilled this function" (13). Arendt uses this example to show how there are deep philosophical issues at play when not only turning to violence

11

but also glorifying the use of violence, which go unnoticed in the thinking process of revolutionaries.

Furthermore, Arendt also discusses the development of violence in the 1960s and 1970s. Many revolutionaries of the New Left grew up with violence being part of the main political sphere and their goal was to create change without violence. Some examples Arendt mentions are the atom bomb, the cold war and the Vietnam War. The generation of revolutionaries in the 1960s and 1970s started protesting and advocating politics of non-violence. However, the idea of trying to make social and cultural changes without violence was short lived because many protestors had discovered "only violence pays" (14). The argument that only violence pays is also connected to art, which is described by Frank Lentricchia and Jody McAuliffe in their book *Crimes of Art and Terror*. Lentricchia and McAuliffe explain that already in the Romantic period the goal is to change society through art, which is the "transgressive artistic desire" (2). The desire to create change just as the terrorists had tried to achieve on September 11th is also what Karl Heinz Stockhausen wanted his music to be able to accomplish (11). Stockhausen claimed that the attack was "the greatest work of art that is possible in the whole cosmos" (6). Due to this statement, Stockhausen was considered a madman, because as Anthony Tommasini, a critic for the *New York Times*, points out Stockhausen had lost touch with reality. The controversial nature of Stockhausen's statement stemmed from the mixture of art with reality. Stockhausen believed that art should have the same changing impact as terrorists have on society.

In the second chapter, Arendt looks at the definition of "violence"; however, she shows how this is complicated by other terms — such as power, strength, force and

authority (43) — that throughout history have been used almost synonymously with "violence." She points out that these terms are erroneously used as synonyms of each other because they have the same ultimate goal — to rule over man. Even though there are these difficulties in distinguishing violence from the other terms, there is one definite aspect that sets violence apart: violence is instrumental (46). The instrumentality of violence is central to Arendt's arguments, especially because she believes it is the main reason for the diminished impact of violence on society. Arendt explains this instrumentality as follows, "Violence is by nature instrumental; like all means it always stands in need of guidance and justification through the end it pursues" (51).

In her third and last chapter, Arendt discusses the scientific explanations of violence. She argues in this section, "violence is neither beastly nor irrational" (63). As example she uses moments when there is an event that is unjust and people think something could have changed but it did not, rage and then violence arise, which Arendt sees as a natural reaction. Violence becomes irrational when it is not directed against the culprit of the injustices but against a substitute. She indirectly talks about the beginnings of "terrorism" when she uses as an example Robespierre and the French Revolution. Arendt uses the French Revolution to show the shift from "*engagés*" to *"enragés."* She explains that,

> Moreover, if we inquire historically into the causes likely to transform *engagés* into *enragés*, it is not injustice that ranks first, but hypocrisy. Its momentous role in the later stages of the French Revolution, when Robespierre's war on hypocrisy transformed the "despotism of liberty" into the Reign of Terror, is too well known to be discussed here; [...] (65).

Arendt describes that the reason for the transition between being "engaged" to being "enraged" is not an injustice but hypocrisy. This hypocrisy was believed by French moralists to be "the vice of all vices and they found it ruling supreme in "good society"" (65). In this section, Arendt also indirectly describes the transition of revolutionaries into terrorists. As described by Laqueur the word terrorism first appeared during the French Revolution and meant "reign of terror" (Laqueur, *History* 7). Arendt points to how in the later stages of the French Revolution the "war" turned into "terrorism." This transition is significant in the discussion of terrorism because there are elements such as the use of violence that characterize both, revolutionaries and terrorists; therefore, it is difficult in some instances to separate them from each other.

Arendt's theory illustrates the difficulties that arise when trying to discuss the topic of violence, and even though Arendt's theory focuses on violence in general, her theory can be used to explain the problems that arise when talking about terrorism. Arendt not only shows how violence sometimes fails to have the appropriate impact on society because of its instrumentality, but she also shows that there are difficulties in defining violence, which consequently adds to the complexity of defining "terrorism."

Finally, Arendt's discussion of the end-means categories is significant for terrorism, specifically the notion that the means justify the end. The role the end plays in the justification of violence is a topic Simone de Beauvoir takes up in her book *The Ethics of Ambiguity.* Arendt's and Beauvoir's discussions help explain terrorists' actions, since terrorists try to justify the use of violence due to their belief that they are fighting for a better society. The goals terrorists pursue are usually short-term goals, but the structures they are fighting are deeply rooted within society and are not easily shaken.

The problems that arise when dealing with the topic of violence are not only addressed by Arendt's philosophy, but are also taken up in literature by authors such as Heinrich Böll. Böll's story *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum oder Wie Gewalt entseht und wohin sie führen kann* (1974) theorized about the emergence of violence in an individual through the power of the press. Johanna Knoll provides an historical overview not only of the story itself but also of the time in which it was written in her article "Fiktion eines Berichts: Narrative Reflexe sozialgeschichtlicher Konstellationen in Heinrich Bölls *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum.*" Knoll explains that, "[m]it ihr [der Erzählung] greift Böll Themen wie den Terrorismus, die Anwendung staatlicher Gewalt und die Macht der Boulevardpresse auf [...]" (101). Knoll highlights how Böll's story shows how by critically writing about terrorist themes, an author is connected to the terrorists. Knoll describes this as follows,

> Bölls persönliche Auseinandersetzungen mit der Presse und sein Ruf als Sympathisant der Terroristen – ein Ruf, der aufgrund seiner öffentlichen Kritik an den staatlichen und publizistischen Reaktionen auf den bundesrepublikanischen Terrorismus zustande gekommen war – sind Themen, die auch in der Erzählung behandelt werden. (101-102)

Böll criticized the actions of the press, specifically the *Bild-Zeitung*, for "terrorizing" innocent people in his tale of how a sensationalist newspaper fabricates a false image of the main character, Katharina Blum, until she snaps and kills a journalist. Even though the stories the press writes about Katharina are lies, she cannot get out of the vicious circle without resorting to violence. In addition, Böll illustrates the power of the press to create a negative image of a person based on lies, which has serious consequences.

Katharina's life is negatively affected by the lies of the press, because even some of those who know her believe in what is being published. At the end, Katharina becomes the image the press has created.[7]

The problems of violence, identity and the press that Böll introduces in his work are also developed in correlation with the RAF-connected events of the 1970s depicted in the film *Die bleierne Zeit* (1981) by Margarethe von Trotta. Trotta problematizes the emergence of violence with the addition of personal and national history. Silke von Emde explains in her article "Intertextuality as Political Strategy in Margarethe von Trotta's Film *Marianne and Juliane*" that German scholarship focuses on how national and personal history plays a role in the life of the characters (270). The construction of identity is an issue portrayed by Juliane's and Marianne's personal past, by the press, and by the impact of German national history. The question of what shapes one's identity can be seen when Juliane, a journalist, tries to counteract the existing negative press about her sister, accused of terrorism. Juliane writes an article that tells the story of how Marianne grew up. After Marianne reads the article, she confronts her sister. Marianne argues that, "Du [Juliane] kannst mich nicht aus unserer persönlichen Geschichte heraus beschreiben. Meine Geschichte beginnt erst mit den anderen" (Trotta 58). Marc Silbermann focuses his analysis of this scene in his article "The Subject of Identity: Margarethe von Trotta's *Marianne and Juliane*" on the role of the personal history that, according to Juliane, is still part of Marianne's identity. Marianne, on the other hand, claims that her story starts when she joined her group and her personal history has nothing to do with her. This movie highlights how joining a terrorist organization creates a new identity separate from

---

[7] For more information see Heinrich Böll's *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*.

16

the identity one has as an individual. The new identity is connected to the cause of the group. This cause is what drives the actions of the group, including the use of violence.

Before turning to the question of what type of communication terrorism is being represented as in the individual texts and films, a closer look is needed at how films can be defined as a narrative and what the role of the director as the "author" of this narrative is. Louis Giannetti provides an extensive overview of how movies are created in his book *Understanding Movies.* Giannetti establishes the connection between written narratives and films through Aristotle's theory of "mimesis" and "diegesis." Giannetti incorporates Aristotle's theory into the analysis of film as follows,

> In *The Poetics*, Aristotle distinguished between two types of fictional
> narratives: *mimesis* (showing) and *diegesis* (telling). *Mimesis* is the
> province of the live theater; where the events "tell themselves." *Diegesis*,
> the province of the literary epic and the novel, is a story told by a narrator
> who is sometimes reliable, sometimes not. Cinema combines both forms
> of storytelling and hence is a more complex medium, with a wider range
> of narrative technique at its disposal. (366)

Giannetti asserts that a film not only shows a story, but it also uses elements of literary narration, which as Aristotle points out is the inclusion of a narrator. Giannetti emphasizes that because there are "two types of fictional narratives" involved in the construction of a film, it is a more complex medium than a literary work.

Through the study of narratology the complexity of the analysis of a film is further emphasized because the question arises: Who is the narrator? However, Giannetti conflates the terms storyteller, narrator, and director, which are usually strictly separated

in literature. Giannetti explains the problems that arise through the study of narratology in film as follows,

> In traditional terms, narratologists are interested in the "rhetoric" of storytelling; that is, the *forms* that "message senders" use to communicate with "message receivers." In cinema a problem with this triadic communication model is determining who the sender is. The implied author is the filmmaker. However, many stories are not created by a single storyteller. (368-369)

Because there are many people involved in the creation of a film a determination of who the author is could be difficult. However, I will argue that the director is the author of the narrative created not only because of his role as an editor, but also because,

> […] the filmmaker controls virtually every aspect of the finished work. The degree of precision a film director can achieve is impossible on the stage, for movie directors can rephotograph people and objects until they get exactly what they want. As we have seen, films communicate *primarily* through moving images, and it's the director who determines most of the visual elements: the choice of shots, angles, lighting effects, filters, optical effects, framing, composition, camera movements, and editing. Furthermore, the director usually authorizes the costume and the set designs and the choice of locales. (334)

Both the aspects of editing the text and the decisions made by the director in selecting film shots and mounting them on each other in order to create a story can be considered, as Giannetti points out, the film's "grammatical language" (148).

Through Giannetti's theory on film it is safe to conclude that a film can be interpreted as a narrative. The director can be considered the author, because the director is the one who not only creates a story by making decisions prior and during the making of the film, but the director is also the one that connects individual film shots to create the story that the movie audience will eventually see.

Another important element that needs further discussion is the difference between communication represented in a film and communication represented in a text. The difference between these is that in a film there are several ways in which to communicate; however, if communication happens through language it is most often speech. In a text, one can mimic the idea of speech by writing dialogs, but communication with the readers is still happening through writing. Judith Butler explains in her book *Excitable Speech* the difference between writing and speech as follows,

> That speech is not the same as writing seems clear, not because the body is present in speech in a way it is not in writing, but because the oblique relation of the body to speech is itself performed by utterances, deflected yet carried by the performance itself. (152)

Even though Butler does not want to emphasize the obvious difference between speech and writing, which is the presence of the body, she does elaborate on how in writing only the mark the body has made can be read, whereas in a speech act the body as the vehicle that generates speech is immediately made present (152). This difference is highlighted in the films *Was tun wenn's brennt* and *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* and in the novel *Rosenfest*. In the films *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* and *Was tun wenn's brennt*, communication through the body is highlighted through the violence done to the body. In

Was tun wenn's brennt Hotte, one of the members of Group 36, loses his legs during a violent demonstration against the police. The image of his missing legs is a constant reminder of the struggle against the police and the Berlin Senate. In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the news constantly repeats that the protagonist Rita can be recognized through a scar she has on her elbow.

Even though, as Butler describes, the body is present in speech as the vehicle from which the speech emanates, the film *Was tun wenn's brennt* further accentuates the presence of the body in communication when Tim, a member of Group 36 who remained in the saved building after the group disbanded, is taking a shower and Maik, a former member of Group 36, who became a successful businessman after leaving the group, walks into the room. Maik sits down in an armchair and turns on a film projector. The film, which is one of the propaganda films made by the group, projects off of Tim's body. In this instance, the naked body of Tim becomes the film screen that illustrates the identity of the group. This scene highlights how the body is an essential part not only of speech itself but also when not speaking. The film represents the speech act through Tim, who is a representative of the group's cause.

One aspect the works analyzed in this dissertation have in common is that they represent terrorists fighting for a specific cause, such as in *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the group is struggling against capitalist West German society. The fictional terrorists represented in these works try to persuade their audience of their cause in order to achieve their goals. Persuasion, as described by J.L. Austin is a "performative utterance." In his article "Performative Utterances" Austin explains that a new theory was needed in order to be able to differentiate between statements that can be true or false from

utterances that cannot be judged in that manner. Austin defines performatives or

"performative utterances" as utterances that do not describe something but they do

something. They bring something about or create a relationship between people. Austin

provides several concrete examples; one of them is the marriage ceremony. Austin argues

that in a marriage ceremony when the words "I do" are said, the wedding ceremony is not

described but performed (Austin, "Performative" 1432). Even though Austin develops a

theory to distinguish between statements that can be true or false and performatives that

can be felicitous, which means the utterance did perform what it set out to do, or

infelicitous, that is, the utterance did not perform what it set out to do because the

conditions governing performatives were not observed, he also asserts that there is the

implication of truth in performatives. He goes back to his example of the wedding

ceremony, where he explains that if those being married say "'I do' or some other

formula in the marriage ceremony, [they] do imply that [they] are not already married,

with wife /[husband] living, sane, undivorced, and the rest of it" (Austin, "Performative"

1433). Finally, in order for these utterances to have satisfactory outcomes, or as Austin

calls them, felicitous outcomes, certain rules have to be followed. In the marriage

example, for the utterance to be felicitous the person marrying the couple has to have the

authority to do so, and those being married have to fulfill the requirements that allow

them to get married, such as being unmarried. If the utterance does not abide by the rules

"infelicities" arise, which Austin divides into misfires and abuses. Abuses are those

circumstances in which someone, for instance, would pretend to be in authority to

perform the wedding ceremony when in fact he or she is not. A misfire happens when the

conventions or procedures connected to the performative speech act are not accepted

within the society. Austin uses once more the marriage example to give an example of a misfire. Austin explains that if a person, in a society like ours, decides to divorce, stands in a room with the person one wants to divorce and says "in a voice loud enough for all to hear, 'I divorce you'" (Austin, "Peformative" 1433) the person is not divorced because the divorce rules have not been followed. Thus the utterance misfires.

This distinction Austin initially makes between performatives and statements is problematic and therefore he introduces a theory on "illocutions" in *How to Do Things with Words.* According to Austin, an illocutionary act has a certain force, whereas the perlocutionary act has a certain effect *(*Austin, *How to* 121*).* In addition to the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, Austin adds what he calls "locutionary acts" and explains all three acts as follows,

> We first distinguished a group of things we do in saying something, which together we summed up by saying we perform a locutionary act, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to "meaning" in the traditional sense. Second, we said that we also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, ordering, warning, […] utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. Thirdly, we may also perform perlocutionary acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even saying something surprising or misleading. (Austin, *How to* 109-110)

Austin's terminology helps break down the claim made earlier that one aspect the works analyzed in this dissertation have in common is that they represent a group of terrorists

who are trying to persuade an interlocutor of their cause. The problem that arises in these texts is that the fictional terrorists use a "perlocutionary act" in order to achieve an outcome specifically tied to "illocutionary forces" or intent. The perlocutionary act performed in, for instance, *Was tun wenn's brennt* is the act of persuading the Berlin Senate to stop demolishing the buildings in Kreuzberg. The expectation that the Berlin Senate is actually persuaded is an expectation that is linked to illocutionary acts and not to perlocutionary acts, because successful persuasion is not a guarantee of this type of act. However, as John R. Searle and Daniel Vanderveken make clear in *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, persuasion cannot be an illocutionary act because a speaker cannot perform persuasion only the intent to persuade. In addition, the goal for these terrorists is that the interlocutor should understand the message as they intend it, and when this is not achieved they change the "illocutionary force" in order to try to achieve the same "perlocutionary act." For example, in the novel *Rosenfest* language fails to explain the realities of war; therefore Andreas and Gudrun use violence in order to alter the degree of strength of the illocutionary force.

In order to be able to explain in more detail the problems arising from the use of an "illocutionary act" to achieve a "perlocutionary effect" a closer look of the illocutionary forces will follow. The "illocutionary act" is, as described by Searle and Vanderveken*,* one example of a speech act, which is "the minimal unit of human communication" (1). Shoshana Felman explains in her book *The Literary Speech Act*: *Don Juan with J.L. Austin, or seduction in two languages,* the "illocutionary acts" to be the manner in which performatives are analyzed in terms of their context and force (18). Searle and Vanderveken recognize the importance of these forces, which are also

dependent upon the context, and developed the theory of "illocutionary logic." Searle and Vanderveken claim that "[i]llocutionary logic is the logical theory of illocutionary acts. Its main objective is to formalize the logical properties of illocutionary forces" (1). Searle and Vanderveken divide the illocutionary forces into the following seven components: (1) "illocutionary point," (2) "degree of strength of the illocutionary point," (3) "mode of achievement," (4) "propositional content conditions," (5) "preparatory conditions," (6) "sincerity conditions," (7) "degree of strength of sincerity conditions." As Searle and Vanderveken point out these components are interrelated and depending on their implementation the illocutionary act, "like all human acts, can succeed or fail" (13). However, Searle and Vanderveken also make a distinction among speech acts that are successful and nondefective, successful but defective, and those that are unsuccessful (13).

The above-mentioned outcomes of a speech act are dependent upon the seven components Searle and Vanderveken develop. The first element that needs to be satisfied is the "illocutionary point." Searle and Vanderveken define this element as,

> [e]ach type of illocution has a point or purpose which is internal to its being an act of that type. The point of a statement and descriptions is to tell people how things are, the point of promises and vows is to commit the speaker to doing something, the point of orders and commands is to try to get people to do things, and so on. (14) […] In general we can say that the illocutionary point of a type of illocutionary act is that purpose which is essential to its being an act of that type. This has the consequence that if the act is successful the point is achieved. (14)

An example Searle and Vanderveken give is the act of promising something. When promising something, a person is committing to doing something for someone. It does not matter if the person has other aims when making the promise, such as trying to keep the person's attention. In order for the promise to be successful the person has to do what was "promised" (15). The "illocutionary point" is also the most important component, because it is the basis for the illocutionary forces. For instance the pairs, "assertion/testimony, order/request, and promise/vow" have the same illocutionary point, but its force differs (14). This example also serves as a transition to the second component, which is the "degree of strength." Searle and Vanderveken explain that "[d]ifferent illocutionary acts often achieve the same illocutionary point with different degrees of strength" (15). As illustrated above, ordering someone to do something has a higher degree of strength than requesting someone to do something.

In order to accomplish an illocutionary act there are "modes of achievement" which is "a special way or special set of conditions under which [the] illocutionary point has to be achieved in the performance of the speech act" (15). One example of this is when speaking from a position of authority, not only does the speaker have to occupy the position of authority, the speaker has to be using this authority when speaking (15-16). Austin's marriage example can further illustrate Searle's and Vanderveken's point. The person marrying a couple, whether a priest or a justice of the peace, has to be invoking his or her authority under god or the law in order for the marriage ceremony to be valid.

The fourth component is derived from the illocutionary force and is the "propositional content condition." Achieving a certain goal is dependent upon the propositional content and it is also linked to the syntactic structure of the utterance. For

25

instance one can only promise to do something in the future and what is under one's control. One cannot promise to do something in the past (16). Another example Searle and Vanderveken provide is the act of apologizing. Again, one can only apologize for what one has done. One cannot apologize for "the elliptical orbit of the planets" (16).

One of the components of illocutionary force that will be central in this dissertation is the fifth component, which is the "preparatory conditions." These "preparatory conditions" are essential in determining if an illocutionary act is both successful and non-defective. For instance, if someone promises to do something but it is not in the interlocutor's best interests, the illocutionary act is successful but defective. Another example provided by Searle and Vanderveken is when someone apologizes for something. The person apologizing assumes that what he or she did was bad (17).

The sixth component is the "sincerity condition" which points to a certain psychological state of the speaker. Examples of the sincerity condition are: "[…] when one makes a statement one expresses a belief, when one makes a promise one expresses an intention, when one issues a command one expresses a desire or a want" (18). Searle and Vanderveken also point to speakers who use a certain expression but whose psychological state does not match this expression, which is a way to distinguish between "sincerity" and "insincerity." Within this component Searle and Vanderveken also give an example of a successful but defective illocutionary act. For instance, "[a] lie, […], can be a successful assertion" (18). Finally, the seventh component deals with the "degree of strength of the sincerity condition." For instance, "[t]he speaker who makes a request expresses the desire that the hearer do the act requested; but if he begs, beseeches, or implores, he expresses a stronger desire than if he merely requests" (19).

26

One distinction that Searle and Vanderveken make, which Austin does not, is that Austin categorizes a perlocutionary act as a performative, whereas Searle and Vanderveken argue the opposite. One difference they note between an illocutionary and a perlocutionary act is that a perlocutionary act is not necessarily linguistic and therefore "can achieve perlocutionary effects without performing any speech act at all" (12). One example of perlocutionary effects is the act of waving a gun in order to intimidate. Searle and Vanderveken further develop the difference between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts as follows,

> Since illocutionary acts have to do with understanding they are conventionalizable. It is in general possible to have a linguistic convention that determines that such and such an utterance counts as the performance of an illocutionary act. But since perlocutionary acts have to do with subsequent effects, this is not possible for them. There could not be any convention to the effect that such and such an utterance counts as convincing you, or persuading you, or annoying you, or exasperating you, or amusing you. And that is why none of these perlocutionary verbs has a performative use. There could not, for example, be a performative expression "I hereby persuade you," because there is no way that a conventional performance can guarantee that you are persuaded, whereas there are performative expressions of the form "I hereby state" or "I hereby inform you" because there can be conventions whereby such and such counts as a statement or counts as informing you. (12)

The disagreement arising from Austin's theory and Searle's and Vanderveken's theory

will be further explored within the individual works analyzed in this dissertation. In the

representation of the terrorists within these works there is a tension between the

illocutionary and perlocutionary, because as mentioned above a perlocutionary act is used

with the expectation of an illocutionary outcome based on the use of the illocutionary

forces. However, as much as the speaker may try to perform a perlocutionary act, this is

not possible. The appropriate implementation of the illocutionary forces is, as Searle and

Vanderveken argue, the basis for a "successful and nondefective performance of

illocution" (13).

The seven components of illocutionary force developed by Searle and

Vanderveken, and the question of the role of a perlocutionary act as a performative, will

form the theoretical framework for the four main chapters of this dissertation. Chapter II,

"Terrorism: Perlocutionary versus Illocutionary" will show that the connection between

terrorism and communication is a topic discussed by theorists dealing with actual

terrorism to terrorism represented in literature. Even though many of the theories

discussed use the general term "communication," this chapter will also show that the

types of communication referred to are either illocutionary or perlocutionary speech acts.

Chapter III, "Terrorism and the Tensions between Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts"

will focus on Searle's and Vanderveken's first illocutionary force component, which is

the "illocutionary point." As discussed by Searle and Vanderveken, this first component

is the most important and in the texts and films under analysis it is the first point to cause

the speech act to move away from being a successful, nondefective speech act. The

reason for this is that the fictional terrorists represented start their speech act with an

attempt at "persuasion," which is a perlocutionary act; however, they are trying to achieve what Searle and Vanderveken argue cannot be guaranteed, which is the guarantee that someone is persuaded. In this chapter, I will show that the fictional terrorists are trying to achieve the impossible statement "I hereby persuade you" (12). Chapter IV, "Violence as an Illocutionary Force Component to Add the Sought-for Degree of Strength" will show how violence is used as an alternative means to communicate, specifically as the second illocutionary force component, which is "the degree of strength," in order to attain the sought-for subsequent effect. Finally, chapter V, "Violence and the Failure to Add the Sought-For Degree of Strength" will focus on the last five illocutionary force components, which are interconnected and cause the communication to be a failure from the point of view of the fictional terrorists, because they not only do not achieve the sought-for subsequent effect, but due to their use of violence are condemned by the press/police as "terrorists." These theoretical elements are the basis for the discussion in each chapter, and even though there are aspects that unify the films and texts analyzed here, each also provides a different view of terrorism as a speech act. The following section will provide an overview of how these texts are used within each chapter to represent terrorism as a speech act and how they contribute not only to the discussion of terrorism but also to the theoretical discussion of speech act theory.

In this dissertation the terms performative, locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary will be used as follows:

A performative is, as Austin describes, when language does not describe something but does something, as for instance in the marriage ceremony where the words

"I do" do not describe the ceremony, but "performs" it. To consider the context in which performatives are used is essential to them being felicitous or infelicitous. Performatives can be tied to language as in the wedding example, but they can also be "performed" without a language component, such as when protesting. Austin explains that one can protest by chaining oneself against something.

A type of performatives are illocutionary utterances. Illocutionary utterances are linguistic utterances that perform according to a certain convention. For instance, there are conventions governing when someone is informed and when not. When someone is informed, the utterance has achieved its illocutionary point and is felicitous, or as Searle and Vanderveken explain, non-defective and successful. Illocutionary utterances will have an effect on the interlocutor, through the force they exert. For instance, the interlocutor will either be informed or not. An illocutionary force can be non-defective but unsuccessful, when for instance, someone promises to do something, but this is not in the best interest of the interlocutor.

Searle and Vanderveken do not consider perlocutionary acts to be performatives, because there are no conventions to govern these utterances. Therefore, there cannot be a performance associated with perlocutionaries that can be deemed successful and non-defective or defective. Unlike an illocutionary utterance, where conventions can tell if the interlocutor has been informed or not, there are no conventions to say if the interlocutor has been persuaded or not; therefore a determination of whether the act was successful and non-defective cannot be made. In addition, the aim of a perlocutionary utterance is to have a subsequent effect on the interlocutor. For instance, if the speaker is trying to persuade someone to do something, an action is required of the interlocutor. A

perlocutionary act can also have unintended consequences. For example, the interlocutor can become annoyed instead of being persuaded. Despite this critique of including the perlocutionary act as a type of performative, this analysis will follow Austin's definition of the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary as different forms of performative speech acts. Austin's concept can better reveal the contradictions and interdependencies at play among these three types of speech act in the four works under analysis.

Finally, a locutionary act is a linguistic utterance that is tied to conventions and is defined by Austin as an act that is "roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to 'meaning' in the traditional sense" (Austin, *How to* 109). In other words, a locutionary act is not concerned with the context in which the utterance is used but with the meaning of the words themselves (Austin, *How to* 99). Austin also highlights that locutionary acts are performatives; however, depending on the context in which they are used they will be either perlocutionary or illocutionary acts.

 In the texts and films analyzed here, the boundaries between the performative, illocutionary and perlocutionary are blurred and a tension arises when perlocutionary acts are used to achieve illocutionary effects. In order to achieve illocutionary effects the perlocutionary act has to conventionalized, so it can be deemed successful and non-defective and avoid any unintended consequences. To guarantee that the perlocutionary act has the intended subsequent effect, illocutionary force components are redefined and used in the hopes to create performatives that will ensure the outcome of the perlocutionary act.

In order to be able to show how the texts and films fictionalize terrorism to show the tensions between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, chapter II will illustrate the discursive aspect of terrorism. This will be shown through Lewis H. Lapham's essay "Seen but Not Heard: The Message of the Oklahoma Bombing" and Anthony Kubiak's article "Spelling It Out: Narrative Typologies of Terror." Kubiak illustrates the discursive aspect of narratives connected to terrorism and divides them into three different types of narratives. Lapham also points to the discursive aspect of terrorism by using specific examples, such as the Unabomber and the Vietnam War bombings, to make this connection. In addition, in order to show how terrorism is represented as a perlocutionary and/or an illocutionary act, the similar roles of readers and spectators as interlocutors are addressed by Kubiak and by Gerrit-Jan Berendse in his book *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF- Terrorismus.*

In the film *Was tun wenn's brennt* the tension between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is shown through the representation of Group 36 defined as a propaganda film group. Group 36 develops in their propaganda film a set of rules that determine how a militant attack is supposed to communicate a certain message. For Group 36 the message essentially is "Stop tearing down the buildings in Kreuzberg" and is directed at the Berlin Senate. Even though Group 36 wants the militant attack to speak for itself and to create the situation that it expresses, in other words be a perlocutionary act, they also back up their perlocutionary act with several locutionary acts, such as a letter sent to a newspaper and a pamphlet detailing the rules of the perlocutionary act.

Group 36 tries to develop rules for their perlocutionary act and connect to an illocutionary act in order to control the response of the interlocutor.

In the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the locutionary act emphasizes, through a variety of works ranging from books, magazines and even a letter, the "illocutionary point" of the fictional terrorists, which is to create a world where money does not rule society. However, in this film the fictional terrorists use perlocutionary acts in order to redefine the linguistic conventions of the illocutionary act, but these two types of acts do not function together. This movie also shows, through its representation of the GDR, what the world would look like if the interlocutor would respond to the perlocutionary acts successfully, as the fictional terrorists intend.

The text *Rosenfest* starts by showing the problems with certain illocutionary acts, such as the attempts of the figure of Andreas to witness the student demonstration and later in the novel the figure of Gudrun to protest with a group of students against the Vietnam War and the mayor of Berlin. After the narrative shows Andreas's and Gudrun's failed attempts to protest against the Vietnam War to have the desired effect on the interlocutor, represented by the police, it presents them substituting their illocutionary act for a perlocutionary act, which is the setting of the bomb in a warehouse. One aspect this text specifically focuses on is the dysfunctionality of the illocutionary act and how it uses figures of terrorists to represent an effort to destroy the illocutionary and replace it with a performative perlocutionary. However, this perlocutionary act is supposed to retain the illocutionary forces attributed to illocutionary acts. This is exemplified in the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt,* when Group 36 teaches how to execute a successful militant attack.

The attack is supposed to communicate the cause of the group without words and have a subsequent effect on the interlocutor.

In the biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten*, as in the other works, there is a tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, but this biography lends itself to the closer analysis of the propositional content of the illocutionary force, specifically how this propositional content relates to the world of utterances, which is called the direction of fit (52). "The null or empty direction of fit" is described by Searle and Vanderveken as follows, "[t]here is no question of achieving success of fit between the propositional content and the world, because in general success of fit is presupposed by the utterance" (53). In the biographies Edschmid writes there is a focus on illocutionary acts with the goal of achieving "the null or empty direction of fit." For instance, Katharina de Fries, "lives" in the world of books where language makes things happen, whereas language does not connect to what Katharina perceives as the "real" world. Katharina later on tries to connect these worlds by writing down the stories of violent individuals who have been incarcerated.

Even though chapter II shows the link between terrorism and communication, specifically through their use of illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, chapter III will focus on the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, specifically through the illocutionary force components, in particular the "illocutionary point." In the film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* the tension arises through the use of perlocutionary acts with the expectation of an illocutionary outcome. In order for the members of Group 36 to be able to achieve social change, for example, they have to redefine the illocutionary point to include the perlocutionary act. In other words, the idea of "persuasion," which is a

perlocutionary act, has to be made part of the illocutionary point. However, Group 36 has to conform the perlocutionary act to fit the rules of the illocutionary point, which means that Group 36 has to be able to conventionalize the idea of persuasion in order to achieve the goal "I hereby persuade you." Group 36 tries to achieve this through their propaganda film, which redefines the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts in order to steer the opinion of the interlocutor to support their cause, which is stopping the Berlin Senate from demolishing the buildings in Kreuzberg. The role of the performative is to have the acts become conventionalizable, so the outcome of the acts can be controlled to be successful and non-defective.

The film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, as mentioned in earlier, not only emphasizes "the illocutionary point" of the fictional terrorists through a variety of works, such as films, music and books, but it also shows that from the perspective of the fictional terrorists, these works have failed. The failure of these works is shown through the capitalistic society of West Germany, which has not changed according to the expectations of the fictional terrorists, which means the expectations the fictional terrorists have of these works is of a perlocutionary nature. Because of the failure of the works to create change, the fictional terrorists within this film redefine the perlocutionary act and, in contrast to the other works analyzed in this dissertation, the film shows the outcome of a successful redefining of the perlocutionary act, which is illustrated through the former East-German state.

The novel *Rosenfest* focuses on the problems that arise when using a variety of illocutionary acts to convey their messages. The perceived dysfunctionality of these acts arise from the "illocutionary point," which in this novel emphasizes the performative

aspect of the illocutionary act illustrated through the figures of Andreas and Gudrun who expect language to perform its message and achieve a perlocutionary subsequent effect. In this novel both illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are categorized as performatives, which means that the terrorists represented in this novel expect that the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts perform their message. For instance, the flyers comparing the war in Vietnam with the burning of department stores and the bomb in the department store are supposed to bring the realities of war to a West-German audience, and consequently stop the war.

Finally, this chapter will show through the analysis of Edschmid's *Frau mit Waffe* how the illocutionary point is redefined in order to be able to achieve "the null or empty direction of fit." In both the biographies, there is what Searle and Vanderveken describe as an expectation of the "[…] success of fit [which] is presupposed by the utterance" (53). In *Frau mit Waffe* in order to be able to achieve the success of fit, the utterance has to be a performative. However, in the biographies of Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll there is an expectation of all types of utterances to be performatives, not just utterances as defined by Austin and / or Seale and Vanderveken. For instance, Katharina does not perceive that language in books connects to what she perceives as reality; therefore, she starts writing books about inmates, which is a way to retroactively connect language to reality and recategorize it as a performative.

One aspect these films and texts have in common is that from the point of view of the fictional terrorists the initial perlocutionary act failed to have the intended subsequent effect. For instance in *Rosenfest* the flyers fail to make the realities of war clear to a German audience. Therefore, the "degree of strength of the illocutionary point" is

36

changed, which is, as Searle and Vanderveken point out, a change in the utterance. An example they use is requesting and insisting. Requesting is less strong then insisting (15). In the works analyzed in this dissertation "the degree of strength" is not achieved through language but through violence.

In chapter IV, I will show how violence is used as an alternative means of communication in order to change "the degree of strength" of the illocutionary point to repeat and clarify the illocutionary point itself, and eventually have what Searle and Vanderveken define as a successful nondefective performance. Violence as a means to communicate is not a new concept. Gerrit-Jan Berendse develops the idea that violence is used as an alternative means to communicate when conventional methods have failed in his book *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF- Terrorismus.* Berendse explains that,

> Terrorism so wird argumentiert, ist der Versuch, eine ideologische
>
> Botschaft mittels Gewalt zu überbringen, wenn schriftliche und mündliche
>
> Kommunikation, oder konventionelle Umgangsformen überhaupt nicht
>
> mehr auf ausreichende Akzeptanz bei den Adressaten stoßen. (21)

Berendse not only points to the use of violence as an alternative means to communicate a message, but he also refers to the integral role of the interlocutor, who has to "accept" the message. In the films and texts under analysis, there is not just the expectation that the interlocutor accepts the message, but there is also the expectation of the interlocutor to act for the fictional terrorists to achieve their cause.

The role of violence as a means of communication to change someone's mind, specifically as an illocutionary force component to strengthen the perlocutionary act, will

be explained in this chapter through J.L. Austin's theory of "performative utterances," which he develops in *How to Do Things with Words*, also the basis of Judith Butler's book *Excitable Speech.* Austin's and Butler's theories will help illustrate how the performative aspect of language is transferred to violence and is supposed to convey a message without language. In addition, the perlocutionary aspect Austin attributes to language will illustrate how the symbolic power of the gun is supposed to communicate a certain threat level and achieve the change sought for by the different groups. For instance, in the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the gun is used to communicate a threat of violence and is not supposed to actually cause violence.

In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* the use of violence as an alternative means of communication, specifically as an illocutionary force component, is established through a set of rules presented in the propaganda film Group 36 shows at the beginning of the movie. Violence is used as an illocutionary force component, to change the degree of strength of the illocutionary point. The tension that arises between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts can be explained not only through the use of perlocutionary acts as a illocutionary force component, but also because the perlocutionary acts are attributed with characteristics associated with illocutionary acts, such as the illocutionary point.

In the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the perlocutionary act and its performative characteristic are emphasized through the use of the gun. The gun plays a central role as a means to communicate the threat of violence, which fails when the gun is used to cause violence. In this movie, the attempted perlocutionary act is also used to strengthen the illocutionary point in order to achieve the terrorist goal, which is to create a better society not ruled by money. This is shown through a photograph Erwin, a Stasi

official, is holding. The photograph depicts Rita, one of the members of the terrorist group, holding a gun and hugging a child who is making the peace sign. This image shows that the terrorist group is fighting for peace in the world, and the gun Rita holds highlights how serious they are to make this a reality.

In the novel *Rosenfest* violence substitutes directly for what language failed to communicate. Violence is used to clarify the locutionary point in several instances, and when, from the point of view of the figures of Andreas and Gudrun, it fails, they try to change the rules that govern illocutionary acts. According to Searle and Vanderveken one of the differences between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is that illocutionaries are conventionalizable. This convention is perceived by Andreas and Gudrun as hindering their attempts to communicate their message and therefore needs to be destroyed. They attempt this through the destruction of the publishing house that keeps misrepresenting and condemning them when they use the term "terrorist" to refer to Andreas and Gudrun.

Finally, the biography *Frau mit Waffe* will show how violence is not only used as an illocutionary force component, but in Astrid Proll's case it is seen as a new type of language that is not ruled by conventions, therefore suitable for the message of Astrid and the RAF. The move to this new language is achieved through the illocutionary force of the gun, which is, as described by Astrid, what differentiates the RAF from other groups. Similar to Astrid's experience, Katharina uses violence, because she does not feel language has a connection to what she perceives as being the real world.

Even though the films and texts show the different attempts by the fictional terrorists to use violence to strengthen the degree of their illocutionary point, their speech act ultimately fails, because as Searle and Vanderveken assert, in order to have a

successful non-defective speech act all the illocutionary force components have to be met. In addition, these films and texts illustrate how the inherent characteristics of violence and its relation to authority, power, force and strength do not fulfill the expectations of the fictional terrorists and further highlight the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

As discussed in the beginning of this introduction there is no one unifying definition of terrorism, and, even though Coady points to characteristics these definitions have in common, such as violence, they also further problematize the discussion of terrorism. In order to show how violence associated with terrorism fails to strengthen the illocutionary point, chapter V will take a closer look at the theories developed by Hannah Arendt in her book *On Violence* and "What is Authority," Simone de Beauvoir in "The Antinomies of Action," and Wolfgang Sofsky in his book *Traktat zur Gewalt*. These theories will not only illustrate the more intricate problems that arise when talking about violence, but they will help inform this analysis of the cinematic and textual representations of what is perceived as failed communication that violence associated with terrorism engenders.

In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* there is an attempt to redefine the illocutionary force components in order to achieve a successful non-defective illocutionary act through the representation of Group 36. The illocutionary force components that are redefined through the propaganda films are: (1) "the modes of achievement," (2) the propositional content" and (3) "the preparatory condition." In order to alter the "modes of achievement," the members of Group 36 have to situate themselves in a position of authority, which they try to do through the propaganda film as experts

and teachers of how to execute successful militant attacks. By situating themselves in a position of authority they can manipulate "the propositional content," because they have to be in control of what they are proposing. And finally, they have to convince their audience that what they are saying is in their best interest, which is part of "the preparatory condition." Even though Group 36 tries to redefine the elements that are needed to achieve a successful non-defective illocutionary act they fail, due to the use of violence as a perlocutionary act and the need to conventionalize it.

In the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* "the mode of achievement" is shown through works representative of the leftist movements. The authors, directors and musicians of these works are situated in a position of authority and Rita and her group are joining their ideology. The focus in this film is "the preparatory condition," because the group has to convince those around them that what they are doing is for the best of society. Therefore, the group needs to be in control over their process of communication, which they attempt to do by redefining "the propositional content" of their illocutionary act. This film also exemplifies through Rita's defection to the GDR a successful non-defective illocutionary act.

In the novel *Rosenfest* the press is seen as occupying a position of authority that controls "the preparatory conditions" and "the propositional content." In order to be able to control the illocutionary act, the figures of Andreas and Gudrun see it necessary to destroy the publishing house that keeps condemning their perlocutionary acts as terrorist acts. The destruction of the publishing house would give the main characters within the novel an opportunity to redefine the illocutionary force component and their

41

perlocutionary acts, which would change the image the press created of Andreas and Gudrun.

Finally, the biography *Frau mit Waffe* will illustrate how violence fails to replace the illocutionary force components. Even though there seems to be room for redefining "the modes of achievement" because violence is perceived as a new language that can be conventionalized, it fails because violence is not an illocutionary act and perlocutionary acts cannot be conventionalized.

CHAPTER II

TERRORISM: PERLOCUTIONARY VERSUS ILLOCUTIONARY

Unlike the violence-driven terrorist novels from the English speaking-world, which Robert Appelbaum and Alexis Paknadel survey in their article "Terrorism and the Novel, 1970-2001," the German texts and films I analyze in this chapter focus on the communicative aspect of terrorism. One cannot deny that violence also plays an important role in German narratives about terrorism; however, the main focus of these novels is communication, which the narrative structure, the role of the spectator or reader and the main characters within the novel illustrate. In this chapter, I am going to show how Schlöndorff's drama, Schnitzler's comedy, Scholz's *Rosenfest*, and Edschmid's biography represent terrorism as communication, specifically illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, which both drives and disrupts the narrative it creates.

Communication's central role, specifically communication through illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, is highlighted within the narratives through the connection between the fictional terrorists and their cause, which is directly linked to the fictional terrorists' identity. The representation of terrorism as communication is achieved in the texts and films I analyze through the fictional terrorists' cause, not only because it is this cause that the fictional terrorists are trying to persuade an interlocutor of, but communication itself is an integral part of the cause itself. Furthermore, as in real terrorist attacks, the role of spectators or readers is an integral part of the narrative, because the interlocutors have to not only understand the terrorists' narrative but, they have to be persuaded by the message the fictional terrorists are trying to communicate.

Terrorists attempt to communicate their cause through their attacks, which critics, such as Lewis H. Lapham, explain when discussing terrorism. Lapham links the communicative aspect given to the American military bombings during the Vietnam War to the Oklahoma terrorist attack in his essay "Seen but Not Heard: The Message of the Oklahoma Bombing." The bombing raids during the Vietnam War, which were also referred to as "bomb-o-grams," were intended to communicate to the Vietnamese people the might of the American military and their sure success. Lapham points out that, "McNamara in the summer of 1965 explicitly defined the bombing raids that eventually murdered upwards of two million people north of Saigon as a means of communication" (29). In the same way, the bomb Timothy McVeigh used to blow up the Oklahoma Federal Building was supposed to be understood as a criticism of the federal government (30).

As Lapham points out, a narrative or story is constructed through these bombs in order to communicate. Lapham further illustrates the communicative power of terrorist attacks when he describes the emergence of the "Unabomber." Lapham explains that,

> […] five days after the explosion in Oklahoma City, the correspondent
> known to the police as "The Unabomber" entered the conversation with a
> mail bomb […] that killed the man who opened it in an office in
> Sacramento, California. The force of the explosion blew out the door and
> all the windows in the room, and in an accompanying letter received the
> same day by the *New York Times*, the author of the bomb, who apparently
> had been sending similar compositions for seventeen years […], offered to

cease hostilities in return for a book contract and certain publication of his

treatise on the evils of the "worldwide industrial system." (30)

In this instance, the terrorist used the mail system, which is one of the main venues of

communication, in order to send his message. The example of the Unabomber also

highlights how the terrorists are trying to "persuade" an audience of their cause. Lapham

points to the role of the interlocutor when explaining that the Unabomber was attempting

to enter into a "conversation," which requires there to be a receiver of the message.

However, the receiver or interlocutor of the "messages" from terrorists cannot choose to

be persuaded or not; they have to be persuaded in order for the message to be perceived

as successful by the message sender.

Anthony Kubiak affirms the narrative aspect of a terrorist attack in his article

"Spelling It Out: Narrative Typologies of Terror." In this article, Kubiak acknowledges

the discursive aspect of terrorism; however, he argues that there is not just one type of

terrorist narrative but three different types (295). According to Kubiak these narratives

are:

> (1) the writing of terrorist groups themselves, [such as] the writings of Al
>
> Qaeda [or] the Baader-Meinhof group [...], (2) narratives about terrorism,
>
> [which] would include [...] any form of literary discourse set out to
>
> explore the motives and ideas behind the socio-political and psychic act of
>
> terrorism [...], and (3) narrative terrorism (297).

Kubiak defines "narrative terrorism" as, "[...] attempts to destabilize narrativity itself –

disrupting linearity, temporality, plot, character or whatever conventions may be regarded

as essential to the production of stories, memories, dramas or histories" (297). The films

and texts I analyze are primarily narratives about terrorism that, through the topic of terrorism, highlight the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts not only within the narratives but also through the structure of the narrative.

In addition, Kubiak addresses the role of the spectator within terrorist discourse. He explains that "[t]errorism intends its story, [...], to be understood by those who watch, by the 'readers' and voyeurs of terror's moments, not by its first-line victims" (298). In his description, Kubiak parallels the terrorist narrative created by an actual terrorist attack to a written text because he describes the spectators as readers who not only observe what is happening, but also have to interpret the message. The requirement that the message has the intended effect is an illocutionary effect of an illocutionary act. However, persuasion, as explained in the introduction of this dissertation, is a perlocutionary act and is dependent upon subsequent effects. Therefore, the terrorists expect that their attempt to persuade an interlocutor has the subsequent effect that their message will persuade (Searle and Vanderveken 12). In the example of the Oklahoma bombing, Lapham points out that the message and its intended receiver were not immediately clear (Lapham 30), which the terrorist perceives as a failure of his speech act, because his expectations were not met.

The integral role played by a spectator or reader of a terrorist attack is further examined by Gerrit-Jan Berendse in his book *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltcodierung, kulturelle Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF-Terrorismus.* Berendse explains that, "[e]in Schiffbruch kommt nicht ohne Zuschauer aus. Das heißt, nach Blumberg, die Zuschauer stehen zwar am Ufer, sind jedoch immer Teil der Katastrophe. Keiner kann sich dem terroristischen Diskurs

entziehen" (35). According to Berendse, the viewers of a terrorist attack are not only an integral part of the attack, but, in fact, they are unable to withdraw themselves from this discourse. Alex P Schmid and Janny de Graft go one step further than Berendse in their book *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western News Media,* by claiming that "[w]ithout communication there can be no terrorism" (9), which they believe came through the technical development of the late nineteenth century. Schmid and Graft explain that,

> In the late nineteenth century two new phenomena entered social life: the mass press and the modern insurgent terrorism. Both owed much of their existence to recent technical developments: dynamite, discovered in 1866, and the rotary press, introduced in 1848 and perfected in 1881. The two inventions soon started to interact. (9)

Schmid and Graft are not only connecting terrorism and communication in general, but they are specifically connecting it to writing through the rotary press. Furthermore, Kubiak highlights the role of an interlocutor of this communication, which is the spectator. Spectators, as also Berendse claims, are unable to withdraw themselves from the narrative, because they are the target audience, in other words they are an integral part of the narrative. As such, the spectator is supposed to formulate an understanding of the message, ideally as it was intended by the terrorist.

As mentioned before Kubiak cautions that there are three different types of narratives connected to terrorism, which are often erroneously interchanged with each other. The question that arises in this dissertation is: what connection is there between a terrorist narrative and a narrative about terrorism as defined by Kubiak? Critics, such as

Frank Lentricchia, Jody McAuliffe and Margaret Scanlan, explore this connection not only through the discussion of primary and secondary texts dealing with this topic, but also within the structure of their texts. Scanlan, for instance, analyzes the blurring of the lines between real and fictional terrorism through the role of the author and the role of the terrorist in her book *Plotting Terror: Novelists and Terrorists in Contemporary Fiction*. She describes the connection between terrorist and writer as follows,

> Plotting Terror is a study of contemporary novels in which terrorists' themes lead to the question about writing and language. In each of these novels, writers and terrorists encounter each other, resuming a motif of the writer as terrorist's victim, rival, or double, [...]. (1)

Scanlan argues that "terrorist novels" comment on writing and language itself, which occurs not only through the "terrorist" as a fictional character within the novel, but also through the different roles the writer occupies in relation to the terrorist.

Scanlan contextualizes the author's relation to the terrorist through her analysis of Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel *Demons* and Henry James's novel *The Princess Casamassima*, in which she sees "[...] both writers and terrorists [...] as remnants of romantic belief in the power of marginalized persons to transform history" (2). Inge Stephan describes the romantic belief in her book *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte*. This romantic belief initially developed in Germany when writers tried to create change by living their life against social norms and introducing literary salons in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (179-180). They modeled the salons after the well-established French salons, which were unknown to most Germans. In addition, some political groups formed during this time, such as the Jacobins, made it their goal to create

political change in Germany. The Jacobins believed that the only way to create change was through a revolution. This method of creating change differed from ideas propagated in Germany especially during the Classical period (181-182). Stephan describes as follows:

> Der von den Jakobinern immer wieder beschworene Gegensatz zwischen "Wort" und "Tat", d.h. zwischen literarischer und politischer Praxis, ist nicht antinomisch zu verstehen, sondern er läβt sich historisch-dialektisch auflösen. [...] Nicht "ästhetische Erziehung" im klassischen Sinne, sondern politische Erziehung d.h. Aufklärung der Bevölkerung über ihre Rechte und Pflichten im Medium der Literatur, ist die Antwort des jakobinischen Schrifstellers auf die vorgefundene gesellschaftliche Situation. Eine solche Erziehung [...] versucht, bei der Bevölkerung Einsichten für die Notwendigkeit einer [...] Revolution zu wecken. Damit wird die Dichtung unmittelbar zu einem Element der revolutionären Praxis. (182-183)

Stephan's observation, as related to the historical situation in Germany, emphasizes the similarities between writers and revolutionaries through the goals of the writer and writings themselves. In this case the writings become tools for revolutionary ideas and a pathway for the writer to educate readers about the importance of change through revolution.

Scanlan affirms the connection between writers and revolutionaries, but also draws attention to a shift that occurred with the birth of the terrorist novel in the nineteenth century. With the appearance of the terrorist novel, comparisons between writers and terrorists emerged, which Scanlan sees as a disservice to writers. Although

the comparison of writers to terrorists is contested in contemporary literature, Scanlan reiterates that, "we find terrorists both as rivals and as doubles of the novelist" (6), consequently maintaining a historical continuity between the comparisons, which began in the Romantic period. Through her repetitious linking of writers to terrorists, Scanlan cements the relation of writer to terrorist and situates the writer not in one fixed position vis-à-vis the terrorist, but in several shifting positions among "victim, double and rival" (6).

Even though Scanlan draws a historical timeline from the Romantic to the contemporary period to connect writers and terrorists, the terrorist novel itself allows for drawing similar connections based upon the goals pursued by both writers and terrorists. Frank Lentricchia and Jody McAuliffe reiterate many of the historical connections found in Scanlan's theories in their book *Crimes of Art and Terror* (2003). In addition, they expand on the connection of writers to terrorists by focusing on the role of violence. Lentricchia and McAuliffe explain that,

> The desire beneath many romantic literary visions is for a terrifying
> awakening that would undo the West's economic and cultural order,
> whose origin was the Industrial Revolution and whose goal is global
> saturation, the obliteration of difference. It is also the desire, of course, of
> what is called terrorism. (2)

The "terrifying awakening" writers want to realize is not a subtle awakening, but rather a radical change achieved through "terror" or "apprehension,"[8] which at first glance writers attain through language but not through violence. However, "undo[ing] the West's

---

[8] In Merriam Webster the word "terrifying" is defined as "causing terror or apprehension" http://aolsvc.merriam-webster.aol.com/ dictionary/terrifying.

economic and cultural order" is coupled to violence, not only because it is done through a terrifying awakening but also because it implies a radical change. Therefore, writers and terrorists have violence in common, due to the type of change they want to achieve, which can only be reached by shaking up the existing structures, be they political, economical or cultural.

Furthermore, Lentricchia and McAuliffe describe the intentions of an author of narrative terrorism to create change by blurring the lines between the characters within the stories and the authors. This fusion of writer and terrorist is performed by the structure of the chapters with a weaving of different plot summaries, biographical accounts of authors that parallel the life of their respective narrative characters, actors portraying characters in a movie and criminals who have committed violent acts to include their recounting of these acts in narratives. This fusion illustrates Kubiak's claim that narrative terrorism disrupts the narrative conventions.

Communication is the central theme presented in the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* as illustrated by the propaganda film Group 36 makes. The propaganda film the group creates serves two purposes: (1) the members of Group 36 and their cause are introduced to the main film's viewer and (2) it shows their attempt to create a narrative, about themselves, for the fictional spectators. Group 36 is a leftist group of young people who want to preserve the old buildings in Berlin and therefore fight against the construction plans of the Berlin Senate. While making their film, the group forgets to remove the lens cap from the camera. This allows the viewer to hear that something is taking place, but not to see what is happening thus leaving the viewer in the dark in the literal and symbolic sense. Leaving the lens cap in place symbolizes the viewer's lack of

51

information. As soon as the group mentions its name - Group 36 – the lens cap is taken off the camera and the group members come into the light, obviously because the viewer is now able to see, but at the same time one of the group members enlightens the viewer by introducing the group, and narrates the cause for which they are fighting.

The propaganda film stresses that communication is a key characteristic in the actions of Group 36. The group provides five rules on how to execute a successful militant attack where the first two steps focus on communication. The group explains,

> Regel 1: Anfänger sollten keine komplizierten Ziele wählen. Die Aktion muss aus sich heraus verstanden werden. Regel 2: Für Erklärungen gilt: Keine handschriftlichen Traktate. Typenräder und Farbbänder wegschmeißen. Schreiben mehrfach kopieren und vor allem: Nie die eigene Schreibmaschine verwenden. Regel Nr. 3: Materialen, die für die Aktion gebraucht werden, sollten bei verschiedenen großen Handelsketten besorgt werden. Als Behälter eignen sich leere Stahlflaschen, Feuerlöscher oder ein fest schließender Schnellkochtopf. Regel 4: Möglichst nichts mit bloßen Fingern anfassen, denn Spuren können bleiben, die später nachweisbar sind. Zur Not Prints mit Spüli abwaschen. Regel 5: Leer stehende Häuser werden besetzt, wenn nicht möglich, dann gibt's 'nen kleinen Denkzettel. (*Was tun wenn's brennt*)

As in the Oklahoma bombing, which Lapham uses as an example for terrorism as a narrative, Group 36 communicates its cause through a symbolic target, in other words through a perlocutionary act because the target will communicate the cause of the terrorists without a linguistic component and as the perlocutionary act is characterized by

its subsequent effects, so is the terrorist attack. However, Group 36 adds a letter in order to guarantee that their message has the subsequent effect as they intend it. The letter Group 36 writes is also an attempt at controlling the process of communication to reduce the possibility for misunderstandings.

Similar to the film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* illustrates the central role of communication through a group's actions, which have been redefined in order to communicate their cause. In the beginning of the movie, a group of leftist radicals is in the process of robbing a bank in Germany. While entering the bank, Rita and the members of the group to which she belongs start redefining its actions through slogans, such as "Dies ist eine Enteignungsaktion" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*), not only to communicate their ideology, but also to show how their actions are in support of their anti-capitalistic cause. The use of a bank robbery as a means of communication becomes apparent when Rita later objects to robbing a bank in France. Rita points out that in France, no one will be able to understand the group's objective, even though Friederike can speak French and could translate the group's message. Rita clarifies that language is not the only barrier that prevents them from communicating but in addition the audience they are trying to address is not present in France. Rita argues that it is pointless for Friederike to explain to the French people, "Wir klauen nicht. Das ist die deutsche Revolution" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*), because the French audience would not be able to understand the relevance of the German "Revolution" happening in France. Rita's argument shows that for them, a bank robbery is constructed as a narrative with a very specific audience in mind. If that specific audience is not present, communication will be unsuccessful. Consequently, due to the absence of the target audience in France,

Rita refuses to rob a bank in France, because the bank robbery would only function as a

bank robbery and not as a means of communication.

Even though communication of the cause is meant to be accomplished through the

bank robbery, additional scenes further emphasize to the viewer of the film that for Rita

the slogans used during the bank robbery actually represent her cause. After Rita leaves

the bank, she passes a bum on the street, who is begging for money. Rita stops and fills

his hat with change from the robbery. This scene illustrates how communication not only

happens through a perlocutionary act, but it emphasizes the performative aspect of this

act: Rita is a true believer of her cause and performs the slogans used in the bank robbery

by implementing what was said in the bank, which also highlights the importance of the

subsequent effect of the perlocutionary act.

In this film written and spoken forms of communication are used to communicate

the leftist cause of Rita and the members of the group she belongs to. As mentioned

above, Rita reads a letter she has written to a friend after she has defected from the group,

explaining the cause for which she had been fighting. Furthermore, later in the film, when

Rita, Friederike, a newcomer to the group, and Joachim, a senior member of the group,

are planning the escape from jail of Andy, the leader of the group, the camera pans

through the room the group is sitting in and a variety of media are seen, such as posters,

records, books, newspaper clippings, magazines. These items are representative of the

leftist ideology to which the group subscribes. Some of the items shown include a Jimi

Hendrix poster, a movie advertisement for Louis Malle's film *Viva Maria*, records by

Ton Steine Scherben, a poem by Bertolt Brecht, books such as a biography of Ho Chi

Minh by Jean Lacouture or the novel *Tote sollten Schweigen* by Pierre Boileau, Thomas

Narcejac and Helga Riedel, and newspaper excerpts dealing with key moments in the Red Army Faction or RAF history, such as Benno Ohnesorg's death, all of which communicate Rita's and her group's ideology and cause. The group's ideology is presented through the conversation Rita and Friederike have concerning Friederike's reasons for joining the group. Friederike recounts her experiences as an affluent member of society, taking full advantage of capitalistic privileges such as eating Caviar and riding horses, which she now rejects in favor of Rita's anti-capitalistic cause. These different narratives presented in this scene not only highlight the importance of communication for the group about their ideology, but also that different methods and types of narratives have been used to communicate their cause to a variety of audiences. There also is a combination of locutionary that are performed as either illocutionary and/or perlocutionary acts, because books are obviously tied to linguistic communication, which is inherent to the illocutionary acts, but there are also items that serve as perlocutionary acts, such as the bust of Karl Marx. Marx called for actions through the *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. At the end the text calls for "Proletarier aller Länder vereinigt euch!" (56).

   In the novel *Rosenfest* by Leander Scholz, communication is a central theme not only within the narrative itself, but also through Leander Scholz's approach in writing his novel, which he explains in "Hyperrealität oder das Traumbild der RAF." Within *Rosenfest,* a fictional account of Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin, the leaders of the Baader-Meinhof Group, there are several elements that point to the central role of communication, for example, Andreas's quest to witness the student demonstration even after his camera breaks and Gudrun's participation in specific actions that are supposed to

communicate the demands of the students to politicians. However, what sets this novel apart from the movies previously discussed is Leander Scholz's comment on his narrative technique. His novel is a collage of different narrative styles, which he believes helps in communicating to the reader about his main characters. Scholz explains, "[...], man bekommt mehr über Figuren heraus, wenn man sie von ihrem Umfeld abtrennt: das ist Collage" ("Hyperrealität" 218). Through this collage of narratives, Scholz hopes not only to communicate to his reader about his main characters, but he believes one can gather "more" information through this narrative style. Taking the characters out of the historical narrative and creating a new narrative around them is, as I will argue, not only a way for Scholz to communicate about the narratives created by the press, but he also adds to the discussion of speech act theory through the tension he creates between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

The narrative structure of Scholz's novel can be paralleled to Lentricchia's and McAuliffe's narrative, because in order to disrupt the established narrative Scholz blurs the lines between fact and fiction by weaving historical moments from the Baader-Meinhof group with fictional accounts of Andreas's and Gudrun's lives. This can already be seen in the first chapter, where Benno Ohnesorg's death in 1967 is retold by Andreas Baader who witnessed the student demonstration, which took place against the Shah of Persia in front of the "Deutsche Oper." There is a conglomeration of sounds coming from inside the building, the students' protests, and the moment Andreas and Gudrun meet. Paragraphs within this chapter start with a line from the *Marriage of Figaro*, which was being performed at the Opera at the time, and then continue by describing either the students' demonstration or the moment Andreas sees Gudrun for the first time.

The mixture of real historical events and people, fictional narratives either created by Scholz or Mozart's *The Marriage of Figaro*, is used to dismantle the established dominant narratives in order to create a new narrative. The characteristics of this new narrative are described by Kubiak as elements of terrorist narratives, because they destabilize narrative conventions, in this case narrative linearity and temporality. Scholz succeeds in disrupting the conventions of narrativity not only by blurring fact and fiction but also through the structure of the text.

Finally, communication is again the ultimate goal in the biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* by Ulrike Edschmid. Edschmid explains in her prolog that,

> Die beiden biographischen Erzählungen folgen dem Leben von Katharina
> de Fries und Astrid Proll. Beide Frauen wurden in der Öffentlichkeit mit
> dem Begriff "Terroristin" gebrandmarkt. Begriffe aber vernichten die
> Geschichte des einzelnen Menschen. (Vorbemerkung)

Edschmid's explanation points out that the word "Terroristin" destroys the story of the individual; therefore she feels compelled to create a story about these individual women. Even though Edschmid claims that terrorism destroys a story, she at the same time represents terrorism as a form of communication by focusing on how communication played an important role in the life of each woman and how the inability to communicate drove them to terrorism. As mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation, this text also illustrates the tension between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts; however, it also focuses on the inability of language to have the "expected fit." Searle and Vanderveken explain that the illocutionary utterance used already presupposes a general success, which

can also be seen in Katharina's and Astrid's biography. However, even though there is a certain expectation of language it fails to have the "expected fit." For instance in Katharina's experience, the texts she reads do not have the effect on reality that she expects them to have.

Communication, as argued by Scanlan, is a topic that writers comment on through the terrorist novel. Scanlan limits the commentary to language and writing (1), which the texts analyzed in this dissertation also emphasize. However, they also comment on speech act theories, specifically the tension between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The authors and directors of the texts and films analyzed, accomplish this by writing or telling a story about the individual terrorists detached from their group identity. Even though the writers want to tell the story of the individual, the connection to the group cannot be completely ignored, because the fictional terrorist's identity is directly linked to their cause, which links them to a group. Furthermore, the cause is linked to communication, because it is the cause and their connection to it that the terrorists are trying to communicate. Therefore, the authors and directors link terrorism to communication, because they create characters whose drive is to communicate their cause.

Communication, in its different forms, is the motor that drives the narratives in the texts and films under analysis, and language plays an integral role in this communication. Although the main characters in these texts and films are terrorists, be they based on real people or fictional, violence is an integral part of their way of communicating. The terrorists in these examples attempt communication through

58

language by striving to create a narrative that can be understood by the intended audience prior to resorting to violence.

Even though Group 36 is already involved in a violent demonstration in the beginning of *Was tun wenn's brennt,* the film also shows that they used verbal language to communicate before resorting to violence. Inspector Manowski, while searching for information about Group 36, finds in an old newspaper an advertisement from the group about their film screenings. As mentioned before, Group 36 is a propaganda film group that tries to communicate their cause through language, both spoken and written. Within this propaganda film there is not only a linking together of mimesis and diegesis, because the group not only shows how to build a bomb but they also tell about it, but there is also a linking of performatives to writing. Communication through written language is emphasized when Nele and Flo, two members of Group 36, hold up signs with key words of Tim's speech. In this speech Tim is explaining what it entails to build a bomb. The first two words highlighted in this speech are "genau" and "zuhören," which points to the role of the interlocutor to listen to the information given. Moreover, when Group 36 gives instructions on how to make a successful militant attack, the second step focuses on a written form of explanation. The proposed steps to execute a successful militant attack have characteristics attributed to locutionary acts as Austin would define them, because the target chosen is supposed to speak for itself. However, in order to guarantee the success of the attack they give suggestions for writing a letter to accompany the attack, which is associated with locutionary acts. Here the locutionary characteristics are supposed to guarantee that the interlocutor not only understands the message as it was

intended but also that the pursued goal is a success. The locutionary is supposed to guarantee the success of the perlocutionary act.

As mentioned before, perlocutionary acts are not necessarily linguistic, but Group 36 ties language to the actions that are supposed to speak for themselves. For instance, when vandalizing objects they write messages on them. There are several examples of perlocutionary act which are connected to linguistics in the film; however, the most notable is the building they are squatting in. The walls are spray painted from the bottom of the stairs to the apartment, which visually highlights the group's connection to communication, specifically to communication tied to linguistics and writing. As mentioned before, the group is linked to communication through their cause, not only because it is what they want to communicate, but because their ultimate goal is communication itself. The building itself visually emphasizes this connection, specifically through the red communist star, which is also present on both Hotte's wheelchair wheels and the front cover of a booklet Hotte holds in the propaganda film.

Parallel to the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt,* the group in the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* is also involved in a violent act in the beginning of the film. In addition, language was also used to communicate their cause prior to resorting to violence. The group sees itself as part of a worldwide group, fighting for their cause, and as part of this larger group they have already tried to communicate their cause through language, which is shown through the books, posters and music they have in the room where they plan Andy's escape. As mentioned before, these books are not only representative of the leftist movement, they are iconic figures of the movement. Rita also explains to Tatjana, a girl she met and fell in love with after defecting to East Germany, that the group sees itself as

60

part of this worldwide movement. Rita writes, "[w]ir hielten uns für die Größten, Tatjana. Wir wollten das Unrecht abschaffen und den Staat gleich mit oder umgekehrt. Beides hing ja zusammen. Politik war Krieg überall auf der Welt" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). While Rita is reading this letter, a Stasi officer is looking at a picture of Rita in Palestine. In the picture, Rita has a machine gun and she is wearing a scarf with the Palestinian black and white check motif. She is hugging a child who is making a peace sign, which is a perlocutionary act. That Rita is hugging a child and the child is making a peace sign shows that the group is fighting for the future and their goal is not a world filled with violence but peace. However, because Rita is carrying a gun, the picture also communicates that Rita and her group are willing to use violence to achieve their goals. In addition, because the group sees itself connected to and part of this worldwide fight, they also believe that they have already tried to communicate their cause through written and spoken language.

Written and spoken language is also used to communicate prior to the use of violence in the novel *Rosenfest.* Even though the novel is a fictionalized account of two actual violent terrorists, the text shows how Andreas and Gudrun use language to communicate their cause and ideology before resorting to violence. When we look at these figures in their historical context, they started to communicate through spoken language while still part of the student movement. Within the novel, the importance to communicate through words is shown after Benno Ohnesorg is shot, and Gudrun returns to her boyfriend. Instead of immediately resorting to violence, Gudrun joins her friends in trying to protest against the government through written language. The group works together by writing each individual letter of their message, "Albertz!" on one side and the

word "Abtreten" on the other side of several T-Shirts. The message becomes legible when the students stand together and turn around at the same time. This action also emphasizes the performative aspect of protesting. In this novel there is a gradual movement from the illocutionary act to the perlocutionary act, because as described above the novel starts with the death of Benno Ohnesorg, which Andreas is trying to witness. Witnessing, according to Searle and Vanderveken, is an illocutionary act. After Andreas's attempt to witness fails, both Andreas and Gudrun focus solely on perlocutionary acts. Even though perlocutionary acts do not have to have a linguistic component, this novel makes the linguistic component an essential part of the perlocutionary acts. This is exemplified when Gudrun and Andreas are focused on achieving the subsequent effects of their perlocutionary acts. In order to achieve these, they constantly explain their actions, because they feel that if their interlocutors would understand the message as intended the sought-for change would occur.

In contrast to the fictional works, Edschmid's biographies focus on the story of real terrorists; however, her focus is on the life these women had before they became terrorists, after they left the terrorist groups, while in hiding or in prison. Even though both Astrid Proll and Katharina de Fries struggled with communication, specifically with regard to what Searle and Vanderveken describe as the ultimate fit of the utterance,[9] they also tried to communicate their cause and ideology before resorting to violence. Katharina de Fries's biography demonstrates how language has been used to fight for one's cause. In this biography, Edschmid details the struggle of Katharina's father against the Nazis through the posting of posters. A poster, according to the *New Standard Encyclopedia,* "is designed to attract the attention of many persons. Printed in bright

---

[9] The problems to communicate through language will be further developed in chapter III.

colors, an effective poster is easily read and understood" (517). The function of a poster

parallels the characteristics attributed to the narrative qualities of a terrorist attack,

because as Lapham points out, the narrative created by the Oklahoma bombing was

meant to be immediately understood as a criticism against government (30). The posters

Katharina's father posts, though not described in detail in the narrative, as well as their

role and their possible threat to the Nazi regime are explained through further comments

made by Katharina's grandmother. The posters can be characterized as perlocutionary,

because there is an expectation that the posters will change society or persuade Germans

to change their society. Edschmid describes Katharina's experience as follows,

> Nachts konnte sie [Katharina] nicht schlafen, weil die Großmutter weinte,
>
> "....und dann haben sie ihn festgeschnallt und ihm heißes Öl in den Mund
>
> gegossen." Das darf nicht sein, dachte sie [Katharina], nicht er. Immer
>
> wenn vom Vater gesprochen wurde, weinte die Großmutter, sie wußte, er
>
> lebte gefährlich, was er tat gefährdete die Familie, sie war dagegen.
>
> Dennoch war es gut, was er tat. (12)

This description shows that Katharina grew up in a household where communication

through a combination of words and images, exemplified by the posters, was seen as a

way to fight for one's beliefs, and the power of communication is shown by the fact that

the Nazis did try to stop the father from posting his posters.

Language and communication are central in these texts and novels, because it is

through language that the terrorists, be they fictional or real, come into existence and the

reason for this existence is to communicate their cause. As argued, the texts and films

interpret show that communication, represented through a variety of forms including

communication through images, spoken and written language, is the goal of each respective narrative. Critics, such as Kubiak, have discussed the link between either identity and narrative or identity and language. Kubiak addresses this topic when he explains his use of the word "narrative." In starting with the present concept of the term, Kubiak describes that, "In the work of some recent writers, narrative is not merely story-telling, or even simply linguistic, but is a structuring principle that precedes language, even gives it birth" (295). Kubiak criticizes the idea of theories that link identity creation with language, because he bases his argument on Roland Barthes's argument that narrativity is universal and is just simply there (Barthes 79). Kubiak explains that,

> Some recent narrative theory, in fact, attempts to rethink the bias of some
> eighty years of theoretical and philosophic thought that locates the
> principle of human identity-in-creation in language, or the language–like
> activity of mind. (Kubiak 295)

Kubiak uses this to argue that narrativity is present before language and that to disrupt narrativity is to disrupt body and soul. Nevertheless, in the argument presented here, it does not matter which came first, language or narrative. Because of the manner in which the fictional terrorists are constructed, both narrative and language are intricately linked with their identity. The fictional terrorists come into existence through the language and narrative of the text, and their identity is linked to their cause, which is what they attempt to communicate. In addition, it is not only narrativity that plays a central role, but also illocutionary and / or perlocutionary acts, and performatives linked to the representation of terrorism as communication achieved through the use of terrorists as main characters.

In the first scenes of the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* Group 36 comes into existence immediately linked through language and a narrative to the cause for which it is fighting. Group 36 introduces itself not through its individual members, but through the cause for which they are collectively fighting. The first thing that is presented is a drawn map of Kreuzberg, the area of Berlin where the group is active. Through a short synopsis, the viewer becomes aware of the group's past, present, and future, which is entirely linked to its cause. Their cause consists of fighting against the Berlin Senate, which intends to demolish old buildings in order to build new ones. The members of Group 36 believe in preserving the buildings. So far, the group has been unsuccessful; however, they keep persistently fighting, which becomes apparent when the movie cuts to a scene where the group is involved in a violent demonstration. The transition from past to present is accomplished through the burning of the map, which illustrates the continuity of the narrative. After the map is burned, the present situation where Group 36 is involved in a violent demonstration against the police is shown. Tim, one of the group members who was narrating their story, stops talking, and the present situation of the group is shown only through images. Finally, the future of the group is shown after they have disbanded. Most of the members have left the terrorist group and have integrated into society. However, two of the group's members have stayed together and are still fighting for the cause.

Similarly, the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* links the group to its cause in the first scenes of the film through a narrative that points to the past, present, and future of this cause. The present is shown through the bank robbery; the past demonstrates how Rita and her friends fit into a larger context that shares an ideology; and Rita's letter to

Tatjana introduces a future that the viewer of the film has not yet seen. Even though the viewer gets a glimpse of the future of Rita's life, the letter written by Rita is intended to explain to her friend why she was a member of a terrorist group. There is a progression from the universal down to the individual. The group's ideology is not shown in isolation, but as a universal ideology of leftist groups. The books, music, posters, and magazines link the group to the larger leftist fight for social justice. Not only do these objects show that there has been a past communication of the group's cause and ideology, through images and written and spoken words, but that communication of the cause is the ultimate goal of the group.

Unlike the two movies discussed above, the novel *Rosenfest* does not introduce the reader to the terrorists by their cause, their ideology or even by their actual names, but rather by an epigraph that foreshadows the fate of the terrorists. The epigraph is about Hänsel and Gretel, which evokes the familiarity of a German fairytale, a German literary tradition from the Romantic period. A modern fairy tale is developed without a happy end because the fate of Andreas and Gudrun is already foreshadowed in this epigraph: "*Als Hänsel gefangengenommen wurde, ging Gretel ins Kaufhaus, um sich eine rote Bluse zu kaufen. Als Gretel an der Kasse gefangengenommen wurde, sagte sie zu den Häschern, was für ein Glück, und sie gab die Bluse zurück*" (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 7). The end that is foreshadowed is an end that is unavoidable because the story about Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin has already been written. Not only has the story of Andreas and Gudrun already been written in the history books, but as Scholz points out, they made themselves into a myth which does not evolve (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 218). This epigraph does not focus on the fact that Andreas and Gudrun are terrorists, but it is rather

their status as a myth that is being introduced. The introduction of the myth is central to Scholz's claim that he is trying to disrupt the established narrative around Gudrun and Andreas. The myth is also central because Andreas and Gudrun cannot escape the image they constructed of themselves or the image constructed by the press. Scholz explains,

> Nun zum Märchen. Märchen erzählen das, was sich alle erzählen. Und sie sind ganz und gar nicht märchenhaft. Lüge, Gemeinheit, Hinterhalt, Tod, etc. sind ihre Themen. Märchen sind in der Regel grausam, sie dienen dazu, das schlechte Leben in der Gewalt zu haben. Was tut man wenn man sich Hans und Grete nennt? (Hänsel und Gretel) Wenn man sich einen Namen gibt wie Rote Armee Fraktion? (Klingt wieder ironisch) Wenn man sich soweit stilisiert, diese Stilisierung erfolgreich aufgenommen wird und millionenfach zirkuliert, dass man am Ende tot sein und ja zu seinem eigenen Mythus sagen muss? (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 218)

The introductory epigraph of *Rosenfest* sets up the main characters as they have portrayed themselves, as a myth. As Scholz explains this mythologizing is a stylization, which, after the members of the RAF constructed it of themselves, went beyond their control, and they had no choice but to accept the narrative that they had constructed around themselves. In order for Scholz to be able to tell a story about Andreas and Gudrun he has to break this myth, which he does through the structure of the narrative in *Rosenfest*. Through this technique, not only is the inevitable end of Andreas and Gudrun foreshadowed, but also the central position of communication, which Scholz accomplishes through the flexibility of the narrative, is introduced. One additional

communicative aspect that is highlighted in this novel is the necessity of explaining the actions performed within the novel.

The beginning of *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* by Ulrike Edschmid seems to go in the opposite direction as that of the other narratives analyzed in this chapter. In the beginning of this biography, Edschmid tells the reader that she wants to tell a story while avoiding the term "Terroristin," giving the appearance that she is not starting with the cause and ideology of these women. Edschmid interjects her own ideology and her own cause in the preface of the biographies, which is intended to tell the reader what her goal is and indirectly guide the reading, which is also the way in which Edschmid tries to control the process of communication. By trying to control the process of communication she is trying to make sure that the biography is understood as intended. Also, in both biographies, Edschmid focuses on elements that could be used as an explanation as to why Katharina and Astrid were drawn to the cause of the RAF. Even though Edschmid writes the individual stories of Katharina and Astrid, she does not use their names within the biographies only the pronoun "sie" to refer to them. By not referring to them, she generalizes the experiences.

Communication itself and the communication of the women's past is central to the biography Edschmid writes, which is illustrated through the parallel function of her and Katharina de Fries's writing. Katharina de Fries visits prisons with the intent to have the inmates write down their violent actions on paper. This mirrors Edschmid's own goal of writing down the terrorists' stories, in order to communicate the history of an individual. Edschmid describes Katharina's efforts as follows,

68

[Katharina] […] war in einem offiziell von der Justiz genehmigten Projekt

tätig, das von Ärzten und Psychologen initiiert worden war. Zusammen

mit Schrifstellerfreunden versuchte sie, eine literarische Gruppe im

Zuchthaus Tegel aufzubauen. Sie regten die Gefangenen dazu an, ihre

Lebensgeschichten zu erzählen und aufzuschreiben, und publizierten sie in

einem Buch. (46)

Katharina de Fries attempts to have inmates write down their life stories, which

Edschmid also does with these biographies. This section exemplifies Scanlan's theory of

the position of the writer in relation to the terrorists, due to the parallel intentions of

Edschmid and Katharina in focusing on the stories of the individual. Edschmid sets up

her "cause" in her preface, where she not only provides an explanation of why she wrote

down these biographies, but also how they should be read, giving these biographies a

propagandistic character, as propaganda attempts to distort information for the author's

purpose. These characteristics are also associated with perlocutionary acts, because

propaganda is used to persuade an interlocutor of the message as it is intended.

Terrorism in these films and texts analyzed here is represented as a form of

communication that begins with written or spoken language. The fictional terrorists come

into existence in the beginning of the narrative through the cause for which they are

fighting. The authors create a terrorist narrative where the viewer and spectator are an

integral part of the story. The fictional terrorists, whose goal is to communicate their

cause, which in turn communicates their identity, drive the story. That the

communication in these films and texts is narrative terrorism is not only shown through

the main characters, who are terrorists trying to communicate, but also by the integral

part played by the viewers and readers of these narratives. The viewer is made an integral part of the communication, because it is the viewer who is being addressed.

In the film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* even though the group does not refer to itself as a terrorist group, which terrorists never do, and the official description of them in the beginning of the film does not use the term terrorists to describe them, their actions make them a terrorist group as demonstrated by the use of violence in furthering the cause for which they are fighting. Group 36 fights for its cause with violence, by (1) being involved in a violent demonstration, (2) making an educational video that not only shows how to find targets for violent acts that have symbolic meaning, but also teaches how to make a bomb, which (3) the group exemplifies by making a bomb and setting it in an abandoned house. The group is only referred to as a terrorist group later in the movie by Dr. Henkel, a younger BKA[10] officer, who links the terrorist groups to the cause for which they are fighting. Dr Henkel says, "Dabei handelt es sich um besonders gefährliche Terroristen. [...] Und vergessen Sie nicht: Diese Leute glauben wirklich an etwas. Das macht sie so unberechenbar" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). The danger and unpredictability of the group stems from the cause for which they are fighting, which in turn is also their identity, their reason to exist.

In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* the group again does not refer to itself as a terrorist group. The reader brings this information to the movie prompted by the group robbing the bank and introducing itself saying, "Ihr kennt uns aus der Tagesschau und aus der Bildzeitung" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). As in Schnitzler's film, the terrorists in this film once again do not call themselves terrorists, they are labeled as such by the

---

[10] BKA stands for Bundeskriminalamt, which is the German FBI.

news. The viewer of the film has to be aware of the role of the news media in Germany during the RAF era, which created images of the terrorists during the 1960s and 1970s for which they were criticized.[11] In addition, the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* is loosely based on the book *Nie war ich furchtloser,* which is the biography of Inge Viett,[12] who was an actual German terrorist. This is information, which when brought to this film further defines the group as terrorists.

Similarly, the novel *Rosenfest* is a fictionalized account of two actual notorious German terrorists; however, this information has to be supplied by the reader. The main characters in this novel are Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin; however, Scholz mostly mentions their first names throughout the novel. The beginning of the novel also recounts the moment when during the student demonstration against the Shah Benno Ohnesorg is shot. This is seen as a key moment in the emergence of the RAF. Even though the text eventually shows, through the press and through Gudrun and Andreas's actions, that they are terrorists, the information the texts are trying to communicate would be incomplete without the reader having independent knowledge of Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin.

Even though Edschmid, Scholz and Schlöndorff base their stories on real terrorists and events familiar to the reader, Scanlan warns that the writer brings his or her own agenda to the text. Scanlan describes this as follows,

---

[11] The role of the press and its influence in German society was criticized by Heinrich Böll in his book *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum oder Wie Gewalt entstehen und wohin sie führen kann.* Nigel Harris, interpreting Böll's preface, describes the influence of the *Bild-Zeitung* in his article "'Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum': The Problem of Violence" as follows, "the *Bild-Zeitung*, the sensationalist tabloid which, in the early 1970s, regularly sold over four million copies a day and consequently exerted an enormous influence on public opinion in the Federal Republic" (198).

[12] Inge Viett was born in 1944 in Schleswig Holstein and became a member of the *Bewegung 2. Juni* in 1972. Viett defected to the GDR in 1982. She was arrested in 1990 after the Fall of the Berlin Wall (2).

The terrorist acts a writer describes may take place in his or her homeland and may be of great immediate importance to the novelist. On the other hand, literary depictions of terrorism often displace some other scene of violence. In the imagined act of terrorism, a writer may assess his or her own political commitments, actions, and failures. Thus the terrorist novel opens itself up to more general questions about the writer's ability to understand, respond to and influence politics. (6-7)

Writers' comment on terrorist writing and the terrorists' cause are specifically illustrated through Edschmid's and Scholz's remarks on their own works and what they are attempting to accomplish through their writings. This mirrors the act of terrorism in terms of creating an attack and then supplementing it with explanatory material, which also mirrors the attempt to execute a perlocutionary act, and in order for it to have the intended effect on the interlocutor, it is accompanied by a locutionary act to guarantee that the interlocutor understands the message as intended. In Scholz's and Edschmid's case they write a terrorist novel or biography and supplement these with commentary to make sure the reader understands what they are doing. Therefore, the reader needs to keep in mind that even though Scholz's novel, Edschmid's biography, Schlöndorff's and Schnitzler's films deal with fictional and non-fictional terrorists, and the terrorists' quest to communicate their cause, the terrorist novel can be representative of the "writer's own political commitment," which manifests itself in these texts through terrorism being represented as a form of communication.

Finally, that these texts and films deal with terrorism as a form of communication is illustrated through the role of the reader or viewer as the interlocutor of the message.

As I mentioned in the introduction, Kubiak and Berendse attribute an integral role to the spectator of a terrorist attack. This stems from the story terrorists create through their attack, which is specifically geared to a spectator who cannot withdraw him or herself from the story. This integral role of the spectator is accomplished in Scholz's novel, Edschmid's biography, and Schlöndorff's film through the information the reader or film viewer brings to the narrative in order to complete the story. However, the spectator/reader is not supposed to be free to interpret the narrative, which is illustrated through the emphasis on the control of the process to communicate. By attempting to control the process of communication a certain interpretation is expected. The process by which the interlocutor is made to understand the message is linked at first to the perlocutionary act, which requires the act to be understood by itself and a certain effect on the interlocutor is expected. In order for the message to be understood as intended a locutionary act supplements the perlocutionary act.

In Schnitzler's film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* the viewers do not play an active role in creating a story; however, they are made an integral part of the narrative because of the use of Group 36's propaganda film. The passivity of the viewer is explained by Louis Giannetti in his book *Understanding Movies.* He explains that, "Propaganda, no matter how artistic, doesn't usually involve free and balanced evaluations" (175). Even though the viewer does not provide information to create the narrative, he or she is still made an integral part of this communication, because this propaganda made by Group 36 establishes and guides the opinion of the viewer throughout the film.

In the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* the viewers play an active role in creating the narrative through the information they bring to the movie, and their

knowledge of not only German culture, but also of leftist ideology. As mentioned above, when the group introduces itself they mention the "Tagesschau," a reputable news show on TV, and the *Bildzeitung*, a not-so-reputable magazine, which was part of the Springer Press, and as previously stated, was criticized during the RAF years for creating sensationalized images of the terrorists. Furthermore, the terrorists never refer to themselves as terrorists, but they allude to their role as such by stating that the people already know them from the "Tagesschau." This means that the viewer has to bring this information to the film to construct the identity of the terrorists. In addition, to be able to understand the group's ideology, one needs to be familiar with leftist iconic figures, works, and music. For instance, when the group is planning Andy's escape from jail, the camera pans through the room they are sitting in and the viewer sees several books, records, movies, and posters all representative, as previously described, of the group's leftist ideology, which the viewer has to recognize as such. In addition, the viewers are put into a critical position, because they have to decide if the terrorists' actions are noble, such as Rita giving the money she stole from the bank to a bum, or if the terrorists' actions are self serving, such as Rita's claim that she is doing everything for the love of her boyfriend.

In Scholz's narrative, the reader also plays an active part in completing the narrative. When Scholz introduces his main characters, he provides mostly only their first names, Andreas and Gudrun. He situates them in the middle of a student demonstration, during which Benno Ohnesorg is killed by the police. This narrative is not complete if the reader is not familiar with Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin, two of the most notorious German terrorists and the leaders of the RAF. In addition, the killing of Benno

Ohnesorg is the moment when terrorist cells split from the student movement. As mentioned in the introduction, Stefan Aust describes this moment in his book *Der Baader Meinhof Komplex* as follows, "Der 2. Juni 1967 wurde zum historischen Datum, zum Wendepunkt im Denken und Fühlen vieler, nicht nur der Studenten" (Aust 59). The role the reader plays in the novel *Rosenfest* is similar to the role Silke Emde ascribes to the viewer of the movie *Marianne and Juliane.* This film "themati[zes] German terrorism of the '70s and its origin" (270). In Emde's article "Intertextuality as Political Strategy in Margarethe von Trotta's Film *Marianne and Juliane*" she claims that the viewer adds an intertext to the movie's narrative. She describes this process as follows,

> The process of activating intertext does not mean merely providing the historical background which a typical German viewer might possess watching the film. Instead the very act of filling in, of adding the intertext to the film, is itself an act that produces meaning. It means, in Roland Barthes's sense, rewriting the text. On the most basic level the film leaves the production of meaning to the reader, and the film becomes an example of a truly "writerly" text. (270)

In the novel *Rosenfest,* the reader also has to be familiar with the established narrative of Andreas and Gudrun and recognize it in order to be able to see the changes made to the story. Because the reader has to bring very specific information to the text, which points to Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin, in order for the narrative to be able to communicate a "complete" story, the reader has been made an integral part of the story. Scholz's technique of creating a story through collage also involves the reader, because

he or she brings bits and pieces to the narrative. This makes the reader an integral part of this narrative as well.

Scholz's novel also disrupts what is considered traditional narrative ideas, a characteristic Kubiak attributes to the terrorist novel. Kubiak explains, "[t]he tendency of some terrorist novels to flirt with the edges of narrative stability suggests the final form of terrorist narrative" (297). Scholz's novel, and to a certain degree Schlöndorff's film, represent terrorism not only as a form of communication through their main characters, but also through the narratives they create. Scholz's narrative collage and Schlöndorff's film collage of actions both require information brought by the viewer and information provided by the group itself to illustrate the representation of terrorism as a form of communication.

This chapter has shown how Volker Schlöndorff's drama *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* Gregor Schnitzler's comedy *Was tun wenn's brennt*, the novel *Rosenfest* by Leander Scholz and the biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* by Ulrike Edschmid represent terrorism as a form of communication that starts with language. Communication in these texts is not limited to written and spoken language, but also extends to the performative qualities of the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The authors and directors link the fictional terrorists' identity to communication, and the goal of these fictional characters is to communicate their cause by all means possible. However, prior to resorting to violence, they use language in order to communicate this cause and achieve the sought-for subsequent effect. The communicative aspect of their speech acts is also highlighted through the role of an interlocutor, which in these texts and films is the reader or viewer of these texts or films.

The readers and viewers have to bring certain information to the texts in order to recognize the changes made to the dominant narrative, and they are made part of the narratives and the process of communication by having to follow certain instructions.

Even though the works analyzed here focus on terrorism as a form of communication, specifically illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, the next chapter will try to answer the questions: (1) How are these acts used to communicate and what goal is to be achieved? (2) How does the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts arise? (3) How does the tension between these acts disrupt the narrative?

CHAPTER III

TERRORISM AND THE TENSIONS BETWEEN ILLOCUTIONARY AND

PERLOCUTIONARY ACTS

The representation of terrorism as a form of communication, specifically as illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, that drives the narrative established in chapter II through Schlöndorff's drama *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* Schnitzler's comedy *Was tun wenn's brennt*, Scholz's novel *Rosenfest* and Edschmid's biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten*, highlights Scanlan's argument that writers comment on writing and language through terrorist themes (1). Even though the texts and films seem to connect perlocutionary to illocutionary acts, a tension arises between these speech acts. This chapter will focus on the tension that arises between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts not only through the inability of the fictional terrorists to create change but also through their inability to gain control over the process of communication.

As discussed in chapter II, the films and texts mentioned above represent terrorism as a combination of illocutionary and perlocutionary acts; however, following Austin's argument "terrorism" would be categorized as a perlocutionary act, because of the subsequent effects expected from it. Austin distinguishes between the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts as follows,

> [...] we distinguished the locutionary act (and within it the phonetic, the phatic, and the rhetic acts) which has meaning; the illocutionary acts which has a certain force in saying something; the perlocutionary act which is the achieving of certain effects by saying something. (Austin, *How to* 121)

78

From this description one could argue that terrorism could be categorized as an illocutionary act, because a certain force is associated with the manner in which the terrorists communicate their message; however, the main goal of terrorism is to achieve a certain subsequent effect, which in the films and texts analyzed here is the quest of the fictional terrorists to create change; therefore "terrorism" is a perlocutionary act. For instance, in the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, the fictional terrorists are trying to fight against the capitalist society of West Germany in order to persuade other West-Germans to create a society were money does not rule the world.

"Terrorism" is not only a perlocutionary act because of the subsequent effects associated with it, but also because perlocutionary acts do not have to be tied to linguistics. Austin explains that, "[i]t is characteristic of perlocutionary acts that the response achieved, or the sequel, can be achieved additionally or entirely by non-locutionary means: thus intimidation may be achieved by waving a stick or pointing a gun" (Austin, *How to* 119). This description not only shows that perlocutionary acts can achieve their goals without a linguistic component, but it also highlights through the words "may be achieved" that the response sought-for is not guaranteed. Searle and Vanderveken further describe this problem as follows,

> Perlocutionary effects may be achieved intentionally, as, for example,
> when one gets one's hearer to do something by asking him to do it, or
> unintentionally, as when one annoys or exasperates one's audience
> without intending to do so. (12)

The reason why the subsequent effects of a perlocutionary act cannot be controlled is because a perlocutionary act is non-conventionalizable. A perlocutionary act is non-

conventionalizable because there are no conventions in which, for instance, persuasion of an individual is guaranteed, whereas there are conventions that say when something has been "stated" or somebody has been informed (12).

If "terrorism" is categorized as a perlocutionary act, the questions that arise are: (1) what is the role of the illocutionary and (2) what is the tension that arises between the perlocutionary and the illocutionary? "Terrorism" is a perlocutionary act because the terrorists' goal is that their actions achieve a certain subsequent effect. The terrorists expect a very specific outcome and this expectation becomes a problem to them, because the subsequent effect of a perlocutionary act can be intentional but it can also be unintentional. For instance, in the novel *Rosenfest*, Andreas and Gudrun set a bomb in a warehouse to make clear the realities of the Vietnam War to a West German audience. However, instead of achieving their goal, Gudrun and Andreas are labeled dangerous terrorists, which is the unintended consequence of their actions. In order to overcome the problem, that the subsequent effects of a perlocutionary act are not guaranteed, the fictional terrorists attempt to take control of the process of communication. In order to take control of the process of communication and guarantee the intended outcome, characteristics that are part of illocutionary acts are introduced to the perlocutionary act. The characteristics are the "illocutionary force components" and are used to conventionalize the perlocutionary act in order to guarantee that the message has the intended subsequent effect.

The first step of the "illocutionary force components" used to control the process of communication is the "illocutionary point." As explained in the introduction of this dissertation, Searle and Vanderveken develop a series of "illocutionary force

80

components" that need to be met in order for the illocutionary act to be non-defective and successful. The first and most important component is the "illocutionary point." Searle and Vanderveken explain that each illocutionary act has a specific point that is inherent to the utterance. For example, a command is used to get people to do something. The success of the utterance is determined by the achievement of the specific point of the utterance. Searle and Vanderveken caution that a speaker might use a certain utterance to achieve other goals, for instance one might promise something in order to keep the hearer's attention; however, that is not inherent to a promise and therefore it is not the illocutionary point of the promise. An illocutionary point cannot be changed by the intentions of the speaker (13-14).

One important aspect to remember when analyzing the individual texts and films is that the fictional terrorists use perlocutionary acts in order to convey their message. In order for the message to have the intended subsequent effect the perlocutionary act has to be conventionalized, which the fictional terrorists attempt to do by introducing characteristics attributed to the illocutionary act. According to Searle and Vanderveken one can achieve a perlocutionary effect through an illocutionary act, such as "[when] making a promise (illocutionary) [one] may reassure or create expectations in [one's] audience (perlocutionary)" (11). However, the reason why the illocutionary act is introduced in the texts and films analyzed here is because of the force it is supposed to add to the perlocutionary act, which in turn is supposed to help the fictional terrorists accomplish their goals. In the films and texts analyzed here the fictional terrorists use perlocutionary acts and attribute them with illocutionary force components, which they redefine in order to control the process of communication.

The goal of the terrorists represented in the films and texts analyzed in this dissertation is to create change, which is shown in a variety of ways. In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the group's ultimate goal is to change the capitalist West German society into a society where money does not rule. Change, as an integral part of the terrorists' goal, is already present at the beginning of the movie when Rita, Friederike and Detlev are planning Andy's escape from jail. The camera pans through the room in which Rita, Friederike and Detlev are sitting, and as mentioned in chapter II, there are books, posters, records, and other materials supporting the leftist ideology of the group. One of these works is the poem "Wenn das Bleibt, was ist"[13] (1936) by Bertolt Brecht,[14] which is printed on a piece of paper and taped to the wall of the room. This poem highlights the quest to create change through violence. The poem reads,

> Wenn das bleibt, was ist
>
> Seid ihr verloren
>
> Euer Freund ist der Wandel
>
> Euer Kampfgefährte ist der Zwiespalt.
>
> Aus dem Nichts
>
> Müßt ihr etwas machen, aber das Großmächtige
>
> Soll zu nichts werden.
>
> Was ihr habt, das gebt auf und nehmt euch
>
> Was euch verweigert wird. (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*)

---

[13] The poem "Wenn das bleibt, was ist" appears in Brecht's cycle of poems *Gedichte 1933-1938.* According to Howe, the poem "make[s] the reader aware of his surroundings as a historical condition in need of alteration" (294-295).

[14] Not only were Bertolt Brecht's works significant in that they had become part of the regular reading materials for the RAF members incarcerated at Stammheim, but also Ulrike Meinhof wrote some poems that were based on Brecht's poetry (Aust 274, 494).

In Brecht's poem the lyrical voice addresses a group of people with whom it is familiar, because of the use of the pronoun "ihr." The lyrical voice advocates for change, which will happen out of "nothing." At the same time the goal of "greatness" will not happen and become "nothing." Geoffrey Howes's analysis of this poem highlights the importance of the word "friend." Howes describes in his article "Classicism and Modernity in Bertolt Brecht's Poetry" the role of the word as follows,

> The lexical items that do appear in the poem derive meaning only from implied relationships. A "friend" is a friend *to* someone; likewise "comrade in arms" implies other comrades. These terms refer in turn to "Wandel," which must be from one thing to something else, and to "Zwiespalt," which must be between two things. These things are "ihr" and "das Großmächtige," which rely on their opposition for meaning. (286)

As described by Howes, change is a central theme in this poem, which is also what the fictional terrorists in the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* strive for. This poem also exhibits characteristics of a perlocutionary act, because it is calling for action and there is an expectation that the interlocutor will make this change happen. In the context of the movie, the poem has been successful because Rita and the terrorist group she belongs to are fighting for change and are taking back what they feel has been taken from them.

The perlocutionary aspect of Brecht's poem is highlighted through the revolutionary ideals within the poem, which are further described by Howes, who explains that,

Brecht's works have often been characterized as having classical features;

didacticism, utilitarianism, a striving for permanent value – all these are

classical in the sense that they put literature to work for a recognized, if

unrealized, greater good. (283)

The call to create change within Brecht's poem, and Howes's interpretation that

characterizes Brecht's poem, as working for an unrealized "greater good," is also

mirrored in the representation of the fictional terrorists within the film. Howes describes

the power of Brecht's poem to call for change as follows, "[t]he tools of poetry are

stripped to their essentials for this incitement to action" (286). Howes's description points

to the perlocutionary effect of the poem because the incitement to action is the focus of

this poem. The fictional terrorists, in the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* take this call

and fight against capitalism to create a socialist society, which they see as a greater good.

These ideals are also performed by Rita after the initial bank robbery, which further

highlights the perlocutionary characteristics of the poem. After Rita leaves the bank she

fills the hat of a bum on the street with the money stolen from the bank. This scene casts

the terrorists in a positive light, through their "Robin Hood" type actions and their fight

for the "greater good" of society, which is exemplified by Rita's gesture toward the bum

on the street. This scene also further highlights the perlocutionary effect of the poem,

because perlocutionary acts can convey their message entirely through non-locutionary

ways.

Even though the terrorists are following the advice of the lyrical voice in Brecht's

poem, there is also the implication that, from the point of view of the terrorists,

communication through not only the poem but through the different works that have been

placed in the room has failed. The poem, as mentioned before, is situated in the beginning

of the film, next to books, music and posters, that are connected to the leftist ideology of

Rita and her group. These works illustrate that there has been an attempt to communicate

the leftist ideology through language; however, according to the fictional terrorists, this

communication has failed, because German literature has failed to change West German

capitalist society against which Rita and her group are still fighting. The failure of this

communication is linked to the expectation the fictional terrorists have of literature,

which is connected to perlocutionary acts, because their characteristic is the subsequent

effects of the utterances made.

     The expectations of literature to create change and the failure to achieve this

change are not unique to this film and were a source of frustration felt by students in

Germany during the 1970s. The student movement's frustration was directed at

literature[15] and its role in society. Johanna Knoll points out in her article, "Fiktion eines

Berichts: Narrative Reflexe sozialgeschichtlicher Konstellationen in Heinrich Bölls *Die

verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*" that,

> Plötzlich aber hieß es in den 70er Jahren, besonders von Seiten der
>
> Studentenbewegung, dass Schriftsteller nutzlos seien; sie trieben - so hieß
>
> es - Dinge, die mit dem wahren Leben nichts zu tun hätten und trügen
>
> nichts zur Veränderung der Gesellschaft bei. (116)

---

[15] The failure of literature to create change is not only part of the frustrations felt by the students during the student movement, but it is also a way in which communication is developed within the RAF. Ulrike Meinhof's writings are used to communicate the sentiments of the group to the general public and as mentioned in the previous footnote Meinhof rewrites known works, such as Brecht's poetry, to communicate their cause. In addition, after Gudrun Ensslin's death over 450 books were found in her cell including Hermann Melville's *Moby Dick*, which was used to shape communication among the Stammheim inmates (Aust 292, 494).

Knoll asserts not only that writers are supposed to be able to contribute to the change of society, but also that the students felt that there was a disconnect between literature and "real life." This can be deduced from Knoll's description of the students' opinion. According to the students, writers did nothing that had anything to do with real life. In other words, their writings did not connect with the experiences of the students. Literature is not connected to "real life" and fails to create change; therefore, it makes writers useless in the eyes of the student revolutionaries.

The expectation of literature not only to create change in "reality," but to be "reality," is exemplified in the life of Katharina de Fries, as discussed by Ulrike Edschmid in *Frau mit Waffe*: *Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten.* In Katharina's life, the connection between literature and her experiences is illustrated through her choice of readings. After the war, Katharina reads about the horrors of war in books. Edschmid describes that, "[s]ie [Katharina] beschäftigte sich mit den Grausamkeiten zu denen Menschen fähig waren, und war davon überzeugt, daß sie der Vergangenheit angehörten" (20). Katharina was convinced that the atrocities she read about in books were over. Katharina at first does not differentiate between the real world and the literary world. She assumes, because events have been written about, they are in the past. However, after she starts realizing through her life experiences that this is not the case, her world splits into two opposites – the literary world, which is the world of language, and the world she lives in, which is the world where language fails. Ferdinand de Saussure describes some fundamental misconceptions about language in his lectures on linguistics, which were published posthumously in *Grundfragen der Allgemeinen*

Sprachwissenschaft, before developing his own theory on the signified, signifier and sign. Saussure describes the connection of the signifier and signified to the sign as follows,

> Das Band, welches das Bezeichnete mit der Bezeichnung verknüpft, ist
>
> beliebig; und da wir unter Zeichen das durch die assoziative Verbindung
>
> einer Bezeichnung mit einem Bezeichneten erzeugte Ganze verstehen, so
>
> können wir dafür auch einfacher sagen: das sprachliche Zeichen ist
>
> beliebig. (79)

Saussure describes that there is the misconception that in language words match directly with an object or idea (77). Because of this perceived connection, there is the erroneous thought that the connection is very simple. Saussure's concepts of sign, signifier, and signified can shed light on the problems that Katharina de Fries has with language. The misconception that signified and signifier match directly and that the sign is directly linked to the referent is further oversimplified in Katharina de Fries's life, because she does not make a separation. For Katharina words are reality and even when she realizes that this is not the case, she does not separate them, but tries to force a connection herself.

Katharina does not accept the separation of words from what they represent, and from the "reality" in which she lives. This inability to connect words to "reality" comes from the expectation Katharina has of language to mirror what she perceives as "real." Searle and Vanderveken argue that there are only four directions of fit in language. The fourth direction of fit in language is "the null or empty direction of fit," which describes the relationship of language and its goal as follows, "[t]here is no question of achieving success of fit between the propositional content and the world, because its general success of fit is presupposed by the utterance" (53). As an example of this direction of fit

Searle and Vanderveken use "expressive illocutionary forces." Central to these illocutionary forces is that they contain a "belief" and a "desire." Searle and Vanderveken explain,

> [...] the belief has the mind-to-world direction of fit and the desire has the world-to-mind direction of fit, but the point of the speech act is not to express that belief and desire but rather to express the state of sorrow, pleasure, gratitude, etc., which presupposes the truth of the belief and involves an expression of that desire. (94)

Katharina expects language to express the state of the world; however, she also perceives that there is a gap between the world of literature and the "actual" world, which creates a binary split. Katharina believes that literature represents a changed world, and therefore language has active characteristics; on the other hand, the world is "passive" because change is not occurring. Katharina gives literature active attributes, because as described above, she expects that the violence she has read about has already happened, and should therefore not be present in "real life." This binary division is further described, by Edschmid, through the experiences of Katharina during her marriage. Edschmid describes Katharina's experiences as follows,

> [t]agsüber lebte sie [Katharina] in einer Welt von Büchern, in die sie sich seit ihrer Kindheit stets zurückziehen konnte. Wenn sie von dort hin in die wirkliche Welt kam, in die Nächte, die sie am Fenster saß, hatte sie keine Worte. (29)

Katharina "lives" in the books she reads, which makes the world of literature the active part of Katharina's life. When she is not reading, she only "sits" and has no words. In

Katharina's experience, language creates a literary world in which it functions and is active, but in Katharina's "real" life literature has not only failed but she has no words available to her. Literature, in this case, provides the propositional content and in Katharina's mind there is no question of the success of fit, because she expects literature to be able to create this change. However, Katharina's expectations of literature to have a certain force and achieve specific subsequent effects are misplaced, because she is attributing both illocutionary and perlocutionary characteristics to literature.

Katharina tries to overcome the failure of literature to create change by taking control of the process of writing down stories. Katharina starts working with incarcerated individuals with the goal of having them write down their life stories. Her objective in writing down the stories of incarcerated individuals who have already committed a violent crime parallels the books she read about the horrors of war. Katharina's efforts are described as follows, "[s]ie [Katharina] regte die Gefangenen dazu an, ihre Lebensgeschichte zu erzählen und aufzuschreiben, und publizierte sie in einem Buch" (46). Even though the books Katharina had read in the past failed to create change, she still attempts to connect the "real" world and the world of written books through language. Katharina's efforts can be interpreted as a way to take control of literature in order to connect it to the real world.

Katharina is trying to take control over the process to write down stories, in particular stories of incarcerated individuals, because she believes that language and literature are active in creating change and communicating. In order to demonstrate this, Katharina works with the justice system she believes does not care about the story of individuals. Katharina's view of the justice system is described as follows, "[e]inerseits

erkannte sie [Katharina] die Justiz nicht an; sie verstand sie als Klassenjustiz - ein

Apparat, innerhalb dessen sich niemand Mühe machte, den einzelnen Menschen und

seine Geschichte zu sehen" (46). In this system, Katharina attempts to have prisoners

write down their life's story, which stands in opposition to how Katharina defines the

justice system. In addition, Katharina chooses to work with incarcerated individuals

whose violence lies in the past; therefore, she gives the illusion that the books she

publishes are connected to the "real world" because the violence perpetrated by the

incarcerated individuals is in the past. Katharina takes it upon herself to make the

connections, which she expects literature to have with the "real" life.

The theory and expectations of literature to create change are not only highlighted

within the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* and Edschmid's biography on Katharina de

Fries, but also through Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest*. Scholz tries to use literature in

order to change the dominant representation of Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin. In

order to take control of the representation of Andreas and Gudrun, he has to remove them

from their dominant representation and create a new narrative. As discussed in chapter II,

Scholz explains in his article, "Hyperrealität oder das Traumbild der RAF," that one can

gather "more" information about the characters when they are taken out of their context

(218). The context to which Scholz refers to is the dominant representation of the past.

He describes the role of the dominant representation as follows, "[w]as sich wiederholt,

ist Erinnerung, standardisierte. Was ins kollektive Gedächtnis eingeht, ist nicht die

Historie, sondern ihre dominante Repräsentation" (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 216). Scholz

is making a separation between what happened in the past, which he defines as "history,"

and the dominant representation of the same events in the past. Scholz argues that what is

remembered is not the "history" but its dominant representation. In Baader's and Ensslin's case, this dominant representation came through the press, as well as the myth they created around themselves.

The connection, between the dominant representation of events and memory, is described by Olaf Hoerschelmann in his article "'Memoria Dextera Est': Film and Public Memory in Postwar Germany." Hoerschelmann bases his observations on the role of the press during the 1970s. He explains that, "[…] the press coverage of terrorism in the 1970s illustrates that collective memories are always inserted into the power relations of the dominant culture, which tends to structure representational techniques in its favor" (95). Parallel to Scholz's argument, Hoerschelmann asserts that "collective memories" are used; however, the dominant culture structures them in their favor. Hoerschelmann exemplifies his theory through the film *Nasty Girl*.[16] Hoerschelmann explains that, "[m]oving between popular and official memory, the film [*Nasty Girl*] ultimately illustrates the critical potential of mass-mediated remembering […]" (87). Even though the "mass-mediated remembering" Hoerschelmann describes is tied to the representation of Nazi Germany, it also parallels his previous comment and Scholz's theory specifically that what is repeated is not history but rather the remembrance of it, which in the case of the terrorists of the 1970s is heavily influenced by the media.

Scholz illustrates the challenges in overcoming not only the dominant representation of Andreas and Gudrun, but also the mythical status of these characters. As mentioned above, Scholz's comment concerning the influence of the dominant representation of Andreas and Gudrun by the press is what has influenced the official

---

[16] The film *Nasty Girl* is a comedy about a young woman who is trying to find out about the Nazi past of the people in her town. According to Hoerschelmann, the movie "is based on real events that took place in Passau, a city with very strong connections to Nazism" (87).

remembering. In addition, the myth they created around themselves has also influenced dominant narratives about terrorism in Germany. As quoted in chapter II, Scholz makes a connection between the mythification of Andreas and Gudrun and the writing of a fairy tale. To further examine the connection Scholz makes between these literary forms, a look at how these terms are being defined is needed. In the *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur* Gero Wilpert defines a fairy tale as,

> kürzere volksläufig-unterhaltende Prosaerzählung von phantast.-wunderbaren Begebenheiten und realitätsfernen Zuständen aus freier Erfindung ohne zeitl. räuml. Festlegung [...] Es unterscheidet sich vom Mythos durch das Fehlen von Götterspheren [...]. (494)

In contrast to this he defines a Myth as "zunächst mündl., oft in versch. anonymen Versionen überlieferte Erzählung von Göttern, Dämonen, Kulturheroen und Helden, [...]" (541). The connection Scholz makes is of two opposites because in the case of the fairy tale we have a story that is based on things that do not connect with reality, which mirrors the feeling many students had about literature in general. He also makes a connection with a myth which, as described by Wilpert, can be a story about "Kulturheroen" based on actual people; however, Andreas and Gudrun are not what one would consider traditional "heroes."

Scholz not only makes the connection between the fairy tale and the myth in his comment, but he also makes it within his novel *Rosenfest.* The combination of not only the myth and the fairy tale, but also historical facts and reports from the press give the novel its propositional content. The propositional content of each type of narrative is very different from each other, and through them Scholz creates a new narrative. Scholz starts

his novel with an epigraph that combines the story of Hänsel and Gretel[17] (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 7) with modern ideas. With his novel, Scholz is trying to create change in the narrative created around Andreas and Gudrun. By taking Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin out of the dominant narrative, he attempts to create a new narrative. His novel, at first glance, would seem to have succeeded in accomplishing the creation of a new narrative by interweaving literature, historical events and the fictional accounts of the characters. However, his novel ends where it began. The novel ends with Andreas being shot and Gudrun running into a department store. She takes a red blouse into a fitting room and tries it on. The police are notified and respond to arrest her. The moment of her arrest is described as follows,

> Beim Abstreifen der Bluse geht sie auf das zu, was sie im Spiegel sieht. Dann dreht Gudrun sich mit einem Mal um, so als würde sie auf der anderen Seite aus dem Spiegel wieder hinaustreten können. "Vielen Dank," sagt sie erleichtert zu der Verkäuferin, legt die Bluse neben der Lederjacke auf die Ladentheke und läßt sich ohne Widerstand von den Beamten festnehmen. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 246)

This description almost parallels the epigraph at the beginning. The language and the names have changed, but the circumstances remain the same. The mirror in the end is significant not only because of the parallel description, but also because Gudrun gives the impression that she could escape her situation by leaving this frozen identity. She speaks to her mirror image and finally decides to stay and fulfill her destiny. Hence she fulfills her role as a mythical character, which as Scholz explained she has to affirm (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 218). The mirror is also significant because it not only points to the

---

[17] A complete quote of the epigraph can be found in chapter II, page 66.

direction of fit, but just as a mirror image is reversed from the original, so has the story's propositional content been reversed.

Similar to Scholz, Ulrike Edschmid bases the biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* on two notorious terrorists, Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll. However, Edschmid is not trying to undo a dominant narrative, or compete with a dominant representation, but instead she strives to create a story for both of these women. As mentioned in chapter II, Edschmid explains in the preface of her book *Frau mit Waffe*, that the word "Terroristin" destroys the story of the individual. In order for Edschmid to write a biography for Astrid Proll and Katharina de Fries, she interviews both women. Edschmid explains that,

> Nach langen viele Wochen dauernden Gesprächen mit beiden Frauen habe ich die Texte geschrieben. Sie tragen den Blick der Zeitgenossenschaft und der Freundschaft. Jeder andere Mensch – auch die befragten – hätte eine andere Geschichte geschrieben. (Vorbemerkung)

Because the word "Terroristin" destroys the story of the individual, Edschmid has to create a story for the women. Therefore, she collects information through extensive interviews with both Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll. Afterwards, she writes their stories; however, she also explains that others, even the interviewed would have written a different story. The inability for Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll to have an individual story is not only highlighted by Edschmid's comment that the word "Terroristin" destroys the narrative of the individual, but also because they themselves would have written a different story. In addition, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Edschmid does not use the names of Katharina and Astrid within the biographies but the pronoun "sie" to referr

to them, which takes away the individual character of the story. Even though Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll cooperated in answering the questions that led Edschmid to write their stories, they lost control of the outcome of their intended communication, because they would have told a different story.

Since Edschmid's story does not match that which Katharina de Fries or Astrid Proll would have told, Edschmid blurs the lines between fiction and non-fiction. In doing so, she shifts the emphasis of the function of a "biography" from a story based on facts to a story based on her own perceptions. Edschmid's preface highlights the fact that in order to be able to tell the story of the women terrorists, she had to avoid using the term "terrorist" in order to create a new story, a story that not only redefines the women, but also redefines the narrative. However, her attempt to create a story devoid of the term "Terroristin" fails, because she includes this term at the end of both Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll's story. At the end of Katharina de Fries's biography Edschmid quotes, "Sie [Katharina] war Staatsfeindin und Terroristin. Es stand in der Zeitung und es wurde im Fernsehen gesagt" (74). In Astrid's biography, Edschmid retells what Astrid saw in the newspaper. Edschmid quotes, "[e]s stand in der Zeitung. Sie [Astrid] war Terroristin und Staatsfeindin" (153). By including the term "Terroristin" at the end of the story, she has written and repeated what the newspaper printed. In doing so, she repeats the propositional content of the dominant narrative and destroys the story of the individual, thus situating the women back into the collective of the terrorist group, and into the propositional content the word "terrorism" creates.

The propositional content created by the word "terrorism" has the opposite effect from Edschmid's point of view; rather than destroying the narrative the word creates a

negative narrative about those to whom it refers. The tensions between illocutionary and perlocutionary also already begin with the use of the term "terrorism" itself, not only because of the difficulties that arise when trying to define this term, but also because terrorists do not use this term to refer to themselves. As discussed in the beginning of this chapter "terrorism" can be characterized as a "perlocutionary act" which is used to convey a message that is supposed to create a subsequent effect without using locutionary means. On the other hand, the use of the word "terrorism" by the press/police to name the terrorists and their actions is an "illocutionary act," because it is accompanied by a force that condemns those it names as terrorists and the force that is exerted is derived from the position of authority the police/press occupy in society. Numerous studies have attempted to define the word "terrorism." C.A.J. Coady provides a summary of some of these studies in his book *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues*. Coady claims that there are over 100 definitions of this term, emphasizing the difficulties faced when trying to discuss a topic as complex as terrorism. Even though there are challenges when approaching the word "terrorism," Coady identifies two commonalities found in these definitions. These commonalities are: the negative image the term creates of terrorists, and violence (5).

The use of the word "terrorist" creates a negative image, which, from the terrorists' point of view, shows not only the failure of the word itself to be able to represent the terrorist groups, but also that society has condemned them and their actions. The force of the use of the word "terrorism" to condemn the terrorist groups is further explained by Charles Townshend, in his book *Terrorismus.* Townshend explains that, "'[t]errorist' ist […] ein Begriff, mit dem sich kaum je eine Person oder Gruppe selbst bezeichnet hat. Sie werden von anderen so genannt, in erster Linie von den Regierungen

der Staaten, denen ihr Angriff gilt" (11). Townshend's and Coady's discussion of the topic of terrorism leads to the conclusion that the words "terrorism" and "terrorist" fail to not only represent how the terrorists view both themselves and their actions, but they are also condemned by the force of the utterance. The force is derived from the position of authority of the press/police. Fritz B. Simon not only reiterates Coady's and Townshend's claims, but he further explains the impact of the use of the word in "Was ist Terrorismus? Versuch einer Defintion." Simon explains the word "terrorism" as follows,

> Untersucht man den tatsächlichen Sprachgebrauch, so fällt auf, dass die Begriffe Terrorismus oder Terrorist so gut wie nie zur Selbstbeschreibung verwendet werden. Weder Personen oder Personengruppen noch andere soziale Einheiten charakterisieren sich selbst oder ihre Aktivitäten als terroristisch. Die Bezeichnung Terrorist wird eigentlich immer als Zuschreibung an andere verwendet – ein Hinweis darauf, dass es sich dabei nicht um die neutrale Bennenung eines Phänomens handelt, sondern um eine Bewertung, genauer gesagt: eine negative Bewertung. Man gewinnt keine Freunde, keine Sympathien, wenn man als Terrorist betrachtet wird. Terroristische Aktionen werden von denen, die sie so nennen, als illegitim disqualifiziert. (13)

Simon emphasizes that the word terrorism is not just a word that refers to something but it also makes a value judgment. This value judgment is negative and has consequences in the life of the people or groups that are condemned as terrorists. It also becomes the propositional content within the dominant narrative created by the press and / or the police, even when only the idea of "terrorism" is present and not the actual word.

The force of the word "terrorism" to condemn those named by it is illustrated by the power of the press in the 1970s in creating not only negative but also sensationalized images. The mere presence of the negative narrative signals to the groups that they have failed to communicate their cause. They therefore keep creating counter-narratives to communicate about themselves. Nigel Harris points to the power of the press in his analysis of Heinrich Böll's story *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*.[18] Harris explains in his article "*Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*: The Problem of Violence" that,

> [t]hrough the juxtaposition of title, sub-title and motto he [Böll] also points to the relationship between violence, the dubious methods of the popular press, and the damaging impact both of these can have on the individual and his or her reputation. (198)[19]

Harris illustrates through the interpretation of Böll's story that the images the press creates have a damaging impact on those described. Simon attributes the same characteristics to the word "terrorism." He explains that those referred to by the word do not gain friends nor their actions sympathies. In Böll's story, Katharina is condemned by the press and instead of changing the images the press created of her she ends up committing violence sealing the negative image created of her by the press, which

---

[18] As mentioned in the introduction, Knoll analysis the story in its historical context in her article "Fiktion eines Berichts: Narrative Reflexe sozialgeschichtlicher Konstellationen in Heinrich Bölls *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum.*" Knoll highlights that because of Böll's critical approach to the topic of terrorism he is linked by the press to the terrorists. She also argues that Böll shows how those who commit terrorist acts never use the word terrorism and he defines the action of the press as a terrorist act, which the sensationalist media immediately respond against by trying to discredit Böll and linking him to the terrorists (101-102).

[19] Harris also points to the role of violence, which will be developed further in the following chapters of this dissertation.

parallels the goals and fates of the fictional terrorists in the works analyzed in this dissertation.

Calling someone a "terrorist" signals to those referred to by the word that they have failed to represent themselves and their actions. The impact of calling someone a "terrorist" can be explained through Judith Butler's book *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative.* In her book Butler asserts that "[...] by being called a name, one is also, paradoxically, given a certain possibility for social existence, initiated into a temporal life of language that exceeds the prior purposes that animated that call" (2). The "possibility for social existence" becomes problematic when the name is used to insult someone. Butler further explains,

> Imagine the quite plausible scene in which one is called a name and one turns around only to protest the name: "This is not me, you must be mistaken!" And then imagine that the name continues to force itself upon you, to delineate the space you occupy, to construct a social positionality. Indifferent to your protests, the force of interpellation continues to work. One is still constituted by discourse, but at a distance from oneself. Interpellation is an address that regularly misses its mark, it requires the recognition of an authority at the same time that it confers identity through successfully compelling that recognition. Identity is a function of that circuit, but does not preexist it. (33)

Butler's theory illustrates the position the terrorists are placed in when referred to as "terrorists," which is a position they do not feel they should occupy since it does not represent them but rather condemns them. The terrorists represented in the texts and films

analyzed in this chapter are continually trying to communicate their cause, which they feel they have failed to communicate not only when they do not achieve the sought-for subsequent effect but also when being called "terrorists." Butler explains this process as follows, "[i]f to be addressed is to be interpellated, then the offensive call runs the risk of inaugurating a subject in speech who comes to use language to counter the offensive call" (2). The terrorists are being interpellated into society through a designation which they do not feel refers to them; therefore, they continue to try to communicate their cause. By continually trying to counter what they perceive as being an offensive call they also situate those using the offensive call in a position of authority, because the "terrorists" have been given a social existence with which they do not agree and use language in order to communicate their disagreement with this name. The disagreement that arises also points to the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary characteristics of "terrorism," because the perlocutionary act of terrorism is meant to have a subsequent effect on the interlocutor, whereas the illocutionary use of the term is supposed to have a force which is derived from the position of authority occupied by the police/press. This means that if the interlocutor would be part of a terrorist group s/he would never use the word to condemn the group or the acts to which s/he belongs.

As established in chapter II, terrorism is represented as a form of illocutionary and/or perlocutionary acts in the films and texts analyzed, through the cause of the terrorists. The terrorists' identity is connected to their cause, which is in turn what they want to communicate**.** This identity is also linked to the position given to the fictional terrorists through language. When those referred to turn around and say "This is not me, you must be mistaken!" (33) they are inaugurated into society through language and, in

the case of the terrorists, by being continually referred to as what they perceive is not an accurate definition of themselves they have to keep using language in order to reposition themselves in society. If the fictional terrorists managed to successfully communicate their cause, they would cease to exist as terrorists. Consequently, successful communication is the ability to create change by having one's message become the new reality and to dissolve one's identity. As discussed previously, the novel *Rosenfest* and the biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* attach the idea of successful communication to the author's intent to change or create a narrative about individuals. In the films *Was tun wenn's brennt* and *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the possible outcome of successful communication is afforded to the viewers with a glimpse of the realization of the cause for each respective group. Before being able to look at how a possible outcome of successful communication is represented through the films and texts, the connection between the narrative the terrorists use to communicate their cause and how the terrorists create a narrative must be examined, because they illustrate the tension between the illocutionary and perlocutionary act.

In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt,* Group 36 creates a narrative about themselves through the propaganda film they make in order to (1) achieve the sought-for subsequent effect from the interlocutor and (2) to undo the negative image that has been created of them by the police. The narrative they create about themselves not only highlights the tension between "terrorism" as a perlocutionary act and "terrorism" as an illocutionary act, but it also points to Butler's arguments that one is interpellated into society when called a "name." Group 36 not only gives a background story to their struggle, but they also counter the position in society given to them by the names the

police give them. In this movie, the cause and identity of Group 36 are linked to the last of the surviving buildings, for which Group 36 is fighting. In the beginning of the film, the terrorists' identity is not only established by a voice-over narration explaining the cause for which Group 36 is fighting, but also by the demonstration in which they are participating. The actions Group 36 takes to fight against the Berlin Senate are "perlocutionary acts" because Group 36 not only tries to perform their message without words, but also they expect their actions to have the subsequent effect of it stopping the demolition of the buildings in Berlin. However, in this film they supplement the actions, which are shown in the movie, with a voice-over narration, to explain their actions, which is a locutionary act. This shows not only their cause, but also the extremes to which they will go to in order to accomplish their goals. The group's cause is to fight against the Berlin Senate's plans to demolish certain buildings in Berlin. The film starts with Tim and Maik, two members of Group 36, explaining that,

> Berlin im Sommer '87. Die Alliierten haben die Stadt fest im Griff.
> Nahezu alle besetzen Häuser sind geräumt. / - Nur ein kleiner Straßenzug
> im amerkanischen Sektor leistet immer noch Widerstand gegen die
> Räumungspläne des Berliner Senats. / - Machnowstraße, Postbezirk SO
> 36. (*Was tun wenn's brennt*)

With this introduction, the viewer not only finds out Group 36's cause, but also that they have not been successful in accomplishing their goals. The introduction explains that this is the last street that has not been evacuated and the buildings torn down. The group's determination is demonstrated by their willingness to keep fighting, even though they seem to be losing their fight. This introduction also links the actions of the groups to

perlocutionary acts, not only because they expect subsequent effects from these acts, but these acts are also supposed to convey the group's message without the need of locutionary means. The voice-over narration is a locutionary act, because it introduces the group and describes the images the viewer is seen. This and other similar efforts to connect the perlocutionary to the locutionary emphasizes the need for the group to make sure their message is understood as intended, in order to have the Berlin Senate stop the demolishing of the buildings.

Group 36 attempts to create a narrative about their identity and the cause for which they are fighting and use methods of constructing a narrative similar to those used by Scholz in the construction of his narrative. Inspector Manowski found information about the group and informed his assistant that the group used stolen films intermixed with their own propaganda. This mirrors Scholz's attempt to undo the dominant narrative, because he uses historical information intermingled with fiction. When the group makes the propaganda film, they begin by restating a police warning about their group. The film begins as follows,

> Die Bewohner der Machnostrasse haben weder Arbeit noch anständige
>
> Wohnungen. Sie ergeben sich der Trunksucht oder der Einnahme von
>
> Betäubungsmitteln. Nicht wenige dieser Chaoten machen sich
>
> Sachbeschädigung schuldig. Andere erregen öffentliches Ärgernis. Oder
>
> sie leisten gar Widerstand gegen Vollstreckungsbeamte. Diese jungen
>
> Menschen sind politisch fehlgeleitet und sexuell verwahrlost. Sie wirken
>
> ungepflegt und stellen eine Gefahr für die Stadthygiene dar. Die jungen

Menschen kann jeholfen werden. Sie sollten Sinnvolles tun, 'n jutes Buch

lesen oder 'ne kleine Bombe basteln, wa? (*Was tun wenn's brennt*)

Each member of Group 36 says one of the lines of this definition in the propaganda film,

which is accompanied by images that seem to validate the beliefs of the police. However,

at the end of the definition, the viewer learns that the group had been mocking this

definition. This is illustrated by Hotte adding that it would be a good idea for these

"young people" to build a bomb. The group tries to take control of the process to

communicate their identity and use the dominant narrative within their film in order to

undo the image created by the police through the dominant narrative. The inclusion of

how the police define Group 36 also points to the awareness of the position they occupy

in society, which they continually fight against.

The fact that Group 36 is aware of how they are being defined is also perceived

by the group as a failure to convey their message, because these definitions do not match

the cause they are pursuing and the image they construct of themselves. Group 36

attempts to create a certain image of themselves not only through their propaganda films

in order to communicate their cause, but they also try to use the press, which in this

movie is represented by the *BZ* (*Berliner Zeitung*). Even though it is the *BZ* that is used in

this film, parallels can be drawn between the role of the *BZ* and the *Bild-Zeitung* in the

1970s.[20] Hoerschelmann describes the impact the Springer Press, the publisher of both

those newspapers, had during the 1970s as follows,

---

[20] A comparison of the front pages of these newspapers shows that they are both very similar to each other in that the color red is used for their headlines and both use pictures to illustrate their headlines. Even though the *BZ* is for *Berlins größte Zeitung* and not *Bild-Zeitung* a parallel through the names can be drawn. The following websites were used to establish the similarities of the newspapers http://www.bz-berlin.de/ and http://www.bild.de/.

In the course of these [student] demonstrations, students committed acts of arson, one student was killed by the police, and popular student leader Rudi Dutschke was shot by an enraged citizen who seemed to be motivated by articles in the *Bild-Zeitung*, the most successful paper of the Springer Press. (90)

Just as Harris described previously Hoerschelmann's description points to the power the press had in creating a negative image and inciting citizens to violence. The fact that Group 36 sent their letter to the *BZ* is significant, because it is a way in which they could take control of the narratives created about them in order to sensationalize their bomb. The use of the BZ is also a way to control the propositional content and add force to their message, because as mentioned the BZ was known to sensationalize events and could make their bomb an "explosive" event in the metaphorical sense. Their strategy fails because the *BZ* ignores the letter that Group 36 has sent to them about the bomb, thus showing the powerlessness of Group 36 to gain attention from the press. Therefore, they fail to take control of the process of communication. In addition, after the group writes the letter, they destroy all materials that could lead back to them. Even though they take precautions, such as throwing the typewriter they used to write the letter into the river, the police still manage to link Group 36 to both the letter and the bomb.

In contrast to the film *Was tun wenn's brennt*, the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* illustrates how one group can occupy different positions in society, depending on how they are interpellated into it, because of the presence of two opposing narratives. These competing narratives are represented by the two German States, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). The dominant narrative,

created in the FRG, of the fictional terrorists is the one that condemns them and situates them into a negative position in society, which they continually have to counter. As previously mentioned Rita and her group support a leftist ideology and fight against the capitalistic system of the FRG. Rita and her group are labeled a terrorist group by the press, which creates the dominant narrative for the FRG. One example of the representation of Rita and her group as a terrorist group is when they help Andi escape from jail. Friederike smuggles a gun to Andi when she enters the jail as the assistant of Dr. Gruber, Andi's lawyer. Andi takes the gun and while escaping he shoots the lawyer. Rita, Andi, Detlev and Friederike escape and hide out in the GDR. While in the GDR, they watch the news program *Tagesschau*. The anchor reads the following statement,

> Dr. Gruber war bisher nicht in Terrorismus-Fällen tätig. […] Es wurde eine Großfahndung eingeleitet. Gesucht werden unter anderem: Detlev Bergamann, Joachim Klatte, Hans Jürgen Dost. Martina Lubitz. Rita Vogt. Rita Vogt hat am Ellbogen eine bemerkbare Narbe. Warnung: Diese Personen sind bewaffnet. (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*)

This warning is important because at the beginning of the movie, during the bank robbery, Rita and her group use the image that has been created about them by the media to introduce themselves. When they enter the bank they say, "Hallo Leute! Wir sind die Räuber. Los keine Dummheiten. Hände hoch. Ihr kennt uns aus der *Tagesschau* und aus der *Bildzeitung*" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). By using the narrative the press has created about them, they show that they are aware what position they occupy in society, and they attempt to change this position. Through the use of the term "Räuber," the image of the terrorists is softened and points to the Robin Hood image Rita later

illustrates through her action of giving the bum some of the money stolen from the bank. In addition, the group tries to change their image, not only by the words they use, but also by giving the victims chocolate covered marshmallows. This attempt to change the negative image the West German press creates about them fails.

In contrast to this narrative stands the narrative created through the East German state, or the GDR, because the group is given the impression that their interpellation into society is a positive one. The GDR, like the fictional terrorists, does not support the capitalistic society of West Germany, and the terrorists appear to have the same ideological ideas as those promoted in the GDR. Unlike the dominant narrative of the FRG, the dominant narrative of the GDR does not condemn the fictional terrorists, but affirms their ideological beliefs and struggle against the FRG. This is shown after Rita, Friederike and Detlev help Andi escape from jail. The group is helped by the Stasi to hide in the GDR while they are wanted in West Germany. While enjoying an afternoon outside grilling, Friederike asks Erwin, a Stasi agent, if the GDR has to extradite someone who is wanted by the West-German police. Erwin answers, "[a]ber die DDR und BRD sind ja nicht so befreundet" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). During the same conversation, Erwin further gives the impression that the dominant narrative of the GDR system does not condemn Rita and her group but supports the same ideals. Erwin wants to make sure that Rita and her group do not carry out an attack in the GDR. Andi explains to Erwin that is not their plan and emphasizes that they are on the same side of the fight. Andi reminds Erwin, "[a]ber wir haben ja den gleichen Feind. Das haben Sie doch vorhin selbst gesagt" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*).

The failure of the terrorists' perlocutionary act in this film is exemplified when the GDR system collapses. Rita leaves the terrorist group, after she shoots a French police officer for personal gain rather than in support of the cause. She defects to the GDR and lives under an assumed identity. Rita's belief in the GDR system is demonstrated through her interaction with her co-workers in each separate identity she assumes. During her life in the GDR she is given the opportunity to create an identity of her choice, which means she does not have to counter her position in society. For instance, in her first identity, she tells her co-workers that their system is so much better then the capitalist system of West Germany. When the GDR system fails, Rita is upset because she believes that the GDR system represented a society where the subsequent effects of their perlocutionary acts were reached.

Finally, the tensions between the perlocutionary and the illocutionary acts is shown in the novel *Rosenfest* through the power of the press to create not only a dominant narrative, but the force to distort images and condemn Andreas and Gudrun through the use of the word "terrorism." Scholz illustrates this attempt within the novel through the figures of Gudrun and Andreas and their fight against the images the press creates about them. Gudrun and Andreas perceive these images as a hindrance to the achievement of their goals, and therefore have to change these images before they are able to create change within society. Gudrun and Andreas feel that their identities are misunderstood by the images the press created. These images become their identities within society, and they thus need to change those images in order to reestablish their own identities and cause. The power of the press to create a negative narrative is shown in the beginning of the novel after Benno Ohnesorg is shot. Gudrun witnessed the

108

shooting and knows that what the news is reporting is a lie. She listens to the news

coverage of the event. She hears the news anchor saying, "'…die Demonstranten haben

sich nicht nur das traurige Verdienst erworben, einen Gast der Bundesrepublik

beschimpft zu haben, auf ihr Konto gehen auch ein Toter und zahlreiche Verletzte …'"

(Scholz, *Rosenfest* 41). Gudrun is outraged that the news reports are blaming the death of

Benno Ohnesorg on the students, and not on the police. The power to distort the facts, as

perceived by Gudrun, escalates when the newspaper reports on the bomb Gudrun and

Andreas set in the department store. The headline of the newspaper defines the attack as a

terrorist attack. The force of the word "terrorist" when used by the press to create images

of Andreas and Gudrun is described as follows,

> Gudrun streicht das zerknitterte Zeitungspapier glatt, als könnte sie die
>
> fetten Buchstaben nicht auch aus fünf Meter Entfernung lesen. Andreas
>
> schielt über ihre Schulter. Unter der roten Schlagzeile sind zwei Fotos
>
> abgedruckt. Darunter stehen ihre Namen. Gudrun Ensslin und Andreas
>
> Baader. Aber das auf dem Foto über Gudruns Namen ist nicht ihr Gesicht.
>
> Es ist ein junges Gesicht, vielleicht in ihrem Alter, es trägt blonde, lange
>
> Haare, aber es ist nicht ihr Gesicht. Es ist nicht so schmal wie ihr Gesicht,
>
> hat nicht so tiefe Augen, nein, das ist nicht mal ein ähnliches Gesicht. Und
>
> auf dem Foto über dem Namen von Andreas ist eigentlich überhaupt
>
> nichts zu erkennen. In jedem Fall sieht der abgebildete Mann häßlich aus,
>
> verdorben, häßlich und gemein. Es ist doch ein Mann? (Scholz, *Rosenfest*
>
> 112)

In this description, it is never explicitly said that the pictures used by the newspaper are actually Andreas and Gudrun's pictures; however, when Gudrun describes the picture it seems to be her picture, which she does not recognize. This description exemplifies the power of how being called a name can situate one into a certain position in society, which Gudrun and Andreas are constantly fighting against. It also highlights the divide between the perlocutionary act of "terrorism" which is to create change and the illocutionary use of the word "terrorism" by the press to condemn Andreas and Gudrun and their actions.

The fictional terrorists have been interpellated within their texts through the word "terrorist" and they constantly have to counter this interpellation. The failure of the fictional terrorists to create a counter-narrative that successfully communicates their cause is linked to their identity. The terrorists only exist in the present, which is also linked to their cause. As mentioned above, the fictional terrorists are aware of how they are being defined by society, which is evidence to them that their attempt to communicate has failed. The fact that there is no mention of the terrorists' past, or any other aspect of their lives, other than that for which they are fighting is of significance in these narratives. The fictional terrorists' identity and their existence are introduced in the beginning of the narrative. The terrorist identity only exists in the present, whereas an individual identity has a past, present and future. In the films *Was tun wenn's brennt* and *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the juxtaposition of the terrorist identity to an identity constructed within society illustrates the problems encountered when trying to communicate only within the present. In the biography *Frau mit Waffe,* Edschmid constructs a narrative in an attempt to avoid the word "terrorist." This makes the narrative itself disjointed, because the presence of the terrorist identity is pushed into the

background. In the novel *Rosenfest,* Gudrun herself defines her new life as being devoid of a past, and in the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* the construction of Rita's identities is always disrupted by her scar. This emphasizes the constant presence of her terrorist identity. These narratives also show that the future in the terrorists' lives is an idealized future, never achieved within these narratives. The terrorists exist only in the present, trying to achieve a future, which after each failed terrorist attack situates them back into the present and disrupts their goal, which is to achieve an ideal future. Because the fictional terrorists are still together, fighting for their cause, it shows that communication has failed. This failure is linked to the expectation of the perlocutionary act to create the change that each individual group seeks to achieve. If they would have successfully communicated their cause and achieved the change for which they were fighting, the group would have disbanded. An example of this is given in the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* after they believe they have saved the last building.[21] The group shows that they have accomplished their goal through a banner that hangs over the front entrance of the building. The banner reads, "Wir haben uns endlich das genommen, was uns gehört!!" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). In addition, most of the members of Group 36 start new, separate lives; Maik becomes a successful business owner, Flo is engaged to a wealthy man, Robert, known to most as "Terror," has become a lawyer and Nele is a single mom. Only Hotte and Tim stay in the building for which they had been fighting. Hotte appears unable to move on, owing to the fact that he lost his legs while fighting for the cause. Because of Hotte's loss, Tim feels obligated to stay with his friend. They both remain in the building that they saved, and seek out new causes for which to fight.

---

[21] The group saves the building from being demolished by the Berlin Senate. However, the Berlin Senate turns around and sells the building to a businessperson named Bülent, whose goal is also to demolish the building but cannot do it while Hotte and Tim are living in the building.

In the examples developed so far, the role of the juxtaposition of the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts created about the terrorist groups through the different uses of the word "terrorism" has shown the failure of the fictional terrorists to communicate their cause and create change. This failure is further emphasized by the failure of language to communicate what the fictional terrorists attempt to communicate. The disconnect of language to reality is given not only by the word "terrorist" itself, but also by the way in which language is not perceived, by the fictional terrorists, to connect to reality. The disconnect of the word "terrorism" to reality is not only shown through the different categorization of the word, but it also situates the fictional terrorists into a position in society which they perceive as not representative of their cause and, the force of condemnation when the word is used is achieved through the position of authority occupied by the press/police.

The problems to communicate not only arise through the tensions between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, but also, as mentioned before, through Saussure's observation of the misconception of an oversimplified connection of words to what they refer. Saussure's theory of the signified, signifier and sign further illustrates the disconnect between the word "terrorist" or "terrorism" to the groups and their actions. The word "terrorism," for instance, signifies the "concept" of "terrorism," which is the signified. One characteristic that is highlighted through the word terrorism is the "arbitrariness" not only of the relationship of signifier to signified, but consequently also of the sign. In the case of the word "terrorism" the arbitrariness of the signifier is further emphasized through the possible variables available for this word. As Coady points out, there are over 100 different definitions for this word, and as Townshend explains,

terrorists never use this term to refer to themselves or their action. Therefore, the sign, which is derived from the relationship of the signifier and the signified, varies according to definition and usage of the term terrorist.

Challenges also arise when trying to communicate through signifiers, not only because of their arbitrary relationship to the signified but also because they refer to a concept whose meaning changes depending upon the context. This is exemplified in Volker Schlöndorff's movie *Was tun wenn's brennt,* through the context of the word "Bestes." In this movie, as previously discussed, banners hang from the building Group 36 is trying to save. These banners demonstrate that the group is aware that those representing the Berlin Senate have tried to communicate with them, but Group 36 redefines the meaning of this communication in order to suit their cause. For instance, one banner reads, "[s]ie wollen nur unser Bestes, aber das kriegen sie nicht" (*Was tun enn's brennt*). However, what is meant is not the traditional meaning, which is of someone looking out for the well-being of someone else. Instead this means that their "Bestes" is the building Group 36 is fighting for, and that they will not give it up.

The problem that arises in Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest* is that the students do not perceive that there is an arbitrary relationship between the signifier and the signified and they also, like Katharina, want the words to mirror reality. The expectation of language to mirror reality also points to Searle's and Vanderveken's theory on the fit of language. In this novel, the students are trying to connect words to their perception of reality. During the above described student demonstration, against the mayor of Berlin, the students distribute pamphlets in order to communicate the realities of war. The police then examine these pamphlets. The reaction of one policeman in particular is described as

113

follows, "Der Polizist versucht aufmerksam das unübersichtliche Flugblatt durchzulesen, aber seine Augen bleiben stets auf die letzte Zeile geheftet: Wann brennen die Berliner Kaufhäuser? steht dort in fetten Lettern" (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 65). The goal of the flyers is to make the word "war" more concrete by comparing the burning of department stores in Germany with the bombings in Vietnam. Georg, one of the students explains,

> "Das ist doch nur ein Witz," versucht Georg, dem sichtlich beschämten Beamten aus seiner Verlegenheit zu helfen, "nur eine Provokation, ein Bild eben, um die Menschen daran zu erinnern, was so ein abstraktes Wort wie Krieg in Wirklichkeit bedeutet. Damit sie sich einmal einen verbrennden Menschen wie in Vietnam vorstellen können." "Heißt das, Sie bekennen sich zu gewalttättigen Aktionen?" (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 66)

Even though Georg tries to explain the disconnect between language and the realities of war, the police officer only understands the literal meaning of the words. The relationship between language and reality is questioned by the flyers, which the students distribute in order to link the word "war" and the realities of war. In Saussure's terms the students are trying to explain the concept of "war" by using different "signifiers" in order to explain an abstract word to the people in Berlin, but they fail to make the police officers understand the connection between burning villages in Vietnam and burning warehouses in Germany, because they are using two dissimilar "signifiers" for one "signified." By using different "signifiers" in order to explain one concept, the students inadvertently show that there is an arbitrary relationship between the signified and the signifier.

The challenges to communicate are not only associated with how words connect to concepts, but also, as shown in Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest*, to how individual

114

letters connect to each other to create a word. In his novel, Scholz exemplifies the problem to communicate through each individual letter of a word when Gudrun and Georg, along with other students stage a protest against the mayor of Berlin. Their role in the protest consisted of writing the message "Albertz abtreten" on their T-shirts. Each T-shirt had one letter of the message, and when the students are wearing them, they have to time their movement perfectly in order for their message to be communicated. This intricate method of communicating is described as follows,

> Georg ist stolz auf sich. Er ist froh, daß sie sich jetzt alle fest an den Händen halten müssen, damit die Buchstaben nicht zu weit auseinander stehen und unleserlich werden. Wie ein kleines Ballett muß die Studentengruppe sogar ein paar Schritte einstudieren, um sich gleichzeitig umzudrehen und sofort die Hand des Buchstabennachbarn wiederfinden zu können. Eins, zwei, drei und los, gibt Georg mit fester Stimme das Signal, und die Passanten auf dem Kurfürstendamm können nach dem Namen des Regierenden Bürgermeisters nun auch auf dem Rücken der Protestler das Wort A-B-T-R-E-T-E-N entziffern. (60) […] Los, ruft er, los, umdrehen, macht schon, ruft er, dreht euch um. Aber Gudrun hat die Buchstabenkette durcheinandergebracht. Ihre gemeinsame Parole bricht auseinander, wird unleserlich. Andreas, schreit sie, hüpft hoch und wedelt heftig mit dem Arm, den Georg vergeblich zu fassen versucht. Andreas nähert sich sehr langsam, so daß Georg Zeit bleibt, vom vorletzen auf den letzten Platz zu rutschen. "Stell dich doch mal ordentlich hin. Ich kann ja nichts lesen." (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 63)

In this passage, a simple message is complicated by each individual letter of each word, and the group fails to work together to convey this message. In their attempt to find a new way to communicate their message, they succeed only in complicating what should have been a simple message. The failure of the group to collaborate, in order to spell out words that are supposed to convey their message, highlights the collective nature of the group. The individual's role only matters in terms of what they add, in this case a letter to form a word, to the message the group is trying to convey. If the students do not work together, or if anyone decides to leave the group, as Gudrun does, the group fails to communicate their message. This passage also highlights the problems when attempting to communicate through the performative aspect of a speech act, specifically the locutionary, which includes the performing the sound of each letter to create the word. The students try to perform their message, which is also meant to cause the mayor of Berlin to step down. The manner in which the students communicate show how everything has to work in perfect harmony for their message to be read, which is also important when communicating without language.

The inability to be able to communicate their cause through language and their permanent representation as terrorists in society is also connected to their body. Butler, as previously discussed in the introduction of this dissertation, also establishes this connection. Butler emphasizes the connection of the body between both speaking and writing. Scholz describes the connection between communication, the body and terrorism as follows,

> "Wie geht das? Wie werden Menschen zu Projektionsflächen? Zunächst
> durch Entleibung. Obwohl der Körper im politischen Widerstand eine

entscheidene Rolle spielt, sind die Terroristen immer körperlos, vor allem

Andreas Baader und Gudrun Ensslin." (Scholz, "Hypperrealität" 216)

In this novel, the breaking down of language into its basic parts is paralleled with the

breaking down of the body into its basic parts. While Andreas and Gudrun are in France

they are taking pictures of each other, but they start taking pictures of their body parts.

Their faces are broken down into lips, eyebrows, tongues, etc. The narrator describes the

moment as follows,

Was fotografiert wurde, sind die Bruchstellen zwischen dem, was sichtbar

und ausgeleuchtet ist, und dem, was man nicht sehen kann, worauf der

leere Blick verweist. Einem Fahndungsfoto ähnlich, erinnert nur das

Falsche des Blicks noch an den Menschen, dessen Schicksal im Bild nicht

mehr zu Wort kommt. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 147)

The move from the inability to be able to create change in the images created, and the

move towards their mythological status, is brought one step closer when their bodies are

broken down into individual parts in the pictures. This mirrors the breaking down of

narrative to words and to individual letters. Andreas and Gudrun are incapable of

changing their image in society because this image has been frozen in time.

This chapter has shown how there is a tension between the perlocutionary and the

illocutionary acts which arises through the different characterizations of "terrorism." The

perlocutionary use of "terrorism" is based upon an act that will achieve a subsequent

effect. On the other hand, the word "terrorism" is used by the press/police in order to not

only create a negative image of the terrorists but also to condemn the groups. The force

of this act is achieved through the position of authority that the press and police occupy in

society. The problem that arises is that groups will not call themselves terrorists and disagree with the image that is constructed of them; therefore, they have to keep countering the name in order to clarify their position, which ultimately fails.

The fictional terrorists within the works analyzed here try to constantly communicate their cause, and their attempt to do it through language fails; therefore they use violence in order to communicate the same message. The next chapter will examine the role of violence that is associated with terrorism and how this violence is used as an illocutionary force component in order to strengthen the degree of the perlocutionary act. Violence is used, from the point of view of the terrorists, as an alternative means of communication that is to achieve the same subsequent effect that language previously failed to achieve.

CHAPTER IV

VIOLENCE AS AN ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE COMPONENT TO ADD THE

SOUGHT-FOR DEGREE OF STRENGTH

As established in chapter II, Schlöndorff's drama *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* Schnitzler's comedy *Was tun wenn's brennt*, Scholz's novel *Rosenfest*, and Edschmid's biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* represent terrorism as a form of communication, specifically illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, through the connection of (1) the fictional terrorists to their cause and (2) the manner in which the fictional terrorists attempt to communicate their cause. Communication is tied to the fictional terrorists' cause not only because they want to communicate this cause, but because successful communication itself is their ultimate goal.

Even though there are attempts by the authors/directors to communicate through their narratives and within the works through the fictional terrorists, these communication attempts do not have the subsequent effect intended. As discussed in chapter III, there is also a tension that arises through the use of perlocutionary acts with the expectation that the intended subsequent effect will be achieved. This tension is highlighted through the different uses of the word "terrorism" itself. The word terrorism fails to refer to the terrorists, because it does not represent the image the terrorists have of themselves, and they will not use the word to describe themselves. There is a negative narrative that is created of the terrorist groups and their actions, which signals to them that they have not successfully communicated their cause and, therefore, have to continue to find new ways in which to communicate. When the word "terrorism" is used by the press/police to condemn someone as a terrorist the use of the word is of an illocutionary nature, and the

force behind the condemnation is derived from the position of authority the press/police occupy in society. On the other hand, the act of "terrorism" is intended as a "perlocutionary act" because as an act of persuasion it is supposed to achieve a subsequent effect through an interlocutor without the use of language.

Up to this point, one significant aspect of terrorism that has not been addressed is the role of violence. As discussed in the previous chapter, even though there are over one hundred definitions of terrorism, violence is one aspect that all these definitions have in common. Even though violence seems to be an aspect that might be unifying the definitions of terrorism, it also further complicates these as shown by Walther Laqueur in his book *The New Terrorism*. Laqueur claims that "[t]errorism is violence, but not every form of violence is terrorism" (8), which brings up the questions of what type of violence is terrorism, and how is it represented in the texts and films analyzed in this dissertation. In this chapter, I will show how violence, associated with terrorism, is an alternative form of communication that is supposed to function as the second illocutionary force component. Searle and Vanderveken define "the degree of strength of the illocutionary point" as follows,

> Different illocutionary acts often achieve the same illocutionary point with different degrees of strength. For example, if I request someone to do something my attempt to get him to do it is less strong than if I insist that he do it. (15)

J.L. Austin's theory of the performative developed in his book *How to Do Things with Words* and Judith Butler's book *Excitable Speech* will provide the theoretical basis to explain how violence is used as means of communication. Violence, be it physical or

non-physical, is connected to communication through the fictional terrorists' actions and explanations, because the fictional terrorists feel that language has failed to convey their message, they use violence to convey the same message and regain control over their process of communication.

The theory that violence is used by terrorists as an alternative means of communication has been discussed by critics such as Gerrit-Jan Berendse, who explains in his book *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF- Terrorismus.* Berendse argues that the role of terrorism as a means to convey an ideological message, or the terrorists' cause, through violence is the consequence of the failure of conventional methods of communication (21). Berendse highlights the thesis established in chapter II of this dissertation, that creating change is the goal, because when the terrorists do not feel that their conventional methods of communication have had a subsequent effect on the interlocutor, they switch to physical violence.

The relationship between language and violence, according to Berendse, is not only of relevance for terrorists but also for authors, because authors are challenged to find new ways to write about terrorist acts. In addition, Berendse argues that violence and language are on two different levels. He describes this relationship of language and violence as follows,

> Gewalt und Sprache begegnen sich auf unterschiedlichen Ebenen, wobei in der Begegnung die Bemühungen um sprachliche Verarbeitung angesichts des spektakulären, auf den Straßen aufgeführten Polittheaters unterliegen. Die Folge gewalttätiger Aktionen ist Sprachverlust. Das

121

Konvolut an künstlerischen Darstellungen von Terror, das in den vielen

Jahrhunderten europäischer Kulturgeschichte angelegt wurde, lehrt aber

auch das genaue Gegenteil: Das Vernichtungspotential, das die politische

Gewalt besitzt auch dazu inspiriert neue sprachliche Ausdrucksformen zu

suchen. (44)

Berendse asserts the representation of terrorism has been pursued in art over the

centuries, and has shown that the potentially destructive power of political violence is an

inspiration to find new ways to communicate.[22] As mentioned above, the juxtaposition of

language and violence happens on two different levels, which is a consequence of violent

actions that lead to the loss of language. To achieve a connection between these levels,

writers find themselves challenged to discover alternative forms of communication. The

texts and films I discuss challenge Berendse's argument, because the fictional terrorists

resort to violence as an alternative means of communication after language has failed.

Violence is used in the works analyzed in this dissertation as an illocutionary force

component. The fictional terrorists perceive that their attempts to communicate through

language have failed to have the subsequent effect intended; therefore, they need to find a

way in which they achieve the sought-for subsequent effect in alternative ways. The loss

of language or "Sprachverlust" the terrorists have to cope with happens before they resort

to violence; therefore, violence replaces language as a means of communication. This is

exemplified frequently by the terrorists' choice of target. The targets are chosen

---

[22] Not all discussions on language and violence follow the direction Berendse illustrates. Butler points to
different philosophical approaches to language and violence in her book *Excitable Speech*. In her book
Butler, points to the theory Elaine Scarry develops in *The Body in Pain,* where Scarry situates violence and
language on the opposite spectrum of each other. Butler interprets Scarry's theory as follows, "her
[Scarry's] formulation tends to set violence and language in opposition, as the inverse of each other" (6).

according to their symbolic meaning, which is attributed to them by the terrorists, their cause, and the target audience.

In the films and texts I analyze, there are several forms of physical violence present. The violence associated with terrorism has to be first and foremost defined by those not belonging to the group, because no one would define themselves as terrorists or their actions as acts of terrorism. In addition, the violence associated with terrorism is used as an alternative means of communicating the fictional terrorists' cause after language has failed to have the subsequent effect intended according to the fictional terrorists. Before being able to discuss the connection between terrorism and language in the film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* it is necessary to establish how Group 36 is defined as a terrorist group and not just an anarchist group. This discussion is not needed for the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, because it is repeated several times throughout the movie by the news media that Rita and her group are terrorists. In addition, the film is loosely based on the notorious terrorist Inge Viett's[23] autobiography *Nie war ich furchtloser.[24] Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* recounts the stories of two known RAF terrorists, Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll. Finally, the novel *Rosenfest* is a fictionalized account of Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin. In contrast, the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* is a fictional story of a terrorist group, which is not based on any known terrorists or terrorist groups. The word "terrorism" is only

---

[23] Inge Viett was born on January 12, 1944, but later on she changed her birthday to January 15th, which marked the day Rosa Luxemburg died (Viett 16).

[24] Julian Preece explains in his article "Between Identification and Documentation, 'Autofiction' and 'Biopic': The Lives of the RAF" that Inge Viett accused "Schlöndorff and his screenwriter Wolfgang Kohlhaase […] of adapting her story without her permission" (366).

used one time to define the group. In addition, the RAF is given a brief presence during a discussion Nele and Tim are having about their bomb.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the word "terrorist" is never used by the terrorist groups themselves, because they feel they are not only negatively represented through this word, but they are condemned by the press/police to be interpellated into a position in society, which they have to constantly counteract. In the film *Was tun wenn's brennt* the connection of Group 36 to be officially referred to as a terrorist group happens after the bomb explodes and the BKA, the German FBI, analyzes the letter Group 36 had sent to the newspaper warning about the bomb. Dr. Henkel, a BKA agent, presents the police's findings to the press as follows,

> Dabei handelt es sich um besonders gefährliche Terroristen. […] Der Gebrauch technischer Termini lässt auf universitären Hintergrund schließen. […] Dann ist das Schreiben in Teilen wieder eher fäkalsprachlich geprägt. Die Syntax hingegen neigt gerade zu rauschhaften Exzessen. Überhaupt scheinen große Teile des Schreibens unter Drogeneinfluss verfasst worden zu sein. Und vergessen Sie nicht: Diese Leute glauben wirklich an etwas. Das macht sie so unberechenbar. (*Was tun wenn's brennt*)

Dr. Henkel refers to Group 36 as a terrorist group after analyzing the letter, which they had written to inform the newspaper about the bomb. This determination was based upon a letter that has been in existence for 13 years. The existence of the letter without the bomb does not alert the authorities, or even the newspaper, about the danger of the group. It is not until the bomb explodes that the letter is given serious thought, and it is the

124

combination of the bomb and the letter that situates Group 36 into the position of a terrorist group. Not only does Dr. Henkel come to his conclusions through his examination of the letter, but he adds, at the end of his speech, that the danger of this group can be derived from their cause and their unpredictability. The cause is, according to Dr. Henkel, the reason why the group is extremely dangerous. He believes this is due to the fact that they will do anything in their power to fight for this cause.

The representation of violence connected to terrorism is shown when physical violence is used as an alternative means to achieve what Group 36 has already attempted to do through their propaganda films. Violence performs what language had previously failed to do, and it is used as an illocutionary force component in order to achieve the same subsequent effect. In this propaganda film the performative aspect of violence is shown when Group 36 gives directions on how to execute a successful militant attack by listing five rules,[25] which connects violence to communication. This connection is immediately made through the first rule, which says that the attack has to be understood without any further explanation, which mirrors perlocutionary acts as they can communicate without language. The attack has to communicate the cause for which the group is fighting. The target chosen has to have symbolic meaning in order to be able to represent the cause of the group to the interlocutor.

When using violence as a means of communication the group shows that there are different levels of complexity in the conveying of a message. These different levels are also the different levels of strength that can be used to achieve one and the same illocutionary point. The different levels are also a way in which the groups can stay in control of their process of communication. For instance, Group 36 instructs beginners to

---

[25] A complete list of the rules can be found in Chapter II on page 52.

choose highly symbolic targets that are universally understood. To illustrate how to communicate a "simple" message Group 36 uses the American flag. Maik removes the flag from an official building and throws it on the street. The American flag is internationally seen not only as a symbol of the United States but is also a symbol for capitalism and consumerism. By throwing the flag on the street, the group communicates the disrespect for this system without having to use words.

The action of throwing the American flag off a building in order to communicate a specific cause without words parallels the theory of the performativity of language developed by J.L. Austin in his book *How to Do Things with Words.* As mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation Austin defines a performative utterance as utterances that do not describe an action but perform the action itself (Austin, *How to* 12). In the case of the fictional terrorists, violence is the performative that is used in order to achieve an intended subsequent effect. Language has been removed from the message, but, according to the fictional terrorists, the message to be communicated remains the same. One example Austin gives of his theory is the act of protesting. Austin points out that one can protest by chaining oneself to a railing and no words are needed to express the act (Austin, *How to* 64). According to Austin, words in those instances can help clarify the action being performed; however, actions function like language. In the example described above, the act of removing the American flag is not supposed to describe the disrespect one has for the American capitalistic system. Rather, the act of removing the flag is the disrespect itself.

In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* Group 36 uses a propaganda film to introduce themselves. Within this propaganda film, Group 36 uses a variety of forms of

126

violence to communicate. These forms range from violence that communicates their cause to senseless violence. The violence that directly communicates their cause is the episode where they are filming a scene on one of the streets, where they are fighting against the police to save the buildings from demolition. To save these buildings, the groups squat in them and hang banners with slogans along the building with messages relating to their cause**.** The violence against the police is also violence in support of their cause, because they are defending the buildings that have been scheduled for demolition.

Group 36 uses a wide variety of methods to communicate, including the method they perceive as being the chosen method of communication of the Berlin Senate. The members of Group 36 emphasize their resolve in their cause and set a bomb in a building that they cannot otherwise use to squat in. Even though the group advocates using targets that will speak for themselves, there is a sense that the symbolic meaning of the bomb they set in a villa in the Grunewald will not be universally understood; therefore, they supplement it with a written letter they send to a newspaper. This bomb, and the imminent destruction of the building, is a way for Group 36 to communicate with the Berlin Senate in the same way they feel the Berlin Senate has communicated with them. The Berlin Senate is demolishing the buildings for which Group 36 cares and for which they fight. Therefore, Group 36 sets a bomb in a vacant building that the Berlin Senate has no intention of destroying, in a way giving the senators a taste of their own medicine.

The violence the Berlin Senate is using against the buildings Group 36 is trying to save communicates to the group members that they have not succeeded in communicating their cause. In order to "answer" the communication of the Berlin Senate, Group 36 uses the same violence against them. In this instance, Group 36 perceives the

demolition of the buildings by the Berlin Senate as a means of communication; therefore, Group 36 has to answer by mimicking what they perceive is being communicated to them. Group 36 re-contextualizes the perceived communication by setting a bomb in a building that is perceived to have meaning to the government. Butler describes the role and success of discourse as follows,

> To what extent does discourse gain the authority to bring about what it names through citing linguistic conventions of authority, conventions that are themselves legacies of citation? [...] If a performative provisionally succeeds (and I [Butler] will suggest that "success" is always and only provisional), then it is not because an intention successfully governs the action of speech, but only because that action echoes prior actions, and *accumulates the force of authority through the repetition or citation of a prior and authoritative set of practices.* It is not simply that the speech act takes place within a practice, but that the act itself is ritualized practice. (51)

Group 36 perceives the destruction of the buildings as a speech act, which they repeat. Butler explains that speech does not necessarily gain authority because of the intention behind the speech but because of its repetition. In the case of Group 36, the group repeats the manner in which the Berlin Senate has communicated with them; however, they re-contextualize it. In addition, this communication can be categorized as illocutionary, because the force of the communication is derived from the position of authority occupied by the Berlin Senate. Group 36 mimics this type of communication in order to add force to their communication in order to achieve a subsequent effect. Even though

128

there is no language present when Group 36 turns to violence, the message originally started being communicated through language. As established in chapter III, language did not achieve the intended subsequent effect on the Berlin Senate, which is to have the Senate stop the demolition of the buildings in Kreuzberg; therefore, Group 36 uses violence to communicate the same illocutionary point; however, they have changed the degree of force by which the message is being communicated. And, as will be discussed in chapter V, violence does also not achieve the intended subsequent effect from the interlocutor.

Similarly, in the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* the group uses violence in order to achieve the same subsequent effect after language fails to have the intended subsequent effect on society. In this film, the failure of language to have the desired subsequent effect exemplifies Berendse's claims that terrorists will use violence after conventional methods of communication have failed. At the start of this film, the group is already using violent methods to communicate their cause, as represented through the bank robbery. The bank robbery communicates the anti-capitalistic cause of the group. However, in this film, the anti-capitalistic leftist ideology of the group has already been communicated through a variety of media, such as music, posters, and countless books. These items represent Rita's group's ideology. This can be deduced from an explanation Rita writes in a letter to Tatjana, a woman she befriends when she defects to the GDR. Rita writes, "[…] Wir fühlten uns als Teil des internationalen Kampfes. Und dann erlebten wir, wie in Beirut eine gerechte Sache zu einem mörderischen Bürgerkrieg führte. Wir wollten den Krieg in die Metropolen tragen" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). With this letter, Rita illustrates that she sees her fight as part of a larger international

129

struggle, which already has exhausted the methods of conventional communication concerning their cause, and therefore needs to use violence to continue the communication process.

In this film, physical violence, in the form of a bank robbery, is used as an alternative means of communicating the cause for which Rita and her group are fighting. Rita and her group not only redefine the bank robbery through slogans, but Rita's act of giving the bum on the street part of the stolen money illustrates the implementation of the ideology to which the group subscribes. The slogans, Rita's actions, and the discussion the group has about bank robberies emphasize that the bank robberies are violent acts that communicate to the victims the cause for which the group is fighting. The manner in which language is used in conjunction with the bank robbery redefines the bank robbery. The group uses the slogans such as "Eigentum ist Diebstahl" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*), which in Austin's terms is a constative because it is a statement that can be true or false. According to the ideology of the fictional terrorists the bank is a representation of capitalist society and therefore it embodies all the negative characteristics of a capitalist society. Rita and her group believe that the statements they use to redefine the bank robbery are true, and therefore their actions are also redefined. According to the group they are not robbing a bank, but taking the money away from those who have stolen it from the people. The bank robbery is used to achieve the same illocutionary point as the works supporting the ideology of the group, which is to create a socialist society.

The bank robbery is used as an alternative form of communication, which becomes clear through the discussion the group has about bank robberies later on in the

film. Some members of the group want to rob a bank in order to obtain money to finance their fight for the cause. Rita opposes this because the bank robbery is a means to communicate the cause of the group, which is not going to be effective in France. Rita still believes they are a part of the international fight; however, they represent the German part of this revolution.

In contrast to the films, the biography *Frau mit Waffe* illustrates the use of physical violence as an alternative means of communication when language fails, but it is not violence connected to terrorism. Even though this violence is not terrorist violence, it still demonstrates how Katharina develops from contemplating the use of violence to communicate what language has failed to achieve, to her joining a terrorist group and using physical violence in connection with achieving a terrorist agenda. In addition, the use of violence in these instances is an attempt for Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll to take control of the process of communication. Katharina de Fries contemplated using violence when language failed to have the intended subsequent effect early in her life. Edschmid describes "Nach dieser letzten Rückkehr zu den Großeltern beschloß sie [Katharina], ihre Stiefmutter umzubringen. Sie war elf Jahre alt, und die Ausseinanderseztungen waren auswegslos geworden" (21). Katharina not only realizes that language has failed to solve her problems with her stepmother, but also that there is no way out of the situation which she is in and therefore decides to use violence to solve these problems. She walks around for days with rat poison and eventually kills a rat. She feels bad for the poor animal, which highlights the separation between violence for violence's sake and violence as an alternative means to communicate.

Katharina only temporarily abandons her plan to communicate and to solve her problems through violence; later in life she returns to the use of violence as a means to communicate and to find solutions to her problems. Katharina uses physical violence in order to communicate with her husband, when other conventional methods have failed. One night Katharina goes to the bar her husband frequents and shoots him in the arm in order to regain control of their communication problems. Edschmid describes Katharina's experience as follows,

> Sie [Katharina] spürte, dass sie in ihrer Einsamkeit keine Lösung finden würde und dass ihre Tat der Versuch war, sich einen Ausweg zu schaffen. Das Dumpfe daran machte sie betroffen. Nicht er war durch den Schuß verletzt worden, sondern sie. (30)

Just as in the situation with her stepmother, Katharina cannot communicate effectively with her husband through language and resorts to violence in order to find a way out of her situation. Even though Katharina abandons the idea to kill her stepmother by killing a rat, she reverts back to it and shoots her husband in order to communicate with him. Katharina is surprised that it is not her husband who has changed, but herself. Even though these examples are not examples of terrorist violence, because they are not used in support of a cause or goal, they show how Katharina de Fries struggles with a loss of language and therefore believes her only option is not only to communicate, but also to take control of the process of communication through violence. Katharina tries to achieve the intended outcome through violence when language fails. When she shoots her husband she is trying to find a way out of her loneliness. Even though it seems she has succeeded for a while, because her husband comes home every night, she has also been

changed through the violent act she perpetrated and wants to change her life by becoming independent from her husband.

Finally, Katharina's attitude towards communication through violence is mirrored by her fellow student demonstrators, who later become the members of the RAF. During the student demonstrations, the demonstrators, including Katharina de Fries, start provoking pedestrians in order to communicate with them. The alternating use of language and violence can be seen in the actions of the demonstrators, because first they protest in order to convey their message, but their actions do not accomplish their goals. Therefore, they start provoking pedestrians. This attempt to convey their message fails and ends in frustration. An example of their frustration and powerlessness is exemplified with the actions of Horst Mahler, who starts beating up the workers with his umbrella and yelling "Ihr müßt uns doch verstehen!" (43). The workers react to Mahler's actions negatively and do not see the demonstrators as allies and want to retaliate with physical violence. They move from perlocutionary speech act to illocutionary one's. The frustration felt by the demonstrators shows the inability of their language to have the intended subsequent effect, which the group tries to overcome through violence. The inability of the group to comprehend their failure to communicate is exemplified in Mahler's desperate words "Ihr müsst [...]." These words show that the group does not understand why they are unable to communicate their message, which is linked to the expectation they have of language. The group expects that their utterances will have the subsequent effect that society will change. Furthermore, Berendse's theory is exemplified by the attempts of the students to communicate their message through conventional

methods, which fail. Therefore, the students resort to violence to not only regain control of the situation, but also to achieve their illocutionary point.

As argued so far, the violence associated with terrorism is represented as a form of communication when language has failed to achieve its intended goal. In Astrid Proll's life, the move towards terrorism is compared to a move towards a new language. This transition happens after Astrid and her group name themselves the RAF. Edschmid describes this transition as follows,

> Sie mußten alles lernen. Alles war neu. Nichts gab es, auf das sie hätten
> zurückgreifen können, außer revolutionären Theorien aus anderen Zeiten
> und anderen Ländern. Es war, als ob sie sich etwas ganz Fremdes
> aneigneten, so, als ob sie Latein lernen und damit durchs leben gehen
> müßten. Sie war wie ein Weg durch den Nebel. Die klare Sicht war
> mühsam und schwer. (118)

Edschmid compares Astrid's experience of moving towards terrorism and violence as a move towards a new form of communication that resembles language. This new language resembles the learning of a foreign language; however, in this new language the path to communicate is open and not clear-cut as in established languages.

In contrast to the biography written by Edschmid, Leander Scholz's novel directly links the inability of language to have the intended subsequent effect to the use of violent actions through the figures of Gudrun and Andreas. Violence is used as an alternative means to communicate the group's cause when Gudrun and Andreas set a bomb in a warehouse. In the novel *Rosenfest,* Gudrun is part of a student movement that is distributing flyers in order to communicate the realities of the Vietnam War. On these

134

flyers, the group tries to compare the war in Vietnam to burning warehouses in Germany, which, as discussed in chapter III, fails. This failure is shown through the concerns of the police officers who, even after Georg's detailed explanation of the purpose of the flyer, still think that the group supports violent actions. Andreas does not believe that the flyers distributed by the students achieved their goal of not only communicating the realities of war, but also achieve the subsequent effect of stopping the war. Therefore, Gudrun and Andreas set a bomb in a department store in Berlin. This bomb is supposed to illustrate what the flyers have failed to achieve. This example illustrates the use of violence to reach the same subsequent effect as previously through language. In this novel the message remains the same throughout, it is only the means by which this message is being communicated that changes. In addition, the expectation is that language and/or violence have the subsequent effect that society will change. In the example of the flyers, if West German society would understand the message of the flyers they would support ending the war in Vietnam. The use of an actual bomb to communicate is the only way Andreas and Gudrun see as a means to communicate because the police seem to only pay attention to the flyer when they believe that actual violence is the threat. Violence strengthens the degree of the illocutionary point.

As mentioned in the previous chapter the students try to communicate the realities of war through the flyers. In order to accomplish this they try to connect culturally to something that the population in West Berlin would understand as a capitalist and consumer society. The students use flyers in order to connect the abstract idea of war with the destruction of warehouses, which is an attack on the consumer society. When Andreas and Gudrun perceive that the flyers failed to communicate, they set bomb in a

135

warehouse in order to communicate the same message with a different degree of force. The flyers fail to communicate in both the illocutionary and perlocutionary ways. Austin defines the illocutionary as the force of the utterance and the perlocutionary as the outcome of the utterance (Austin, *How to* 109-110). In the example of the flyers Andreas and Gudrun attempted to connect the war with something the people in West Berlin would understand and to cause more people to be on the side of the students in order for the war to end. This attempt not only fails through the flyers, but also when the actual bomb is set in the warehouse. Even though from the point of view of Andreas and Gudrun the message that is being communicated is the same in both cases, the use of violence is what redefines them as terrorists.

Violence functions within the texts analyzed here as a form of communication in support of the fictional and non-fictional terrorist groups' cause. As asserted before, terrorism in these works is represented as a form of communication, and violence is an integral part of their communication. The connection of violence and language stems from the goal that is being pursued by the fictional terrorists. Both language and violence are used within these texts with the expectation that the subsequent effect will be the change the indivuals seek. This connection is highlighted by Berendse, who focuses on how terrorism is connected to writing and its ability to create change. Because the works interpreted in this dissertation focus on the representation of German terrorists, a closer look needs to be taken at the influence of the RAF. Critics, such as Hans Josef Horchem and Arlene A. Teraoka, focus on the influence the RAF had in connecting terrorism to communication.

Even though Ulrike Meinhof[26] is not represented in the films and texts analyzed here, her work as a writer and editor have been influential in the of role terrorism in Germany. This also extends to the discussion of the connection between terrorism and communication, which would be incomplete without looking at the influence of Ulrike Meinhof's writings. Hans Josef Horchem in his article "Terrorism in West Germany" explains,

> The writings of Mahler[27] and Meinhof are of considerable importance for the political justification of all German terrorists – not just for the Red Army Faction. The three main tracts, covering the concept of the earlier guerilla armed struggle in Western Europe, urban guerilla warfare, and the class struggle, appeared between 1971 and April 1972. The language of Meinhof has affected the linguistic style of terrorist communication to this day. (2)

Although Horchem is making a generalized statement about Meinhof's influence on German terrorism, the fictional film *Was tun wenn's brennt* briefly mentions the RAF. Even though this movie is a completely fictionalized account of a group that is fighting against the demolition of buildings in Berlin, the RAF is given presence after the group has split and their bomb explodes in the abandoned villa. Tim is informing all members

---

[26] Ulrike Meinhof was a central figure of what was first known as the Baader-Meinhof group and later became the RAF. Stefan Aust provides information on Ulrike Meinhof in his book *Der Baader Meinhof Komplex.* According to Aust, Meinhof had been part of the student movement and spoke out for peace. For instance, in 1958 she gave her first speech against the nuclear movements (35). In 1960 she became the editor of *konkret*, which was a magazine that supported the student movements (36). Meinhof became very well known through her writings. However, after she got the impression that *konkret* was not in support of the students' cause anymore, she left the magazine in 1968 (85). Eventually she helped Andreas Baader escape from custody, joined the violent fight, and was later imprisoned. She kept writing until the time she committed suicide in 1976 (388).

[27] Horst Mahler was born on January 23, 1936. Mahler studied law at the Freie Universität Berlin. He also joined the "Sozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbund" and was against stockpiling nuclear weapons. Mahler was a lawyer and after 1968 he would exclusively defend students associated with leftist movements including members of the RAF (Aust 82).

of the group that the police have the evidence they need in order to arrest them and make them responsible for the bomb. When Tim is talking to Nele she is surprised that the bomb exploded and says: "Wir waren doch nicht die RAF." Tim only says, "Du schon" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*).

The wide-reaching influence of Ulrike Meinhof's writing and terrorism is further discussed by Arlene A. Teraoka in her article "Terrorism and the Essay," where she chronologically tracks the journey of Ulrike Meinhof's essay writing and her role in the Red Army Faction. She traces the history of the essay and of Meinhof's life to (1) show the development of Meinhof's writings and her terrorist activities, (2) how the role of the essay fits Meinhof's revolutionary ideas, and (3) the limitations of the essay to influence society. Examples Teraoka uses are Meinhof's essay topics, which evolve parallel to Meinhof's terrorist activities. Not only does Teraoka show how Ulrike Meinhof's path into terrorism links the essay and terrorism, but also how terrorism is highly symbolic. Teraoka illustrates how Meinhof's writings interconnect with her move to terrorism, which is, as Teraoka explains, a natural progression. Teraoka cautions that even though there are aspects that interconnect essay writing to terrorism there are also differences. According to Teraoka, Meinhof's attempt to educate the masses, in order to achieve social change, failed in part due to the history of essay writing itself. The essay is supposed to mobilize and educate the masses, which is something that modern terrorism attempts to achieve. This characteristic of the essay also gives it its propositional content, because the essay is used to mobilize and educate the masses. It can also be categorized as a perlocutionary act, because a subsequent effect is expected of the interlocutor after reading an essay. The problem with Meinhof's use of the essay is that, while philosophers

such as Kant and Hegel used the essay in order to educate and mobilize the masses, Kant emphasized that one still has to obey the laws of the land and Hegel advocated for a pure philosophical freedom. These were not the aims of Meinhof and the RAF.

Even though Teraoka limits her discussion to the role essay writing plays in connection with terrorist communication, in the film *Was tun wenn's brennt* writing is directly connected to the idea of physical violence. The first occurrence of this is seen when Group 36 introduces itself with their propaganda film. During this introduction Group 36 mocks an official definition of themselves. The last line of this definition is supposed to be a solution to how to help young people do something "sensible." Group 36 modifies this line and explains, "Die [sic] jungen Menschen kann jeholfen werden. Sie sollten Sinnvolles tun, n'jutes Buch lesen oder ne' kleene Bombe basteln, wa?" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). With this statement, the ideas of reading a "good book" and "assembling a small bomb" are placed parallel to each other through the grammatical structure of the sentence. The movie emphasizes the theories developed by critics, such as Berendse, who claim that a "good" book is supposed to be able to create change just like the change the terrorists hope to achieve through their violent attacks. This power of books to create change is further described by Maurice Blanchot in "Literature and the Right to death" as follows,

> At first sight one has the impression that the formative power of written
> works is incomparably great; one has the impression that the writer is
> endowed with more power to act than anyone else since his actions are
> immeasurable, limitless: we know (or we like to believe) that one single
> work can change the course of the world. (Blanchot, "Literature" 315)

The power of books to create change is something Katharina de Fries takes very "literally." She expects the violence she has read about to be over. Edschmid describes Katharina's experience as follows, "[s]ie [Katharina] beschäftigte sich mit den Grausamkeiten zu denen Menschen fähig waren, und war davon überzeugt, daß sie der Vergangenheit angehörten" (20). This description exemplifies Katharina's perception of the role of literature, where the violence that has happened lies in the past. This closure is not present in Katharina's real-world experience, which leaves her devoid of the language to express her experiences. Katharina's disappointment can be derived from Blanchot's claim that authors, through their works, can change the course of the world, which is not what Katharina is experiencing. As argued in chapter II, Katharina does not differentiate between "language" and what it represents. She expects language to be "reality." Katharina's expectation in language mirrors Austin's theory of the performative; however, Katharina does not make the distinctions in language that Austin makes. Austin distinguished between "constatives," which are expressions that can be true or false, and performatives (Austin, *How to* 3). Katharina expects all language to perform what it says.

The theory that a narrative can create change is exemplified by Leander Scholz and his attempt to undo the existing narratives around Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin through his novel *Rosenfest*. Scholz's attempt to create a counter-narrative to the existing narrative in order to communicate about Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin also exemplifies Blanchot's idea of the power endowed to the author to create change. Violence is part of the process of writing a counter-narrative in order to undo the dominant narrative. This process is illustrated within the text when the figures of Andreas and Gudrun are talking about going back to Germany to make a change. Gudrun explains,

> Man müßte es schaffen, den Rhythmus der Leute für einen Augenblick zu
>
> irritieren. Man müßte ihnen eine Pause verschaffen, so etwas wie einen
>
> gigantischen Stromausfall hinkriegen. Irgend etwas müßte geschehen, das
>
> sie berührt. Ja, ich meine es ernst, etwas, das bis in ihr Innerstes vordringt.
>
> Aber dazu müßte man erst mal diese ganze verdammte Wortscheiße
>
> wegsprengen. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 183)

In this discussion, Gudrun points out to Andreas that the only way to create change is to undo what has been created through words. This destruction is not superficial, but is a destruction that has to have meaning and shakes up the status quo, which Gudrun equates with the destruction of what the press has created through words. This passage mirrors Blanchot's theory of writing. Blanchot argues that, "[i]n order to write, he must destroy language in its present form, denying books as he forms a book out of what other books are not" (Blanchot, "Literature" 314).

In contrast to Blanchot's theory Judith Butler describes the citational function of language in her book *Excitable Speech.* Butler's discussion does not echo the sentiment that to be able to write and create change one has to destroy what has been, but she describes that one reuses language; however, the meaning keeps changing according to the context in which it is used. Butler points to this when she describes the role of hate speech. Butler describes as follows,

> I [Butler] would argue that the citationality of discourse can work to
>
> enhance and intensify our sense of responsibility for it. The one who utters
>
> hate speech is responsible for the manner in which such speech is
>
> repeated, for reinvigorating such speech, for reestablishing contexts of

hate and injury. The responsibility of the speaker does not consist of remaking language ex nihilo, but rather of negotiating the legacies of usage that constrain and enable the speaker's speech. (27-28)

In Butler's discussion of hate speech, she points to the citational characteristics of language. Butler asserts that language keeps its meaning if reused in the same type of context. She also emphasizes that a speaker does not have to reinvent language, but that the speaker has a certain responsibility in using language so as not to repeat the insult previously uttered.

Even though Blanchot's and Butler's theories differ not only in the obvious, that Blanchot is theorizing on writing and Butler on the use of hate speech, but also in that Butler is talking about a specific type of speech, the theories come together in Gudrun's attempt to try to destroy language in order to create a new meaning. In Scholz's novel the figures of Gudrun and Andreas are fighting against what resembles hate speech, because the newspaper defines them as terrorists and keeps repeating this same "insult" even though Gudrun and Andreas do not view themselves as terrorists, which they try to clarify through various venues such as writing letters. Language, be it spoken or written, is a problem for Gudrun, because she perceives it as being unchangeable; therefore, it needs to be destroyed in order for her and Andreas to start anew. In addition, Blanchot's statement illustrates Scholz's endeavor to write a story that serves as a counter-narrative to the dominant narrative. This is also highlighted within the novel through Gudrun's belief that it is necessary to create a type of change, which can only be achieved through the destruction of language in its current form.

Scholz exemplifies the necessity to create change not only within his novel but also through his novel. Scholz tries to undo the representation of Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin through the press and the myth they created around themselves and the Baader Meinhof Group. Scholz connects the undoing of the dominant narrative to violence. He exemplifies not only the power of the mass media to create a dominant narrative, which has a force to condemn those labeled as terrorists and the violence needed to destroy this narrative through the bombing of the publishing house. After the figures of Gudrun and Andreas set a bomb in the publishing house they make an anonymous call in order to warn the employees. After the bomb explodes, the scene is described as follows,

> In diesem Moment explodiert der Bildaufbau, Schlagzeilen, riesige Wortklötze fallen herunter auf die gaffende Menge, die schnell auseinanderströmt. Manche werden von abgebrochenen Titelzeilen verletzt. Ein roter Balken durchstößt lautlos die Schädeldecke eines alten Mannes, pfählt seinen Körper, schiebt sich fast widerstandslos durch den Hosenboden wieder hinaus und kommt erst mit einem dumpfen Geräusch auf dem Asphalt zum Stehen. Der alte Mann fällt wie eine Statue um und zerbricht. Vor allem die großen Buchstabenreihen erschlagen die Fliehenden, zerdrücken ihre weichen Körper wie faules Obst, bohren tief ihre schwarzen Füße und spitzen Hälse in die gespannte Haut ihrer Opfer. Unter manchen typographischen Haufen kriechen Verletzte hervor, die sich in die angrenzenden Geschäfte flüchten, dort unter Schock in den Eingängen verharren, wie bei einem starken Platzregen wortlos nach

draußen starren, wo sich jetzt aber statt Regen Blut und Buchstaben

ergießen. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 240-241)

After the publishing house blows up, the described destruction is a combination of physical violence, and the destruction of a page in a newspaper. This destruction describes Gudrun's earlier comment, that in order to create meaningful change language needs to be blown up. The influence of language to create images and narratives is shown in the paragraph cited above, through the juxtaposition of what seems to be a newspaper page and a human being. The first line exemplifies the destruction of a newspaper page, which is highly structured through "headlines," "picture formats," and "huge word chunks." The destruction of this newspaper page that creates a narrative not only through words but also through images is intermixed with the death of a man and of numerous injured. The juxtaposition of the human being and the newspaper shows their basic elements, which are words and blood. These are equated at the end, which illustrates how words are the "blood" that gives life to the images and narratives created by the newspapers. When the figures of Gudrun and Andreas destroy the publishing house they have symbolically destroyed how the press had used language to condemn them and their actions. Through this destruction a new narrative is possible, a narrative that is supposed to be able to create change. Scholz exemplifies, through his text, the challenges of creating a narrative, because one has to destroy what already exists in order to create something new.

Scholz is trying not only a conglomeration of different types of narratives in order to create a new narrative but he is also trying to create a new story for the fictional terrorists. This new story includes creating a "body" for the terrorists, which Scholz

144

himself claims are always "körperlos" (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 218). As mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation, the absence of the body is what separates writing from speech. Scholz is trying to create a body for Andreas and Gudrun, and is at the same time connecting writing and speech. He inserts the body not only through creating moments that mirror actual speech, but he also includes specific body parts that connect to speech when Andreas and Gudrun are taking pictures of each other. Scholz is using violence by undoing the dominant narrative in order to create a new narrative.

So far the discussion has shown how (1) violence, specifically violence connected to terrorism, is used as an alternative means of communication to achieve the subsequent effect not reached through language and (2) the connection of violence to language and writing. A significant aspect to be further explored is: how is writing a representation of terrorism and not just a revolutionary tool? Blanchot explains this development as follows,

> Revolutionary action is in every respect analogous to action embodied in literature: the passage from nothing to everything, the affirmation of the absolute as event and of every event as absolute. Revolutionary action explodes with the same force and the same facility as the writer who has only set down a few words side by side in order to change the world. Revolutionary action also has the same demand for purity, and the certainty that everything it does has absolute value, that it is not just any action performed to bring about some desirable and respectable goal, but that it is itself the ultimate goal, the Last Act. This last act is freedom, and the only choice left is between freedom and nothing. This is why, at that

point, the only tolerable slogan is Freedom or Death. Thus the Reign of

Terror comes into being. People cease to be individuals working out

specific tasks, acting here and only now: each person is universal freedom,

and universal freedom knows nothing about elsewhere or tomorrow, or

work or a work accomplished." (Blanchot, "Literature" 319)

Establishing the connection between "revolution" and "terrorism" is not unique to

Blanchot's argument, but it is also a topic discussed by Scanlan, McAuliffe and

Lentricchia. Because there is a transition made between "revolution" and "terrorism,"

terrorism has some of the same characteristics as are attributed to revolution. The

transition of revolutionary action to terrorist action is a consequence of the cause that is

being pursued. Blanchot explains that there is an absolute value that is given to the goal,

which consequently only allows for the slogan "freedom or death," which at first glance

can be seen as a solution in this binary slogan. However, in the case of the terrorists the

answer is death, either actual or figurative death, because their goal is to achieve their

cause and when this cause is achieved the terrorists would cease to exist because it is

their cause that brings them together as a terrorist group. If this cause would cease to

exist, so would the group.

Blanchot's theory explains how there are no individuals in a terrorist group, but

rather everybody is part of the cause for which the group is fighting, which Blanchot

defines as universal freedom. Death, on the other hand, is a symbolical death that is

linked to the group's collective identity. There are no individuals in a terrorist group. All

members are part of a unified struggle, which links each member to their cause. Ideally, if

the group would achieve their goal, they would cease to exist. Blanchot emphasizes that

146

terrorists do not know a tomorrow, which means that because the terrorists are fighting

for an ideal future, they would cease to exist if they would accomplish their goals. If they

fail to accomplish their goals, they stay in their perpetual present. When the terrorists'

attempts to achieve their cause fail, they turn to alternative methods to finally

communicate their cause and create the change for which they are fighting.

The connection between terrorist violence to language is also exemplified through

the symbolic function of the gun. The role of the gun for the terrorists represented in the

films and texts analyzed here is essential because the use of the gun initially is supposed

to communicate violence without actually causing it. Before being able to show how the

gun functions within the films and texts analyzed here, one needs to take a look at how

symbolism and violence have been connected since the emergence of symbolism. When

looking at the historical meaning of symbolism, violence is already inherent in its

definition. Gero von Wilpert defines the word "symbol" in his *Sachwörterbuch der*

Literatur as follows,

> Symbol [...] urspr. in Griechenland Erkennungszeichen in Form eines in
>
> zwei Hälften gebrochenen Gegenstandes, den sich Vertragspartner,
>
> Gastfreunde und Eheleute vor e. Trennung teilten und bei späterem
>
> Zusammentreffen zur Wiedererkennung zusammenpaβten [...] (800)

In this description Wilpert emphasizes the violence that is done to separate an object, in

order to give it to separating parties. The parts of the object are later used when the

separating parties come back together as a form of recognition. In *Frau mit Waffe* the gun

has symbolic meaning, not just as a symbol for violence, but also as a symbol of

recognition. Edschmid describes the role of the gun in Astrid Proll's experience as follows,

> Die Waffen veränderten die Situation. Wenn man sie hatte, konnte jederzeit geschehen, was geschehen war. Es sollte zwar nicht heiβen wir schieβen drauflos. Aber es hieβ: Wir meinen es ernst. [...] Die Waffe sollte der Verteidigung und nicht dem Angriff dienen, aber sie markierte die Trennungslinie zu den anderen linken Gruppen. Das war entscheidend. Die Waffe wurde zum Zeichen. (115)

In Edschmid's description the gun is supposed to symbolize the violence of which the group is capable. The violence represented through the guns is supposed to be self-defense. The symbolic function of the gun also follows characteristics explained by Wilpert. The role of the gun shows the varying convictions of the different groups with leftist ideologies. In addition, the group believes that the gun communicates to the public and other groups that the group using it is serious about its cause, and that they will use the gun if it becomes necessary. In this instance the gun's ability to communicate is extended from merely communicating the threat of violence to strengthening the degree of their illocutionary point. The gun communicates the seriousness of the terrorists' cause and that if necessary they will use it to defend themselves. The necessity to use the gun stems from the inability of the group to achieve their goals through language.

The terrorist groups portrayed in the texts and films analyzed in this chapter also hope for the violence of the gun to work symbolically. This argument for the gun to universally symbolize violence is described by Blanchot. He explains the role of symbolism in literature in his article "The Language of Fiction,"

> [...] the symbolic meaning can only be a global meaning, which is not the
>
> meaning of such an object or such an action taken in isolation but that of
>
> the world in its entirety, and of human existence in its entirety. (Blanchot,
>
> "Language" 79)

In the movie, *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* this global meaning is seen through the gun's role as a means to threaten violence, not to actually cause violence. This is illustrated when Friederike helps Andy escape from jail. Rita finds out that Friederike cannot even hit a tree when shooting the gun, but this does not matter because the gun is not supposed to be used. The gun in this instance is supposed to communicate the threat of violence without actually performing it, which highlights the performative role of the gun. The gun is supposed to communicate the threat of violence through its performative qualities. It also is used as a perlocutionary act, because it is not only supposed to communicate the threat of violence, but by implying "we are serious" it is supposed to show that the fictional terrorists expect a certain actions of the interlocutor.

When Astrid joins the RAF the role assigned to guns by the terrorists is symbolic; however, this role changes abruptly when someone gets killed. Edschmid describes, "[s]ie [die RAF] erlagen der Faszination der Waffe, die sie als Feind des Staates auswies und mit einem Schlag auf die andere Seite warf." (113). The weapon becomes a symbol that leads to the positioning of the group outside society. The guns are not intended to be used to exert real violence, but they are supposed to serve as a symbol of violence. The symbolic use of the gun is illustrated by the inability of the women in the group to use the weapon exemplifying the group's belief that the gun will do its job by the mere idea of violence. The intended symbolic role of the gun and the communicative expectations

149

attributed to the gun are of a perlocutionary nature, in other words, the gun is supposed to cause a subsequent effect on the interlocutor.

The gun in the biographies of Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll is supposed to communicate the idea of violence. As discussed in the previous chapter, language has failed to have the intended subsequent effect on the interlocutor, and therefore violence is used to achieve that which language failed; however, when violence is introduced the force by which this message is communicated has changed. The role of the gun is essential because of its universal symbolic meaning and its ability, as Austin points out, to be able to communicate without using any words.

In the film, *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* guns also serve to support what the news has broadcast about the group. The group enters the bank by saying "Ihr kennt uns aus der Tagesschau," which emphasizes their role as terrorists, and the guns supply the violent power behind those images. Rita and her group rely on the symbolic power of guns to communicate the threat of violence. The weapon's role as a means of communication is exemplified by Rita and Friederike. There is an unspoken rule, which is to use violence only as a means to communicate a threat and through this tactic reach their goal that will advance their cause. Guns fail to communicate successfully causing the terrorists to feel powerless and therefore resort to violence. To use this newly embraced violence successfully they train in Palestine, which illustrates the shift of the role of the guns in their fight. The use of violence will be justified if their quest of creating a better world is achieved, but there are moments when violence is not justified and never can be. Therefore, Rita leaves the group and hides in the GDR.

In conclusion, violence connected to terrorism is used as an alternative means to communicate when language has failed to have the intended subsequent effect. Even though physical violence is not used until after language has failed, violence has been a part of the communication since the beginning because one cannot talk about terrorism without talking about violence. Theories developed by Berendse and Blanchot connect violence to language. In addition, violence is used to achieve the same subsequent effect as the fictional terrorists intended through language. Violence is used as an illocutionary force component; however, a problem arises because force is not a characteristic that is connected to a perlocutionary act. In the next chapter, I will show how the failure of violence to communicate stems from the inherent characteristic attributed to violence by Arendt and Sofsky. In addition, the terrorists represented in the films and texts lose control over the process of communication, which is the consequence of violence itself.

CHAPTER V

VIOLENCE AND THE FAILURE TO ADD THE SOUGHT-FOR DEGREE OF

STRENGTH

Despite all the attempts by the fictional terrorists to try to communicate through a

combination of illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, the fictional terrorists ultimately

fail to achieve the intended subsequent effect through language and later on through

violence. The failure to achieve the intended subsequent effect through violence stems

from violence itself. The aim of this chapter is to show how the failure to communicate

through violence is an inevitable consequence of the fictional terrorists losing control of

the process of communication because of the use of violence as a means to strengthen the

degree of the illocutionary point. In order to determine how the use of violence causes the

terrorists represented in the texts and films under analysis to lose the ability to

communicate their cause and achieve the change they are striving for I will use the

theories developed by Hannah Arendt in *On Violence* and in "What is Authority?",

Simone de Beauvoir in "The Antinomies of Action," and Wolfgang Sofsky in *Traktat zur*

Gewalt. Arendt's, Beauvoir's, and Sofsky's theories will help show how the inherent

characteristics attributed to violence and its relation to power and authority are the

reasons why violence cannot be successfully used to control the process of

communication.

As discussed in chapter II of this dissertation, there are challenges that arise when

trying to talk about terrorism because of the different available definitions of "terrorism."

Even though there are over one hundred different definitions of terrorism, Coady

emphasizes that these definitions have two elements in common, which are the negative

image they create of the terrorists and violence. Violence is used in the texts and films under analysis as an illocutionary force component that is supposed to guarantee the outcome of the perlocutionary act. The main characteristic ascribed to the perlocutionary acts is that their goal is to elicit a subsequent effect. This subsequent effect can be intentional. However, it also can be unintentional. Controlling the perlocutionary act in order to achieve the intended subsequent effect is further problematized when violence is used as a means to communicate. Wolfgang Sofsky's book *Traktat über die Gewalt* focuses on the goals and outcomes of violence and will be used to illustrate how violence causes the terrorists represented in the films and texts to lose control of their process of communication. Sofsky attributes violence with the inherent characteristic of overstepping boundaries. Sofsky contends that,

> Ob unter dem Banner der Ordnung oder des Chaos, ob im Namen des
> Kreuzes, des Staates, der Vernunft oder der Gerechtigkeit, Gewalt birgt
> immer die Tendenz in sich, über die Ideale hinauszuschießen. Das Töten
> ist ihr nicht genug. Sie nimmt auch die Dinge ins Visier, mit denen die
> Menschen ihr Leben ausgestattet haben, die symbolische und materielle
> Kultur. (192)

Sofsky argues that the end one is trying to pursue through violence will be overwhelmed by it, because violence does not stop its path of destruction when the goal is reached. Violence will always go beyond the intended goals. For instance, Sofsky explains that violence does not stop with "killing," but continues destroying whatever is in its path, such as objects with which people surround themselves. This characteristic of violence becomes a problem when it is used not only as a means of communication, but as a

153

means to control the outcome of a perlocutionary act. Because of the unpredictable nature of violence, it is less likely that the outcome of a perlocutionary act is going to be the intended subsequent effect.

Destruction is not only an inherent characteristic of violence, but according to Sofsky, it is its ultimate goal. Violence will continue its path of destruction until nothing that could resist it stands in its way. Sofsky explains,

> Die Menschen demolieren Objekte und räumen beiseite, was ihnen im Wege steht. Zerstörung schafft freien Raum, eröffnet einen Zugang, ob nach vorn oder nach hinten. Selbst im Dienst der Reaktion ist die Destruktion ein Sprung über die Grenzen. Noch das Zerschlagen der Freiheit ist eine Geste der Freiheit. Das Zerstören annuliert das Gegebene. Es will nicht verändern es will abschaffen. Was ist, das soll nicht sein. Die Destruktion ist die radikale Umkehrung der Produktion, des Herstellens. Obwohl sie mitunter Arbeit macht, ihr Ziel ist nicht die Veränderung der Objekte, sondern der leere Platz. (193)

Sofsky reiterates the essential nature of the destructiveness of violence. In addition, Sofsky explains that because destruction is an inherent attribute of violence, and the antonym of destruction is to produce something or make something, violence cannot be used to produce or make something. One might argue that violence eventually creates an empty space; however, that is an unintended side effect of violence, because the goal of violence is destruction. Change itself is not what violence seeks; it is total destruction. Sofsky describes the extent to which violence will seek and destroy anything in its way as follows,

> Die Gewalt wendet sich gegen das Objekt, gegen das Prinzip des
> Objektiven, des Widerständigen überhaupt. Sie sucht die freie Fläche, die
> tabula rasa. Ihr Werk ist erst vollendet, wenn sie nichts mehr zu tun hat,
> weil alles, was sie aufhalten könnte, verwüstet ist. (193)

Sofsky argues that violence goes against anything that stands in its way, creating a "tabula rasa" or an empty "space," which could be said to be a space where something can be created. However, Sofsky's theory does not leave room for anything to be created through violence, because the ultimate goal of violence is complete destruction. This characteristic of violence to be able to create an empty space could be said to support Berendse's claim that the space where violence and language meet can be a space where a new form of communication can arise. However, according to Sofsky, nothing can be created through violence because its ultimate goal is the destruction of that which occupies the space. This characteristic of violence is also the reason why the fictional terrorists are unable to control the process of communication, and instead of achieving the intended subsequent effect, which is to create the change each individual group is seeking, they achieve the unintended subsequent effect of being labeled terrorists.

Finally, Sofsky contends that violence not only destroys individual objects, but also the structures in which these objects are embedded. He claims that, "Destruktion beschädigt nicht nur Einzeldinge, sie zerrüttet auch die Verhältnisse, die Strukturen, in denen die Dinge eingefügt sind" (193). Sofsky exemplifies this when he explains that violence will destroy the objects with which people surround themselves, and because these objects also have cultural meaning and material value, this violence also attacks the culture to which the objects are attached. This characteristic of violence is on the one

155

hand essential to the terrorists because they are trying to create change, which requires undoing established structures. On the other hand, this characteristic of violence is also the reason why the fictional terrorists lose control over the process of communication, because violence will not stop when the intended goal is achieved. In other words, violence will also undermine any efforts to create new structures.

Although violence is a characteristic that unifies the definitions of terrorism, it also further complicates these definitions as shown by Hannah Arendt in her book *On Violence*. Arendt points to several characteristics inherent to violence that are interconnected with each other, which problematizes the ability of violence to have the desired effect on society. These characteristics are the instrumentality of violence, which is connected to the means-end category, and the relationship among violence, power and authority. A summary of Arendt's theory will help exemplify how violence connected to terrorism fails not only to reach the intended subsequent effects, because of the unpredictability of violence, but the relationship among violence, power and authority also influences the illocutionary force components used to try to achieve the intended subsequent effect.

Central to Arendt's argument is that violence is instrumental and it "always needs implements" (4). However, "the technical development of the implements of violence" (3) has diminished the capacity of violence to have an impact on society. Arendt uses the development of weapons by superpowers as an example to illustrate how these have exceeded their ability to be used as leverage (3). She argues that the development of weapons has almost nullified the effect violence used to have on society, because if two superpowers would use their weapons against each other they would not only destroy

156

each other but also the entire world (3). Since the implements of violence have exceeded the goals being pursued, in other words, the end is overwhelmed by the means, Arendt questions the use of those implements to reach a certain goal. Arendt explains, "[t]he technical development of the implements of violence has now reached the point where no political goal could conceivably correspond to their destructive potential or justify their use in armed conflict" (3).

The instrumentality that Arendt attributes to violence stems, according to Beatrice Hanssen, from the means-end category. Hanssen explains in her article "On the Politics of Pure Means" that "[...] she [Arendt] adopted the (Aristotelian/Kantian) means-ends model to define violence (always in need of implements) as instrumental" (25), which leads to the conclusion that the implements of violence have to be justified by the end pursued. At the same time, Arendt cautions that the end is in danger of being overwhelmed by the means, which it justifies (4). Arendt explains that, "[v]iolence, being instrumental by nature, is rational to the extent that it is effective in reaching the end that must justify it" (Arendt, *On Violence* 79). If the end or goal were to be reached, then the violence used to attain that end would be rational. In order for violence to be rational the goals have to be short-term and attainable. Even though Arendt is writing about the threat of nuclear weapons, her ideas about the instrumentality of violence expressed in this essay can also help to understand the ways that violence functions in the texts and films under discussion, because the terrorists use violence in order to justify their means. In addition, their use of violence also oversteps the goals to be achieved. This is exemplified in the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt*, where the group is trying to stop the demolition of buildings, and in order to achieve this, they destroy a building themselves.

The role the "means" play and the importance of choosing them in relation to their end is described by Simone the Beauvoir in her book *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Beauvoir lists characteristics that should be considered when choosing a means for a certain goal. She explains as follows, "[...] the means will be chosen according to their effectiveness, their speed, and their economy; it is simply a question of measuring the relationship of the factors of time, cost, and probability of success" (111). Even though Beauvoir does not emphasize the goal in itself, she alludes to it when establishing a relationship between the means and "the factors of time, cost, and probability of success" (111) because a specific goal has to be chosen before any of those previously mentioned factors could be calculated.

Beauvoir also points to the importance of not only choosing a certain goal, but that the goal has to be able to justify the means. She uses the example of a partisan who is sure of his chosen goal and the means to achieve this goal. Beauvoir explain as follows,

> [...] the justification which he [the partisan] here invokes is that which, in the most general way, inspires and legitimizes all action. From conservatives to revolutionaries, through idealistic and moral vocabularies or realistic and positive ones, the outrageousness of violence is excused in the name of utility. It does not much matter that the action is not fatally commanded by anterior events as long as it is called for by the proposed end; [...] (111)

Even though Beauvoir starts her argument through the specific example of the partisan, she argues that his reasoning for using violence also illustrates the general justification for the use of violence and its legitimization. Not only does Beauvoir's argument mirror

Arendt's means-end category, but Beauvoir also highlights the importance of reaching the end, because "defeat would change the murders and destruction into unjustified outrage, since they would have been carried out in vain; but victory gives meaning and utility to all the misfortunes which have helped bring it about" (111).

The instrumentality that Arendt attributes to violence is significant not only because of the means-end category described above. Because of this instrumentality and its dependence upon implements, violence is not reliant upon numbers to support it. Arendt explains, "Violence, we must remember, does not depend on numbers or opinions, but on implements of violence, and the implements of violence, as I mentioned before, like all other tools, increase and multiply human strength" (Arendt, *On Violence* 53). Even though violence is not dependent upon numbers, it does affect them by increasing their strength. Arendt further describes the multiplication of strength as,

> Violence […] is close to strength, since the implements of violence, like all other tools, are designed and used for the purpose of multiplying natural strength until, in the last stage of their development, they can substitute for it. (Arendt, *On Violence* 46)

In other words, the weakest person can control or even kill someone with the help of a weapon. The more technologically advanced the weapon is the more highly the strength is multiplied. For instance, domination increased when guns replaced swords. Eventually, guns have substituted for natural strength.

Strength is only one of the characteristics that Arendt discusses that adds to the complexity when discussing violence. In addition to strength, Arendt highlights the terms power, authority, and force in relation to violence. Arendt poses the question, "[w]ho

159

rules Whom? Power, strength, force, authority, violence – these are but words to indicate the means by which man rules over man; they are held to be synonymous because they have the same function" (Arendt, *On Violence* 43). The question that Arendt poses illustrates that the terms mentioned are used as synonyms of each other because of their same function. In addition, Arendt also shows that because of the relationship of these terms to each other they cannot be organized in a hierarchical manner.

Arendt discusses these terms and how they influence each other in relation to violence. One of the characteristics that Arendt discusses is power and its relation to violence. Before being able to focus on this relationship, a closer look at Arendt's definition of power is needed. Arendt defines power as,

> Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is in "power" we actually say he is empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name. (44)

In contrast to violence, power is dependent upon the number of people who can unite and work for the same cause. Arendt argues that power is only part of an individual while the individual belongs to a group that supports his or her cause. If the group dismantles, the perceived power of the individual vanishes with it. Arendt reiterates the collective quality of power by explaining,

> […] Power springs up wherever people get together and act in concert, but it derives its legitimacy from the initial get together rather than from any action that then may follow. Legitimacy, when challenged, bases itself on

an appeal to the past, while justification relates to an end that lies in the

future. Violence can be justifiable, but it will never be legitimate. (52)

Arendt emphasizes that power comes to be when people get together, but does not have

any connection to any action taken from that power. This poses a problem for the terrorist

groups, because the power that arises from them getting together behind a common cause

is not furthered by any actions taken in support of this cause.

Arendt further highlights that power and violence are opposites. Arendt points to

the problems that arise when discussing the terms "power" and "violence," because of

their inherent opposite characteristics. Arendt explains that power and violence have been

erroneously used as synonyms of each other, which is a consequence of the ultimate goal

sought for through "violence" and "power." Their goal is to rule over man. Arendt

emphasizes that violence and power are opposites to the extent that "where the one rules

absolutely, the other is absent" (56). The absence of power can be caused through

violence. Arendt also reiterates several times that violence can destroy power. She says,

"[v]iolence can always destroy power; out of the barrel of a gun grows the most effective

command, resulting in the most instant and perfect obedience. What can never grow out

of it is power" (44). Furthermore, power cannot be created out of violence (56), because

violence only has the ability to destroy power and because power and violence are polar

opposites power can also not create violence. Finally, Arendt highlights that the opposite

of violence is power and not non-violence. Arendt claims that, "The extreme form of

power is All against One, the extreme form of violence is One against All" (Arendt, *On

Violence* 42).

161

Similar to power, authority derives it legitimacy from the past. However, it is not dependent upon power or violence. Arendt explains the role of authority as follows,

> Authority, relating to the most elusive of these phenomena [violence, power, strength, force] and therefore, as a term, most frequently abused, can be vested in persons – there is a thing as personal authority, […], - or it can be vested in offices, […]. Its hallmark is unquestioning recognition by those who are asked to obey; neither coercion nor persuasion is needed. (45)

Authority can be found on persons, such as between a father and a son or in official offices such as the hierarchical offices of the Church. Important in the different examples Arendt provides where authority is found is that the authority is recognized and obeyed without question.

Arendt further develops her discussion on authority in her book *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. In her chapter "What is Authority?" she points to the problem of the chapter title. Arendt explains that,

> In order to avoid misunderstandings, it might have been wiser to ask in the title: What was and not what is – authority? For it is my contention that we are tempted and entitled to raise this question because authority has vanished from the modern world. Since we can no longer fall back upon authentic and undisputable experiences common to all, the very term has become clouded by controversy and confusion. (Arendt, "What" 91)

According to Arendt, authority ceases to exist in the modern world, in part because there are no experiences that people have in common. The consequence of living in a world

162

where different experiences lead to different definitions of the same term is that instead of "rendering terms meaningless […] we grant each other the right to retreat into our own worlds of meaning and demand only that each of us remain consistent within his own private terminology […]" (96). Finally, the term authority adds to the challenges when discussing power and violence, because "[t]he most conspicuous characteristic of those in authority is that they do not have power" (Arendt, "What" 122). From Arendt's discussion it can be derived that the challenges when interpreting the representation of terrorism are not only problematized by violence, which is an inherent characteristic of terrorism, but also by its relation to power and authority.

The question that arises from the discussion on violence, power and authority is what role do these elements play when connected to the representation of terrorism as a means to communicate. As mentioned in the previous chapter violence is used as the second illocutionary force component to strengthen the illocutionary point, in order to control the outcome of a perlocutionary act. Authority and power are characteristics that play a role in meeting not only the expectations of the second illocutionary force component but also the third illocutionary force component. Searle and Vanderveken explain that one illocutionary point can be achieved with different degrees of strength, which in some instances also includes the relationship of the speaker to authority and power. Searle and Vanderveken point to the role of authority and power in the second illocutionary force component in the following example,

> For example, both pleading and ordering are stronger than requesting, but the greater strength of pleading derives from the intensity of the desire expressed, while the greater strength of ordering derives from the fact that

163

the speaker uses a position of power or authority that he has over the

hearer (15).

In addition to this example, Searle and Vanderveken also refer to authority in the third

illocutionary force component, which is "the mode of achievement." They describe the

mode of achievement as follows,

> Some, but not all, illocutionary acts require a special way or special set of
>
> conditions under which their illocutionary point has to be achieved in the
>
> performance of the speech act. For example, a speaker who issues a
>
> command from a position of authority does more than someone who
>
> makes a request. Both utterances have the same illocutionary point, but the
>
> command achieves that illocutionary point by way of invoking the
>
> position of authority of the speaker. (15)

In both these descriptions, speakers who issue an order or a command will be invoking

their position of power or authority in order for them to achieve their illocutionary point.

As established in the previous chapters, the texts and films under analysis represent

terrorism as a perlocutionary act. The problem with perlocutionary acts is that the

subsequent effects are not guaranteed, and therefore the fictional terrorists used

illocutionary force components in order to control their process of communication. When

taking into account Arendt's theory, the fictional terrorists derive their power from

coming together behind one cause; however, none of the actions in support of this cause

increases their power. This power also vanishes when they use violence in order to

communicate, even though the fictional terrorists put themselves in a position of

authority in representing their cause. Their position is not recognized by those with whom they are attempting to communicate.

In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* the reason why Group 36 fails to reach the intended subsequent effect of their perlocutionary act is because of the use of violence as an alternative means to communicate. Even though Group 36 takes the necessary steps for violence to communicate their cause, violence is what causes them to lose control of their process of communication. Group 36 tries to communicate their cause through a bomb they set in an abandoned house. As previously discussed, the group advises the viewers of their propaganda film that targets should have a symbolic meaning to the cause. However, Group 36 still backs up the intended communication through a letter. Even with all of these attempts to communicate their cause and stop the Berlin Senate from demolishing the buildings in Kreuzberg, they fail. Not only does the newspaper ignore the letter Group 36 sends, but the police also ignore the threat of the bomb until it explodes. The reason the police ignore the letter is that in the 1980s, when the bomb was set, they received dozens of threatening letters, but the threats never materialized. The bomb not only fails to have the intended subsequent effect through the letter, but it also does not communicate what it meant to communicate because it does not explode in a timely manner. The bomb's unintended effect is that after it explodes, the group is labeled a terrorist group.

The loss of control of communication and the unintended subsequent effects are further illustrated after the bomb explodes, because the police decide to search all the places where leftist organizations are believed to be found. When they search the building where Hotte and Tim are squatting, they seize all the film from Group 36, including the

165

one containing the evidence the police need to make an arrest. In this scene Hotte is hysterical and he insults the police. He tells them that they have no right to come in and take their property. The police completely ignore him showing that he has no power or any kind of authority to make demands. When the police confiscate the films, Group 36 further loses control of their process to communicate, because the films were not meant to be viewed by the police. In an attempt to regain control of the material they used to communicate, they make a second bomb in order to destroy the films.

In theory, to be able to successfully use violence as a means to achieve a specific subsequent effect through a perlocutionary act, violence has to be executed in a timely manner. The group wanted to communicate to the Berlin Senate that it should not demolish the buildings and if they cannot have or use the buildings, then no one will, and they will blow them up. When the bomb finally explodes, thirteen years later, the capacity for it to communicate the intended cause has diminished because the group has disbanded, and the members who left the group have built lives within society. The Berlin Senate has already demolished all the buildings, and the ones they could not demolish were sold. Unfortunately for Group 36, the bomb does not explode in a timely manner, and the symbolism of the place and the people injured after the bomb explodes is lost.

The loss of symbolic meaning is illustrated when Tim informs the members of the group who defected that the bomb exploded. Tim describes what happened as follows, "Hat doch genau die Richtigen erwischt. Die Immobilienschnalle und das blöde Schwein aus Bonn" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). For Tim, who has remained with Hotte in the building that they took over, the symbolism of those who were injured fits into what they

wanted to communicate. However, for those who left the group the significance has been lost and even though, as argued by Beauvoir, for Tim the violence used against the politician and real estate agent has been justified through the achievement of their goal, the rest of the group is outraged because the violence used is not justified anymore and now they feel that their new lives are being threatened. Once more, the group has lost control, not only of the process of communication, but also there is the unintended consequence of them being labeled terrorists by the police. Because of this unintended consequence, Group 36 builds a second bomb, which is supposed to destroy the film which will give the police the evidence needed to arrest them. The second bomb is used to undo the unintended consequence of the first bomb.

In this film there is the illusion that the group has successfully communicated their cause and achieved the sought-for subsequent effect, because the Berlin Senate does not demolish the building they are squatting in. This should also mean that because the group has achieved their goals, they should disband and stop all violence. However, Tim and Hotte not only stay but continue on a path of destruction, which highlights Sofsky's theory that violence does not stop after the intended goal is achieved. For instance, Tim and Hotte are protesting with a handful of people in front of a newly built Mercedes car lot. While there, Tim vandalizes several police cars parked in front of the car lot. After this demonstration Tim needs to get some chemicals to develop the filming of the vandalism. Tim and Hotte have no money; therefore, Tim steals the chemicals from Karstadt, which is a nationwide department store chain. Security officers spot him and chase him through the store. Tim finds a hiding spot where he stays until after closing time. When it is safe for him to come out of his hiding spot he leaves Karstadt, but not

167

before turning on all the lights and opening the doors. He proceeds by making a phone call where he informs someone that he has liberated Karstadt. From a window he observes people coming to loot the store. Finally, later on in the film while Tim and Flo are walking down the street, Tim removes the hood ornaments from all of the Mercedes vehicles parked on the side of the street. Flo tries to stop him, but he refuses and gives her one of the ornaments as a present. She recalls what they used to say and asks Tim, "Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht. Ging das nicht so?" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). After he agrees, Flo steps on the hood of a Mercedes and starts jumping on it and egging Tim on to join her. While jumping, she keeps chanting, "Macht kaputt, was euch kaputt macht." Tim eventually joins her, and after they have damaged the car, she jumps back down and presses her remote key showing that the car belonged to her. When Tim comes down she says to him, "Du bist immer nur gegen was. Du bist nie für was." Tim's actions show that he has lost not only the focus of the cause he was initially fighting for, but he has gone beyond his original goal. Sofsky emphasizes that violence will not stop until all in its path is destroyed. In this film, the violence that was supposed to control the flow of communication has gone beyond the boundary of trying to save buildings from destruction by the Berlin Senate and is moving towards self-destruction. In addition, violence is communicating that Group 36 is a threat to society.

At the end of this film, Group 36 not only fails to stop the Berlin Senate from demolishing the buildings, but they also lose control of their use of violence. The unstoppable nature of violence is shown when Group 36 removes the film that incriminates them of building and setting the bomb in the abandoned house in the Grunewald. Group 36 flees from the police by taking a train. On the train they set fire to

the film and their answer to the question "[w]as tun wenn's brennt?" is "brennen lassen," which highlights not only the destructive nature of the fire, but that there is nothing to stop it. There is a sense that the group regained some sort of power, because they destroyed all the evidence against them and therefore are free to start a new life. The illusion that the group had regained some power comes from their success in destroying the evidence against them. However, as Arendt explains, power is not supported by any actions used in support of the cause that brings a group of people together. In addition, the group has not only failed to reach their original cause but has also joined that which they had been fighting against.

In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* violence also fails to achieve the intended subsequent effect of the perlocutionary act, because the goals Rita and her group are pursuing are not short-term goals, which leads them to lose focus of these goals. Due to the shifting goals the subsequent effects they expect also change. As mentioned previously, Rita and the group to which she belongs use bank robberies in order to communicate their anti-capitalistic cause. However, after they help Andi escape from jail, they leave Germany and their focus begins to waiver. After spending time training in Beirut, the group returns to Europe, where they remain in France for a while. In France the group is trying to plan a bank robbery in order to finance their next steps. All the actions the group undertakes in order to fight for their cause give the group a sense of empowerment and Andi, as the leader, a sense of authority. Everything the group does is in support of their cause. However, as Arendt explains, these actions do not enhance the power of the group. The power of the group is affected because the goals that had initially brought them together changes.

169

Power only exists at the beginning of the film when the group members come together in order to support one cause. The group believes that they have power because they have been able to escape what controls them, which is capitalist society with its consumer goods. This is illustrated in the beginning of the film, when Friederike talks to Rita about her inability to enjoy the comforts she used to have. Friederike explains that, "Reiten, Tennis oder Lachs fressen interessiert mich nicht. Man muss die Rohheiten der Welt hassen um an ihren Feinheiten teilzunehmen" (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*). Friederike's ability to leave consumer society and join Rita in her fight illustrates the power of the group to detach from West German society, which they perceive as being the oppressor. However, this cause that initially united the group has vanished, which becomes clear when Rita and Friederike explain that they are still loyal to their original cause unlike the other members in the group who no longer have a unifying cause.

The shift in focus and the disunity of the group also cause violence to cease being a means to communicate. As mentioned above, during the discussion on what the role of the bank robbery should be, Rita refuses to rob a bank in France. The group members do not see this bank robbery anymore as a means to communicate their anti-capitalistic cause, but rather as a way to finance their anti-imperialistic cause. Because of Rita's refusal she is not seen anymore as a member of the group and treated like the enemy. Her move away from the group is exemplified during a yelling match with Andi when she asks him, "Du suchst einen Feind. Aber wieso mich?!" In addition, Andi also accuses her of having a personal agenda. Finally, the outbursts of other group members illustrate that the group is not united under one cause, which means the power the group might have

170

had at their initial get together has vanished. This group dynamic not only highlights the vanishing unity, but that violence is not used anymore as a means to communicate.

After Rita makes her case on the communicative aspect of violence, she also loses control of violence as a means to communicate. After Friederike relinquishes her gun, she and Rita leave on Rita's motorcycle. Rita is not wearing a helmet and is therefore stopped by a French police officer. Rita and Friederike flee from the officer. At the first possible moment, Rita lets Friederike off the bike and she continues her escape alone. Rita ends up trapped and she shoots the police officer. This violent act highlights that violence cannot be controlled and it also finalizes Rita's complete loss of power. Rita has lost her sense of power because the group that once fought as one is no more and, as Arendt points out, where there is violence there is no power. This incident marks Rita's final separation from her group, because when Erwin asks her to tell him to whom this incident happened, she replies "mir ist das passiert." With this utterance Rita takes personal responsibility for this self-serving action. After Rita shoots the police officer and defects to the GDR, the sense of powerlessness is shown through her resignation.

Even though Rita leaves her group, she has not given up on her cause; therefore, she joins the GDR to keep up her fight. At first glance, her joining the GDR system and living a "normal" life seems as though she has given up the violent fight. However, the manner in which the Stasi officials define the GDR shows that Rita is continuing her violent fight in an alternate manner. Erwin, a Stasi official, explains the ideology of the GDR in a conversation with Andi. The conversation develops as follows,

Andi: "Welchen Gedanken wollen Sie austauschen?" Erwin: "Dass die Revolution auf verschiedenen Wegen marschiert." Andi: "Sitzt ihr nicht

171

meistens im Büro von 8-5." Erwin: "Ihr habt so viel Sinn für Gewalt. Hier

ist der Staat die organisierte Form der Gewalt. Ihr könnt die Gesetze nur

brechen; wir machen sie." (*Die Stille nach dem Schuss*)

In Erwin's portrayal of the Stasi, he establishes that both the GDR system and the

terrorists work through violence; however, the terrorists can only break laws, whereas the

Stasi can actually make laws. This statement contradicts the theories discussed so far,

because as Sofsky explains violence cannot create anything. In addition, there is the

implication that violence and power can coexist, because violence has created laws which

give the Stasi a sense of power, but the power is not legitimate Rita joins the Stasi in their

fight, which she feels restores the cause, which she has been fighting for. However, the

Stasi's power is grounded in violent coercion of their citizens who do not support the

corrupt system that they represent, but who are too fearful to initially protest against

them. The power the Stasi has to control the citizens of the GDR, eventually collapses.

In this film, many parallels are drawn between the terrorists and the GDR system

and their use of violence in order to accomplish their goals. As previously shown Rita

uses violence as an illocutionary force component to achieve a subsequent effect, which

is to change the West-German consumer society into a society where money does not

rule. Violence is also used in the GDR system as a means to create change through

corruption, which is accomplished through the creation of laws through violence. Even

though there are similarities that unite these groups, the film also highlights that the GDR

system has been successful in their process because they have created a country where

money does not rule, whereas the terrorists have not been successful in their attempt to

achieve their intended subsequent effect through their communication attempts. The

172

reason for this difference is that the officials of the GDR system are communicating from a position of authority and power; however, their power is illegitimate and it eventually leads to the fall of the Berlin Wall. The terrorists do not occupy a position of power. This movie exemplifies through the GDR that violence can be used as an illocutionary force component to achieve the sought-for subsequent effect of the perlocutionary act, which initially appears to be successful and non-defective.

At the same time the claim that violence is used in the GDR system as a way of rule also shows the eventual loss of power of the GDR system and the absence of authority. Arendt argues that authority is vested in someone and this authority has to be recognized by those ruled without coercion or persuasion. In the movie *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* authority has been absent from the beginning, because violence has been used to create the laws that rule the citizens within this society. In addition, power is also absent, because as Arendt explains, where violence is used power is absent.

Finally, the use of violence as an illocutionary force component, in order to achieve an intended subsequent effect fails. The GDR system collapses at the end of this film, which highlights Sofsky's theory that nothing can be created through violence. In addition, the absence of power and authority is also shown through the collapse of the GDR system. When the GDR system fails, Rita is surprised at why her co-workers are not in support of what she saw as "a revolution." She pleads with her friends to remember that they were trying to build a society where money does not rule, which all along has been Rita's ultimate goal. Rita is disappointed because the GDR system represented the goal she and her group had been fighting for. The failure of the GDR system also

173

highlights Rita's failure to use violence in order to achieve the intended subsequent effect.

Through the collapse of the GDR system, Rita's image changes back to what the West German society defines her as, which is a terrorist. Rita is forced to flee and finds someone with a motorcycle to give her a ride. Because it is cold, he gives her a scarf that resembles the Palestinian scarf she had worn before leaving her group. Her transformation back into her old self is complete when she manages to steal the motorcycle from the young man giving her a ride. Rita then rides the stolen motorcycle to the border where a checkpoint has been set up. At the checkpoint guards are checking everyone's identification. Rita knows she will be shot if she tries to cross the border without stopping, but decides to ride across the border even though this means she would be committing suicide. This is Rita's final stand. Here she takes control of her death and the violence done against her in an effort to regain control of the process of communication. Rita shows through her suicide that she has chosen to die with her cause, which she sees as completely lost when the GDR system fails.

In Scholz's novel *Rosenfest,* violence fails to strengthen the illocutionary force of the perlocutionary act, which is shown through the bomb Andreas and Gudrun set in the warehouse. This bomb is supposed to mirror the flyers the student demonstrators had distributed in order to illustrate the realities of war through the use of the word "war." Andreas and Gudrun believe that the flyers failed, because the flyer is supposed to have a subsequent effect on the interlocutor, which is to stop the Vietnam War. After the flyers do not achieve the intended subsequent effect, violence is used to achieve the same goal. However, the bomb not only fails to have the intended subsequent effect, but Andreas

174

and Gudrun are labeled terrorists, which is an unintended effect of their perlocutionary act. Even though Gudrun tries to clarify what they were trying to achieve through the bomb, the message remains unheard or ignored by the press. The unintended consequence of their message is highlighted in the newspaper the day after Gudrun and Andreas had set the bomb. The headline reads, "T-e-r-r-o-r-i-s-t-i-s-c-h-e-r B-r-a-n-d-a-n-s-c-h-l-a-g auf Kaufhaus – mindestens e-i-n T-o-t-e-r'" (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 112). Gudrun reads the paper several times and looks at the images underneath the headlines. It is unclear what exactly is written in the newspaper, but Gudrun makes it clear that the message in the newspaper does not match their intentions, because she feels compelled to write to the newspaper to clarify their motives. Violence has failed to help achieve the intended subsequent effect of the perlocutionary act and therefore they revert back to language to clarify their intentions. Gudrun's quest for communication and being able to create change is reiterated several times within the novel. Every time language or violence fails to have the intended subsequent effect, she feels frustrated and powerless.

The headline used by the newspaper also represents the force of condemnation when the word "terrorism" is used to refer to the actions of the groups. As argued in chapter III the terrorists never use the word "terrorism" to describe themselves, because the word creates a negative narrative of the terrorists and their acts, and when the press/police use this word it condemns those referred to by it to be interpellated into a position in society that they constantly have to counter. The violence used by Andreas and Gudrun as an illocutionary force component to achieve the subsequent effect of their perlocutionary act has the unintended consequence that they are defined as terrorists, which is what fuels Gudrun and Andreas to keep trying to communicate their cause and

give explanations for their actions, in other words revert to locutionary means of communication.

Before being labeled a terrorist, Gudrun listened to the evening news and was worried that their attack was not being taken seriously. She reflects on what she heard in the radio as follows,

> Die Untersuchung der Brandursache, das konnte man gestern schon im Radio hören, war schnell abgeschlossen. Experten schüttelten auf die Frage nach internationalen Terroristen schnell den Kopf und gaben wenig amüsiert Auskunft über den stümperhaften Bombenbausatz. Ja. Bausatz, das Wort war ihr bis tief in die Nacht in den Ohren haftengeblieben, als hätte sie ein neues Hobby und die Welt würde mitleidig darüber lachen.
>
> (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 113)

Gudrun has been worried that she was not taken seriously and that her message was not being heard. The bomb is described as an assembly set that makes Gudrun feel as if she has a new hobby and not as if she had just tried to communicate a cause in which she believes. Her concerns about being taken seriously change abruptly the next morning when she reads the paper. Now she knows they are being taken seriously. Andreas and Gudrun have become terrorists overnight. Terrorists, who not only set a bomb in a department store, but also killed one person, a fact that was not mentioned in the evening news. In these instances, there is a sense that Andreas and Gudrun perceive the press to have a certain kind of power to create meaning through language. The press creates stories and images of Andreas and Gudrun with which they disagree.

176

Not only do Andreas and Gudrun fail to achieve the intended subsequent effect through the bomb, this bomb also represents their failure to stay in control of the process of communication. Violence takes on a life of its own, which is illustrated through the fire. Andreas and Gudrun set the bomb in the furniture department in a wardrobe, which was part of a bedroom set. The description of the destruction of the furniture is described as follows,

> Das Feuer sagt, nein, hier entsteht keine Generation von neuen kleinen Monstern, die die alten Monster ablösen, hier erben keine Kinder die Neurosen und die Miβgunst ihrer Eltern, die sie in die Nieten und die Nägel gegossen, durchs Holz gejagt haben, damit jede wackelige Ritze ausgefüllt ist. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 106)

This exemplifies Sofsky's theory on the role of violence to not just destroy objects but also to destroy the structure in which the objects are embedded. The description of the destruction of the bedroom furniture does not describe the destruction of the bed and wardrobe itself, but the destruction goes further into what these represent in terms of how they support societal structures. The furniture pieces are described in the context of the German family. The bedroom set is seen as the starting point of the German family, where children are created who will take their parents' place and support the existing structures. Through the bomb not only has the bedroom furniture been destroyed, but also the continuation of the German family. There is also an indirect criticism of a consumer society where things can easily be replaced.

Violence, as represented through the fire, has taken on a life of its own and will not stop until everything has been destroyed. The destruction is described as follows,

177

> In der Textilabteilung, die die Kunden durchqueren müssen, wenn sie die
>
> Schlafzimmerabteilung verlassen und schnell zum Ausgang eilen, holt
>
> sich das Feuer die Körper, die in die Blusen, Röcke, Jacketts,
>
> Stützstrümpfe und Büstenhalter passen sollen, und vernichtet alle Maße.
>
> Mir egal, sagt das Feuer, wenn nachher nichts mehr da ist, solange nur
>
> nach mir nichts mehr kommt. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 107)

The physical destruction of the fire obliterating the department store parallels the symbolic destruction of the structures constituting a person's make up. The fire is destroying the very bodies, which need these goods in order to clothe themselves. Everything is destroyed until nothing is left. Sofsky also points to the characteristic of violence that will destroy anything that has any resistance and its ultimate goal is complete destruction until there is an empty space. The fire also "feels" this way. It does not care what it destroys and will continue to burn while anything that can be used to feed it remains, until there is nothing that remains after it. In Scholz's novel, violence seems to be alive and it cannot be controlled until everything is destroyed.

Even though there are some similarities to Sofsky's argument, Gudrun argues against the notion that the destruction of objects is also going to affect the structures in which these objects are embedded. She explains,

> Ein Auto anzünden oder einen Politiker anzugreifen und womöglich
>
> auszuschalten ist konterrevolutionär. Jeder Sachschaden, den wir
>
> anrichten, dient dem Warenverkauf. Jede Person, die wir von der
>
> politischen Bühne holen, dient der Auswechselbarkeit der Menschen und
>
> der Erhaltung der Strukturen. Aber worauf es ankommt, ist der

Rechtsbruch, der in dem Moment, wo er bewusst vollzogen wird, aus dem

Verbrecher, dem eigenen Falschen des Rechtssystems, einen Irrläufer

macht, in den Augen des Systems ein Irrer, auf den die Gesellschaft nur

mit den Mitteln der Psychiatrisierung reagieren kann. Aber diese Mittel

sind begrenzt. Und wer irr ist und wer nicht, kann jeden Augenblick

umkippen. Es kommt alles darauf an, das, was wir normal finden, was wir

in uns für normal halten, ins Absurde führen. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 98)

Gudrun makes it clear that she does not believe that the destruction of objects or the

killing of people will change anything, but will rather support a consumer society that

replaces what is broken or missing. Gudrun's belief that destruction is not the answer also

requires her to be able to stay in control of violence, which she still believes can be

useful. Gudrun believes, as shown in the previous chapter, that one needs to destroy

language in order to be able to create change. This action would shake up people's lives

indicating that the world for people is constructed through language and in order to

destroy their world, the language of consumer society needs to be destroyed. Gudrun's

statement mirrors the statement discussed earlier that Karlheinz Stockhausen made about

the attack on the world Trade Center. Stockhausen claimed that the attack was "the

greatest work of art that is possible in the whole cosmos" (Lentricchia and McAuliffe 6).

The controversial nature of Stockhausen's statement was the mixture of art and reality.

He believed that art should have the same transformative impact as the terrorist attacks

had on society. Stockhausen wanted to achieve with his music a "break through the

routine of time 'to get out of the normal human cycles, in order to train a new kind of

human being'" (11). Gudrun believes that to be able to reach people, they need to have a

179

"Stromausfall," which would reset them, giving Andreas and Gudrun time to reach them in order to change society.

The "Stromausfall" represents an attempt by Gudrun and Andreas to situate themselves not only in a position of power but also in a position of authority. By destroying what has been created through language they not only have a fresh start, but they could also create a common experience where meaning can be established according to what Gudrun and Andreas perceive as real. However, Gudrun and Andreas fail because they fail to control what violence destroys. In addition, they never gain the power or authority they seek because of their use of violence to achieve their goals.

In order to achieve the kind of change described above, Gudrun and Andreas decide to set a bomb in the publishing house that has been misrepresenting and condemning them. The publishing house has the power to clarify Gudrun's and Andreas's actions but instead the writers redefine them by misrepresenting them, even though Gudrun sent them a letter clarifying both who they are and their cause. By destroying the publishing house, Andreas and Gudrun not only seek to create change in society, but they also are attempting to regain control of the communication about themselves and their cause. After Andreas and Gudrun set the bomb in the publishing house, Andreas calls the publishing house in order to warn them about the bomb. However, the phone call does not have the desired effect. First, the operator has received so many phone calls that day with bomb threats that the phone call has lost its ability to create panic. Second, it is alluded to that the employees of the publishing house know that what they publish are not facts but fabrications. After Andreas informs the operator about the bomb the operator asks,

"Geht es Ihnen gut?" fragt sie statt dessen in den Apparat, weil sie weiβ,

daβ sich hinter den meisten Drohanrufern nur Wichtigtuer oder gestörte

Psychen verbergen, die sich durch die aufgeladene Spannung in der

Bevölkerung offenbar besonders animiert fühlen. (Scholz, *Rosenfest* 223)

The operator's response frustrates Andreas, because his goal is not to kill people, but to destroy the ability of the publishing house to condemn Gudrun and him. The reaction of the operator shows how the implements of violence, in this case, the bomb, have lost the ability to communicate a threat. After the explosion, it does not take long for the police to show up at the scene and, upon their arrival they shoot Andreas. Gudrun manages to run away and hide in a department store. The failure of this last bomb is exemplified when Gudrun is arrested. The image of her as a terrorist is cemented in society and is still intact even after the destruction of the publishing house and the narratives they create through their newspapers. Violence cannot be controlled, and therefore Andreas and Gudrun not only fail to have their violent attack have the intended effect but they also lose control of the process of communication.

In Edschmid's *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* there also is an attempt to achieve certain subsequent effects; however, in this book there is an attempt to move away from violence. Edschmid writes the stories of Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll many years after these women have left the terrorist organizations and rejoined society. As Julian Preece points out in his article "Between Identification and Documentation, 'Autofiction' and 'Biopic': The Lives of the RAF" that,

If the two "life stories" in *Frau mit Waffe* have anything in common with

each other, it is not the social and family origins of the two heroines,

181

Astrid Proll and Katharina de Fries, not what propelled them to become

embroiled in the "armed struggle," though both had cause for anger, but

their moves away from violence. (366)

However this move away from violence fails. Their failure is a given, because these

biographies are of two actual terrorists who fail to change society and eventually abandon

their cause. The move away from violence is also supposed to empower the women to be

able to tell their story through a biography, which is a non-fictional story that gives the

story told a certain kind of authority. However, Edschmid claims that those interviewed

would have told a different story, therefore removing the power of the women to tell their

story and also removing the authoritative function of a biography to re-tell the story of an

individual.

Even though there is an attempt to move away from violence and the label

"Terroristin," in Astrid Proll's biography violence plays a central role because it becomes

part of the identity of Astrid Proll and the RAF. Edschmid describes the situation as

follows,

Wieder war es Andreas Baader, der die Gruppe rücksichtslos, aber

kraftvoll zusammenschweißte und ihr eine Struktur aufzwang, durch die es

gelingen musste, der zukünftige Gefahr standzuhalten. Dabei musste sich

jeder einzelne in seiner individuellen Geschichte der Gewaltsamkeit des

neuen Kampfbildes aussetzen. (117)

Edschmid points to the structure the group has to submit to in order to be able to protect

itself from danger. This structure is not something that is done by group members out of

their own free will but rather something that has been forced upon them. Violence

therefore plays a role in keeping the group together and is supposed to be an aid in destroying the structures in society. The manner in which this group is assembled is not based on power, because as Arendt explained power stems from the initial coming together of a group supporting a common goal. In this case, the group is organized together through violence; therefore, there is already an absence of power from the beginning.

This chapter has shown that the fictional terrorists fail to use violence as an illocutionary force component, specifically because of the unintended effect caused through the use of violence. In addition, power and authority play an integral role in the success of the illocutionary act. When violence is used there is an absence of power, which is an element that is required in order to fulfill the requirements of illocutionary force components. In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* the loss of control of the communication is shown through the bomb that was designed to communicate to the Berlin Senate that the buildings that cannot be squatted in will be destroyed. The irony in this movie is that the bomb explodes 13 years after the fact. Most group members have left the group and have forgotten about the bomb. Not only does the bomb not have the intended subsequent effect, but the unintended subsequent effect is that Group 36 is defined as a terrorist group.

In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* failure to have the intended subsequent effect on the interlocutor through violence is shown through the collapse of the GDR system, into which former terrorists have integrated themselves and which boasted of being able to create laws and a society through violence. After Rita's group loses focus of their cause, Rita joins the GDR in order to continue fighting for what she believes in. In

183

the end, she returns to her terrorist roots and commits suicide. The failure of violence is also represented through the title itself "Die Stille nach dem Schuss," which means "the silence after the shot," indicating the failure of Rita and her group to change West German society into a society were money does not rule because the shots, the violent acts, have created only a void.

In the novel *Rosenfest*, violence is used as an illocutionary force component in order to achieve what students tried to express through the flyers. In this novel, violence takes on a life of its own and seeks to destroy everything in its path. Violence is also used to undo the unintended subsequent effect caused through the use of violence. Andreas and Gudrun want to destroy the publishing house that misrepresented them and condemned them to a position in society, which they tried to counter. They are labeled terrorist, which creates a negative image not only of Andreas and Gudrun, but also of their violent act. Andreas and Gudrun believe that they can create change in society if they can destroy what has been created through language.

Finally, in the novel *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* violence fails to have the intended subsequent effect on the interlocutor and even though the women try to move away from violence this fails. Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll try to create change within their lives through violence; however, this fails and therefore they return to language in order communicate their cause. In the end, both women describe their experience as having lost any ability to reach their intended subsequent effect through perlocutionary acts.

In examining the role that violence plays as an illocutionary force component in order to achieve the subsequent effect of the perlocutionary act in the works I analyzed in

this dissertation, the conclusion derived is that violence, be it physical or symbolic, connected to terrorism, fails to have the intended subsequent effect sought for by the figures represented in the films and texts. The failure of violence is highlighted through the unintended effect, which is that after the groups use violence to achieve change, they are condemned as terrorists. The use of violence also causes there to be an absence of power and authority, and therefore the quest of the fictional terrorists to achieve the intended subsequent effect fails. Violence cannot be controlled because it will destroy anything in its path.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: TERRORISM: THE DEFECTIVE PERLOCUTIONARY ACT

This dissertation has shown that even though there is no one unifying definition of the word "terrorism," Gregor Schnitzler's film *Was tun wenn's brennt*, Volker Schlöndorff's film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest* and Ulrike Edschmid's biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten* represent "terrorism" as a form of communication, specifically as illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Terrorism is represented as a perlocutionary act when the terrorists use it in order to achieve a specific subsequent effect; however, when the word "terrorism" is used by the press/police to refer to the groups and their actions it functions as an illocutionary act because of the effect the use of the word has. Through the representation of terrorism as a failed perlocutionary act, the authors/directors highlight the inability to achieve an intended subsequent effect, which in the texts and films analyzed is the ability to create change. There is also a tension that arises between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts through the use of illocutionary force components in order to achieve the sought-for subsequent effects. Not only do problems arise through the use of perlocutionary acts, because of the unintended subsequent effects, but also through the use of violence as an illocutionary force component. Violence is the reason why the fictional terrorists lose control of their process of communication and are condemned as terrorists.

The link of terrorism to communication, writing and language has been a discussion in many fields, among those literature, philosophy, political science and history. There is a general connection made between terrorism and communication that

can be traced back to the Romantic period (Stephan 182-183), which is a trait that continues into the twenty-first century. Among the many examples available to illustrate the connection of terrorism to communication, Lewis H. Lapham uses the 1995 Oklahoma bombing. Lapham explains that Timothy McVeigh set a bomb at the Oklahoma federal building to communicate his dissatisfaction with the US government and his desire to provoke change (30); however, from McVeigh's point of view the bomb failed to communicate this dissatisfaction. The attempt to persuade others to accept his view of the government through bombing the Oklahoma federal building was a perlocutionary act with unintended consequences, although McVeigh intended that it would actually persuade others to understand and accept his ideas, that it would have the force of an illocutionary act. He did not perceive that his intended act could not achieve the force of the performative aspect of an illocutionary act; it could only provoke the uncontrollable effects of a perlocutionary speech act. This perceived failure to be able to communicate is not an isolated event, but it is shared by other terrorists, such as the Unabomber, who used the mail system to send his "messages."

The link between communication and terrorism within the texts analyzed in this dissertation illustrates the divide between the actions of groups to create change and the use of the word "terrorism" in order to define groups and their actions. When speech act theory is used to approach the link between terrorism and communication the conclusion that arises is that "terrorism" is on the one hand a perlocutionary act, because the terrorists expect that their act has a specific subsequent effect on the interlocutor. On the other hand, when the word "terrorism" is used by the press/police to describe a terrorist act, it becomes part of an illocutionary act, because according to those referred to the

word has failed to accurately describe them and their actions and it condemns them to be interpellated into a position in society which they have to continually counter.

When the word "terrorism" is used as an illocutionary act, the problem that arises is that it condemns those referred to by it. The philosopher C.A.J. Coady explains in his book *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues* that the word "terrorism" creates a negative image of those described by this term (5); therefore, the term is not used by groups to describe themselves or their actions. Because of the negative image that is created through the use of the word, the terrorists do not perceive their actions to be accurately represented, and therefore they have to counter this negative image to try to not only communicate their cause, but also to try to achieve the sought-for intended subsequent effect, which is change. The use of the word terrorism to condemn the terrorists and their actions is also perceived as an unintended consequence of the perlocutionary act, which has to be controlled in order to achieve the intended subsequent effect.

The communicative aspect of terrorism and the failure to achieve the intended subsequent effect is shown in the films and texts analysed. Each chapter in this dissertation breaks down the individual elements described above and illustrates how these are used by the authors/directors as a means to represent terrorism as a perlocutionary act that fails to achieve what the fictional terrorists intended. Consequently, the questions that need to be addressed are, (1) how does each individual film and text add to the discussion of terrorism as a means to communicate, specifically in a German context, and (2) can these artistic/literary reflections be used to inform the current international debates on terrorism.

188

The movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* is a fictionalized account of a group that is trying to stop the Berlin Senate from demolishing buildings. Even though this movie is a fictionalized account the RAF is briefly mentioned, which highlights that one cannot have a conversation about terrorism in Germany without mentioning the RAF. The influence of the RAF also connects the representation of terrorism in this film to communication, because central to the cause of the RAF was to communicate, which is shown through Ulrike Meinhof's essays. The significance of communication is shown by Schnitzler, who employs several different venues such as: the propaganda film, letters, pamphlets, banners, photographs, and violent attacks all linked to the cause of Group 36. The focus on the propaganda film within the movie not only highlights the importance to communicate, but also the ability to control the process of communication, in order to achieve a specific subsequent effect.

The inability to control the process of communication is highlighted through the use of perlocutionary acts, because part of a perlocutionary act is the unintended subsequent effect, which in the case of Group 36 is present from the beginning of the film and affects the group's process of communication. To control the process of communication Group 36 makes a propaganda film, which lays out a series of rules on how to control the process of communication in order to successfully execute a militant attack. The group lists five rules, which include choosing a symbolic target that will communicate without words, writing an explanatory letter and avoiding being linked to the letter or the attack. The content of the letter is not revealed in this propaganda film, but the process by which this letter should be composed is carefully described. The letter should be typed, not on one's own typewriter. The typewriter ribbon should be typed over

189

several times in order to cover up the message and after the letter is finished the typewriter needs to be destroyed (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). Even though the group takes these precautions, the letter is ignored until after the bomb explodes. The police receive a copy of the letter, and through this letter, the members of Group 36 are condemned as "terrorists," which shows the failure of the group to be in control of the subsequent effect of their actions.

The use of the letter in this film, and other written forms of language, emphasizes not only that Group 36 wants their violent acts to communicate a certain message, but it also highlights the expectations they have of language. Group 36 expects that their use of language has the qualities of a performative utterance, which means, according to Austin, that language is not used to describe an action but that it performs this action as it is uttered. The action to be performed is to persuade the Berlin Senate stop demolishing the buildings in Kreuzberg.

Schnitzler not only establishes a link between terrorism and communication through language and violence, but he also underlines the difference between communicating through violence when a perceived authority is behind this communication and when there is no authority behind this type of communication. Schnitzler accomplishes vesting violence with a sense of authority through the bomb Group 36 sets in the building situated in the Grunewald. This bomb is an attempt for Group 36 to "communicate" with the Berlin Senate. Violence is given a sense of authority because Group 36 perceives the destruction of the buildings they are trying to save as a form of communication; therefore, they use similar violence in return. Group 36 sets a bomb in an abandoned villa in the Grunewald, because they believe the building

190

has meaning to the Berlin Senate. Group 36 has taken what they perceived as a means of communication and has situated it into a new context in order to communicate. By using a similar type of violence to communicate they highlight Judith Butler's theory on the citational characteristic of language. Butler argues that language does not have to be constantly reinvented, but that it changes meaning according to the context it is situated in. This is also what gives language a certain kind of authority (51). In the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* this characteristic is given to violence, which is perceived as a mode of communication by Group 36. They use this communication and situate it in a new context to fit their needs.

Even though there is a perceived sense of authority through the use of violence by the Berlin Senate, violence fails to have the intended subsequent effect sought-for by Group 36. As described by Arendt, violence and authority do not coexist. The problem that arises is that there is no common ground where experiences are shared; therefore, meaning is dependent upon each individual or group, and authority cannot exist under those conditions. The significance of the shared experience is shown at the end of *Was tun wenn's brennt* when inspector Manowski discovers that Group 36 has set a bomb in the basement in order to destroy the evidence the police collected. Tim and inspector Manowski have an argument about the changes that have occurred throughout the years. Manowski points out that the divisions do not run anymore between the right and the left, but between those who won and those who tried to remain true to themselves. This new division is what at the end unites inspector Manowski with Group 36. The success of the second bomb to destroy the evidence is only possible with the corroboration from inspector Manowski.

191

Even though there is a sense that violence has successfully destroyed the evidence against Group 36, it also shows how violence is what causes the group to lose control over their process to communicate. Sofsky explains that violence will not stop until anything that causes any resistance is destroyed (193). In the film *Was tun wenn's brennt* the loss of control through violence is shown when Group 36 sets a bomb in the house in the Grunewald. This bomb is not only supposed to communicate a specific message at a specific time but is supposed to help Group 36 achieve an intended subsequent effect, which fails because the bomb explodes thirteen years after it was set. The explosion of this bomb not only shows the loss of control of the communication through the actual explosion, but also it is this bomb that alerts the police to the existence of the letter Group 36 wrote, and the combination of both is what leads the police to define Group 36 as terrorists, which is an unintended subsequent effect.

Even though violence is what causes the initial loss of control over the process of communication, violence is also used in this film to try to regain control over this lost process. Group 36 has not only lost their attempt to communicate through the letter, which was ignored by the press, and through the bomb, which explodes too late, but also when the police seize all their films because these were not made to communicate to the police. Schnitzler highlights the loss of control of communication through the group members, who left the group and reintegrated into society. The films confiscated by the police are not part of the new identity of the members that left Group 36 and are an unwanted communication from the past. In order to regain control of communication the group sets a second bomb in order to destroy anything that would link them to their past. The second bomb explodes on time and destroys the films in the evidence locker.

However, the group removes the film that shows them building and setting the first bomb, which is the film that needs to be destroyed. The second bomb was made to destroy this particular film. When Group 36 removes this film from the evidence locker, the second bomb also fails to accomplish its goal. It is not until the end of the film that Group 36 sets fire to the film reel and watches it burn. The last scene exemplifies Sofsky's theory that violence is unstoppable, because when the group asks, "Was tun wenn's brennt?" they reply "brennen lassen!" (*Was tun wenn's brennt*). Through this example, Schnitzler not only highlights the inability to reach an intended subsequent effect through violence, but also that violence will not stop until everything in its path has been destroyed. The film meant to be destroyed is not present in the evidence locker; however, the bomb still explodes and destroys not what was meant but everything in its way.

Even though the movie *Was tun wenn's brennt* is a comedy about a group that is only labeled a terrorist group once throughout the film, this film also highlights the influence of the RAF when dealing with terrorism in a German context, specifically the influence they had on communication. The link between communication and terrorism is exemplified through a variety of media, which ultimately fail to have the sought-for subsequent effect. However, this film also provides an example of how violence can be used successfully; this use of violence is not used to communicate but to destroy something. The second bomb is planned out in detail, which is a characteristic Beauvoir makes a prerequisite for violence to reach its end. A new group is also formed for a short amount of time, which includes inspector Manowski. Tim is empowered at the end by walking away from the bomb and leaving the decision to inspector Manowski to either

leave the bomb or stop it. Inspector Manowski lets the bomb explode and claims he cannot remember anything. Group 36 is freed from its past and can move towards a new future.

In contrast to this film stands *Die Stille nach dem Schuss,* in which Schlöndorff highlights communication itself not only through the different genres in the beginning of the movie, but also through the performative qualities expected of language. In this film there is also the illusion given that violence can be used in order to create a new society and control people's lives through the GDR system. Unlike the film *Was tun wenn's brennt,* where Schnitzler emphasizes the control over the process to communicate and the role of Group 36 as a terrorist group is ambiguous because they are only referred to once by the police as a terrorist group, the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* sets the terrorist group in its historical context. The word "terrorist" is used several times to refer to Rita and her group. Schlöndorff situates the group within the 1960s-1970s leftist ideology and gives them a historical context through books, poems, and magazines. Situating the group into their historical context shows that they see themselves as part of a universal struggle that has already failed to achieve the sought-for intended subsequent effect on the interlocutor through language. In other words, there is an expectation that their deeds are perlocutionary acts that will have a subsequent effect, which is to change consumer societies into societies in which money does not rule. However, they also confuse this with the performative aspect of an illocutionary speech act.

In order to show the link between communication and its ability to create change, Schlöndorff focuses on the constructed identities of the terrorists and their attempt to change these. Rita's group uses the bank robbery to redefine their image, starting with the

images created by the press. The press has constructed a negative narrative around Rita and her group by reiterating that the group is a terrorist group, which is an unintended consequence of their actions. Rita and her group incorporate this image to scare their victims; however, afterwards they try to change this image by showing that the bank owners are the robbers and that Rita and her group are only giving back what has been stolen from the people. The use of the word "terrorism" creates a negative image and is the unintended subsequent effect, which the fictional terrorists use in order to regain control over the process of communication and to achieve their intended subsequent effect.

Schlöndorff exemplifies within his film that actions are supposed to communicate through "performative utterances." Actions associated with the terrorists' cause are supposed to have performative qualities, which Schlöndorff highlights through the inclusion of a second bank robbery. Yet, the performative qualities are qualities of a perlocutionary act because their outcome cannot be guaranteed and thus the performance cannot be completed. The planning stages of this bank robbery show that the bank robbery itself is supposed to communicate the group's ideological fight. Rita refuses to rob a bank in France because it will not communicate to the people that they are not robbing a bank but that they are witnessing the German revolution. However, most of the group members want to rob the bank to use the money to finance their cause.

The film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* also illustrates Walther Laqueur's theory that "terrorism is violence, but not every form of violence is terrorism" (Laqueur, *A History* 8). Schlöndorff exemplifies this within his film through the separation of violence that attempts to communicate the terrorists' cause and random acts of violence. As mentioned

before, the bank robbery is one example that illustrates how the same acts of violence are used for different purposes. The use of senseless violence is also what causes Rita to leave the group. Rita uses senseless violence to save herself from going to jail. She shoots a police officer after he stops her while riding her scooter without a helmet.

As mentioned before, Schlöndorff's film highlights the ability to use violence as an illocutionary force component in order to attain intended subsequent effects of persuasion through the juxtaposition of the terrorist group and the GDR system. Within this film the goals of the GDR and the terrorist group are identical and they use the same method, which is violence, to reach their goals; however, there is the illusion given that the GDR leaders are speaking from a position of authority. The GDR leaders are using violence to create a society, whereas Rita and her group use violence to destroy a society. The uses of violence to create a society stand in contrast to Sofsky's claim that violence cannot create anything only destroy. Nevertheless, the inability of the GDR rulers to use violence in order to achieve an intended subsequent effect, which is the creation of a new society, eventually fails when the system collapses.

The role of communication in this film also encompasses the symbolic function of the "gun" as a performative. The gun is only supposed to communicate a threat of danger but is not supposed to be used to kill anyone. This, however, fails several times throughout the movie. Schlöndorff not only highlights the communicative function of the gun in the scene when Rita finds out Friederike cannot use a gun, but also in the scene when Rita is playing ping pong with one of the Stasi officials. Rita and the Stasi official start talking about weapons and the Stasi official is curious to know how Rita and her group used to carry weapons. Rita borrows the gun to answer the Stasi official's

questions and the gun accidentally fires. This scene highlights the inability of the gun to be used purely as a symbolic threat of violence, because it not only accidentally fires but also causes a window to break. The inability to use a gun as a means to communicate the threat of violence illustrates the inability to be able to control the use of violence. Violence takes on a life of its own, and does not stop until there is total destruction.

At the end of this film, terrorism is represented as a failure to attain an intended subsequent effect. Most of the members of Rita's group have either defected to the GDR or been shot by the police. When Rita sees Friederike she assumes Friederike is happy to be living in a society that is modeled according to the cause for which they had been fighting; however, Friederike is very unhappy. Rita's co-workers are also happy that the GDR system is failing, which Rita cannot understand because she has been fighting for a society where money does not rule. At the end Rita commits suicide, which is a way for her to regain control over her process to communicate, and she dies with her cause. The failure of the GDR dictatorsip emphasizes that violence cannot be contained and will cross borders until nothing is left in its path.

In the film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* the word "terrorist" is repeated several times by the news and the media condemning those referred to by the word. In contrast to these theories Ulrike Edschmid develops her own theory about the effect the word "terrorism" has on an individual in her book *Frau mit Waffe*: *Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten.* Even though the biographies of Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll illustrate the theories discussed previously, that terrorism is either an illocutionary or a perlocutionary act, Edschmid also tries to change the effect the word "terrorism" has on those described by it. Edschmid, in contrast to the established theories, believes that when

197

using the word "terrorism" to refer to someone, it does not create a negative narrative but it destroys the story of the individual, which means Edschmid believes violence is an essential part of this word. Therefore, in order for Edschmid to be able to create a story for these women, she wants to avoid using the term "terrorist" (Vorbemerkung), in other words to avoid violence, because violence cannot be used to create.

In these biographies there is an expectation that both language and literature be perlocutionary acts in order to be able to create change through them. Katharina de Fries and Astrid Proll expect to achieve intended subsequent effects through the use of language. In addition, there is an expectation that language be a performative at all times. In Katharina's life for instance, this expectation is already present through her father's attempt to fight against the Nazis through posters. Later in Katharina's life, she feels that language has failed to make changes in her life and therefore she takes action and uses violence in order to achieve sought-for subsequent effects.

The inability to be able to create change through literature is also a focus within these biographies. Katharina does not believe that language and writing match reality, which is a sentiment shared by many students during the 1960s and 1970s. This expectation of literature to be able to create change is already attributed to literature by revolutionary movements in the Romantic period (Stephan 182-183). That literature might be used for terrorist actions was later a fear of the German government during the 1960s and 1970s. Berendse describes the German government being fearful of having "works of fiction" used as "instruments of plain killing" (Berendse, "The Art of Terror" 196). The German government was afraid that the terrorists would make writing come true; however, it was a regular citizen who killed student leader Rudi Dutschke. The

problem that is shown in Katharina's biography is not only that she expects literature to have a subsequent effect, but she expects it to be or to mirror reality, so it would not persuade but in expressing language it would perform what it expressed.

As mentioned in *Frau mit Waffe* the word "terrorist" is also not used in its established connotation. Even though there is not one definition for the word "terrorist," one characteristic that Coady attributes to all the definitions of "terrorism" is the negative image the word creates about those referred to by it. Edschmid does not agree with this characterization of terrorism because it does not encompass the destructive force of the term. She believes that the story of the individual is destroyed by the use of the word "terrorist." Even though her theory seems to stand in contrast to what has been discussed, it also emphasizes the discussion in these chapters that the terrorists lose their individuality when joining a terrorist group and are condemned by the press/police when they are referred to by this word. Furthermore, the terrorists represented in *Die Stille nach dem Schuss* and *Was tun wenn's brennt* come together in their quest to achieve a certain goal. The individual only counts insofar as what he or she brings to the cause. Edschmid's story appears to be different; however, she does not write the story of one individual, she writes the story of two women as individuals and as members of the RAF. In addition, Edschmid avoids using the names of Katharina and Astrid within the biographies and keeps referring to them with the pronoun "sie," which takes away the individual nature of the biography.

In the biographies Edschmid writes, violence associated with terrorism is also represented as a perlocutionary act, especially in the biography of Astrid Proll. Astrid's experience with violence and the role of the gun is central to the discussion of the

performative aspect of violence as a form of communication. Astrid points to the role of the gun and its symbolic force. The gun is supposed to communicate that the group is serious about the cause they are representing. In addition, the gun is what separated those associated with the RAF from other groups fighting for the same cause. The expectations of the gun mirror the illocutionary force of language, because Astrid believes that if everyone knows how serious they are about their cause, they would have the power to achieve the intended subsequent effect. However, as Arendt points out, "power can never grow out of the barrel of a gun" (Arendt, *On Violence 44*).

Finally, terrorism is represented as the failure to achieve an intended subsequent effect. Edschmid tells the story of two known women terrorists, which already communicates that these women have failed to achieve their goals since they were arrested and incarcerated to pay for their crimes. And, even though Scanlan cautions that when authors write about terrorists, they are not necessarily describing the terrorists' cause, Edschmid's own "cause" also fails. Edschmid tries to move away from violence, as Preece argues; however, violence is reintroduced at the end of each individual biography, because Edschmid repeats the word "Terroristin" when she quotes the newspaper, showing the force of condemnation of the word, when used by the press.

In the novel *Rosenfest* by Leander Scholz terrorism is linked to communication; however, unlike the other works discussed in this dissertation, Scholz focuses on communication through language and the inability of language to not only be a performative but also have the intended subsequent effect. Scholz's goal is to undo the narrative that has been constructed in part by the press and in part by the members of the

RAF themselves. Scholz explains that, in order to find out more about the characters, in other words, to communicate about the characters, he has to undo these narratives.

Communication through language is emphasized throughout the novel, which highlights the argument that the fictional terrorists will not resort to violence until language has failed. After Benno Ohnesorg is shot by the police Gudrun Ensslin does not immediately resort to violence to keep communicating her cause. She rejoins the students in order to demonstrate against the mayor of Berlin, Albertz. Scholz's description of the student demonstration shows that language has been used to communicate a cause, but it also highlights the problems of communicating through language. Scholz exemplifies the difficulties to communicate through language when the students have to work together in order to convey the message that the mayor of Berlin needs to step down. The students have to work in unison to convey this message. The links among language, words, and actions also highlight the performative expectations the main characters have in this novel of language.

In Scholz's novel the connection of language and reality is also represented during the student demonstrations. The students are trying to make the realities of war clear to a German audience. Scholz not only describes the attempt of the students to try to connect the bombings in Vietnam to setting a bomb in a department store in Germany, but he also shows how this connection fails. Even the explanation Georg provides to the police does not help them understand the message printed on the flyers. After the police ask Georg if he is supporting a violent cause, he gives up his explanation. The message on the flyer shows the failure of language to connect to reality and have the intended

subsequent effect; therefore, Andreas Baader and Gudrun set a bomb in a warehouse to communicate the same message.

The inability to reach the intended subsequent effect is shown within this novel through the use of the word "terrorism" by the press. Scholz shows through the use of the word that a negative narrative has been constructed around the figures of Andreas and Gudrun. The word "terrorist" condemns Andreas and Gudrun, which is also shown through the pictures that are situated in the newspaper under the headline with the word terrorism. Gudrun does not recognize herself and Andreas, and she also thinks that the man in the photograph is ugly. Scholz shows through Gudrun's reaction to the newspaper article the power the press has to create a narrative and an image that do not match what the terrorists see of themselves. The newspaper article also lets Gudrun and Andreas know that they have not been able to reach their intended goals and have to keep communicating with the press until they reach their intended goals.

One aspect that Scholz introduces in his novel is that the terrorists are "körperlos" (Scholz, "Hyperrealität" 216) and therefore throughout the narrative Scholz tries to build a "body" for them. He includes descriptions of photographs, clothing and body parts to construct a body, which is disjointed. Scholz illustrates how the body is made parallel to language when Andreas and Gudrun are in France and they are taking pictures of each other. The pictures they are taking are not described as whole pictures, but as fragments. These fragments mirror the disjunction of language described at the beginning of the novel, when each student wears a letter on their shirt. The attempt to create a new narrative and a body for Gudrun and Andreas fails, because even in this moment the

pictures are compared to mug shots, which are the pictures taken by the police after an arrest has been made.

Scholz emphasizes in his novel not only the problems that arise when trying to communicate through language, but he also shows how language fails to have the intended subsequent effect in perlocutionary speech acts. When language fails, violence is introduced as an alternative means to communicate and is used as an illocutionary force component. The parallel of language and violence is established when Andreas and Gudrun set a bomb in a department store to mirror what they had been trying to communicate through the flyers. When the flyers alone do not achieve the subsequent effect sought-for, Gudrun and Andreas use violence to achieve the same subsequent effect, which is to stop the Vietnam War.

The description of the destruction of the warehouse also shows the inability of Gudrun and Andreas to be able to remain in control over the process of communication, because of the use of violence. This novel highlights the destructive force attributed to violence by Sofsky. Sofsky argues that violence will destroy everything in its path, which the description of the destruction of the warehouse also shows. Andreas and Gudrun were trying to achieve a specific subsequent effect through the bomb, which fails shown by the newscast Gudrun hears in the evening. Gudrun is not satisfied with the report because she does not feel that they are being taken seriously. The next morning the newspaper labels the perpetrators of the bombing as terrorists, which also shows the failure of the bomb to achieve the intended subsequent effect. By providing two different reports of the bombing, Scholz illustrates the constructive nature of what is reported by the press and its power to condemn those labeled as terrorists.

The loss of control of the process to communicate in this novel is shown through the bomb in the department store, because it not only destroys the wardrobe, but the fire keeps burning until all is destroyed. It is also this bomb that defines Andreas and Gudrun as terrorists, which is the unintended consequence of their perlocutionary act. The miscommunication between Gudrun/Andreas and the German public shows that they had intended their violent attempt at persuasion as an illocutionary act, which, as has been demonstrated, is impossible. Thus they could never have complete control over the public's understanding of their message. Their loss of control to communicate is expanded by the press, because they continually describe Gudrun and Andreas as terrorists, even after they receive a letter Andreas had written in order to explain their cause and actions. Finally, in order to regain control over the process to communicate, Gudrun and Andreas set a bomb in a publishing house, which also does not have the intended subsequent effect. Andreas is shot by the police, and Gudrun is arrested.

In this dissertation, I have shown how terrorism linked to communication, specifically to illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, fails to achieve the intended subsequent effect in Gregor Schnitzler's film *Was tun wenn's brennt*, Volker Schlöndorff's film *Die Stille nach dem Schuss*, Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest* and Ulrike Edschmid's biography *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten.* This failure is highlighted when the word "terrorism" is used in response to violent perlocutionary acts, which is an unintended consequence of the perlocutionary act. The unintended subsequent effect is perceived as a loss of control of communication by the so-called terrorists and therefore they strive to regain control over this process through further violent acts. The reason why the perlocutionary acts fail to achieve the

204

intended subsequent effect is because of the use of violence. The characteristics inherent in violence are what cause the communication to get out of control and are the reason why the groups are labeled as terrorists. The violence accentuates the failure to reach a guaranteed effect. It also represents an extreme attempt to make persuasion a performative illocutionary act, an attempt that can never be realized. The use of violence is intended to lend the revolutionaries power, but instead it destroys their attempt to persuade.

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armster, Charlotte. "Katharina Blum: Violence and the Exploitation of Sexuality." *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature and Culture.* 4 (1988): 83-95.

Baumann, Michael. *Terror or Love: The Personal Account of a West German Urban Guerilla.* London: John Calder, 1979.

Blasber, Anita. "Mythos Rote Armee Fraktion." *Mythen in der Kunst*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004. 176-95.

Böll, Heinrich. "Die Würde des Menschen is unantastbar." *Essaystische Schriften und Reden 2: 1964-1972.* Ed. Bernd Balzer. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1979. 542-58.

---. "Will Ulrike Meinhof Gnade oder freies Geleit?" *Essaystische Schriften und Reden 2: 1964-1972.* Ed. Bernd Balzer. Cologne: Kiepenheuer 7 Witsch, 1979. 149-52.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge, 1990

---. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

---. "Variations on Sex and Gender: Beauvoir, Wittig and Foucault." *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. New York: Longman, 1998. 612-623.

---. *Giving an Account of Oneself.* New York: Fordham, 2005.

Chomsky, Noam. *The Culture of Terrorism.* Boston: South End Press, 1988.

Corkhill, Alan. "Die Sprache des Patriarchats in Heinrich Bölls *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum*." *AUMLA* 83 (1995): 19-30.

Crayton, John W. "Terrorism and the Psychology of the Self." *Perspectives on Terrorism.* Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1983. 33-41.

Deschner, Margareta Neovius. "Heinrich Böll's Utopian Feminism." *University of Dayton Review* 17.2 (1985): 119-127.

Elias, Norbert. "Terrorismus, Nationalstolz und nationale Zivilisationsmuster." *Studien über die Deutschen.* Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1994. 361-89.

Falcon, Richard. "That Obscure Object of Redemption or 'Reality' in Two Adaptations of Heinrich Böll." *University of Dayton Review* 24.3 (1997): 163-171.

Feldman, Allen. "Violence and Vision: The Prosthetics and Aesthetics of Terror." *Violence and Subjectivity.* Berkeley: U of California P, 2000. 46-78.

Fetscher, Iring. *Terrorismus und Reaktion in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in Italien.* Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1981.

Herman, Edward S. and Gerry O'Sullivan. *The Terrorism Industry: The Experts and Institutions That Shape Our View of Terror.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1989.

Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism.* London: Victor Gollancz, 1998.

Kapellen, Michael. *Doppelt Leben: Bernward Vesper und Gudrun Ensslin: Die Tübinger Jahre.* Tübingen: Klöpfer & Meyer, 2005.

Kaplan, E. Ann. "Discourses of Terrorism, Feminism, and the Family in von Trotta's Marianne and Juliane." *Women & Literature* (1988) 4: 258-272.

Koenen, Gerd. *Vesper, Ensslin, Baader: Urszenen des deutschen Terrorismus.* Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2003.

Kuttenberg, Eva. "The Hidden Face of Narcissus: Suicide as Poetic Speech in Margarethe von Trotta's Early Films." *Women in German Yearbook* 20 (2004): 122-144.

MacDonald, Eileen. "German Women and Violence." *Shoot the Women First.* New York: Random House, 1991. 195-229.

Meinhof, Ulrike. "Die Frauen im SDS oder in eigener Sache." *Die Würde des Menschen ist Antastbar.* Berlin: Wagenbach, 1994. 149-52.

---. "Warenhausbrandstiftung." *Die Würde des Menschen ist antastbar.* Berlin: Wagenbach, 1994. 153-6.

Mohr, Reinhard. "Die Prada-Meinhof-Bande." *Der Spiegel* 25 Februar 2002. 202-4.

Moeller, H-B. "The Films of Margarethe von Trotta: Domination, Violence, Solidarity, and Social Criticism." *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature and Culture* 2 (1986): 129-149.

Morgan, Robin. "Token Terrorist." *Demon Lover: On the Sexuality of Terrorism.* New York: Norton, 1989. 180-216, 362-4.

Mouton, Janice. "Margarethe von Trotta's Sisters: 'Brides Under a Different Law'" *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature and Culture* 11 (1995): 35-47.

Oberender, Thomas. "Das Sehen Sehen: Über Botho Strauß und Gerhard Richter." *Sinn und Form: Beiträge zur Literatur.* Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag GmbH, 2002. 32-41.

Oestreicher, Paul. "The Roots of Terrorism: West Germany: A Special Case?" *The Round Table* 269 (1978): 75-80.

Onwudiwe, Ihekwoaba D. *The Globalization of Terrorism.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

Orton, Marie. "De-Monsterizing the Myth of the Terrorist Woman: Faranda, Braghetti, and Mamro." *Annali d'italianistica.* 16 (1998): 280-296.

Pflieger, Klaus. *Die Rote Armee Fraktion--RAF: 14.5.1970 bis 20.4.1998.* Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2004.

Russell, Charles A and Bowman H. Miller. "Profile of a Terrorist." *Perspectives on Terrorism.* Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1983. 45-70.

Sklar, Robert. "Invaded by Memories of Germany's Past: An Interview with Margarethe von Trotta." *Cineaste* (2004): 10-12.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Terror: A Speech after 9-11." *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture.* 31 (2004): 81-111.

Storr, Robert. *Gerhard Richter: October 17, 1977.* New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2000.

Tolmein, Oliver. "Deutschland, Auschwitz und die RAF." *Vom Deutschen Herbst zum 11. September.* Hamburg: Konkret, 2002. 21-34.

Wasmund, Klaus. "The Political Socialization of West German Terrorists." *Political Violence and Terror.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. 191-228.

Weber, Hans Jürgen and Ingeborg Weber eds. *Die Bleierne Zeit: Ein Film von Margarethe von Trotta.* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1981.

Wernicke, Lutz. *Stammheim 1977: Wirklichkeit und Propaganda.* Münster: ATE, 2004.

Widdowson, Peter. "Terrorism and Literary Studies." *Textual Practice* 2.1 (1988): 1-21.

Wilkinson, Paul. *Political Terrorism.* New York, A Halsted Press Book, 1974.

Wright, Joanne. *Terrorist Propaganda: Red Army Faction and the Provisional I.R.A. 1968.* London: Macmillan, 1991.

Zulaika, Joseba and William A. Douglass. *Terror and Taboo:The Follies, Fables, and Faces of Terror.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

REFERENCES CITED

Appelbaum, Robert, and Alexis Paknadel. "Terrorism and the Novel, 1970-2001."
        Poetics Today 29.3 (2008): 387-436.

Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. New York: Harcourt, 1969.

---. "What is Authority?' *Between Past and Future*. New York: Penguin, 1985.

Aust, Stefan. *Der Baader Meinhof Komplex.* München: Goldmann, 1998.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.

---. "Performative Utterances." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism.* New
        York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 1430-1442.

Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." *Image-Music-
        Text.* Ed. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Ethics of Ambiguity.* New York: The Citadel Press, 1964.

Berendse, Gerrit-Jan. *Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle
        Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF-
        Terrorismus.* München: Edition Text + Kritik, 2005.

---. "The Art of Terror: Textualisations of the Baader-Meinhof 'Super Body.' *Error and
        Text – Representing Political Violence in Literature and the Visual Arts.*
        Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2002. 195 - 214.

Berlins Größte Zeitung. http://www.bz-berlin.de.

Bild-Zeitung. http://www.bild.de.

Blanchot, Maurice. "The Language of Fiction." *The Work of Fire*. Palo Alto: Stanford
        UP, 1995. 74-84.

---. "Literature and the Right to Death." *The Work of Fire*. Palo Alto: Stanford
        UP, 1995. 300-344.

Brecht, Bertolt. "Wenn das bleibt, was ist." *Gesammelte Werke 9*. Frankfurt am Main:
        Suhrkamp, 1967.

Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. London: Routledge,
        1997.

Coady, C.A.J. *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Edschmid, Ulrike. *Frau mit Waffe: Zwei Geschichten aus terroristischen Zeiten.* Berlin: Rowohlt, 1996.

Emde, Silke von der. "Intertextuality as Political Strategy in Margarethe von Trotta's Film *Marianne and Juliane.*" *West Virginia University Philological Papers* 38. (1992): 270-279.

Ensslin, Gudrun, Christiane Ensslin and Gottfried Ensslin.*'Zieht den Trennungsstrich, jede Minute':Briefe an ihre Schwester Christiane und ihren Bruder Gottfried aus dem Gefängnis 1972-1973.* Hamburg: Konkret Literatur, 2005.

Felman, Shoshana. *The Literary Speech Act: Don Juan with J.L. Austin, or seduction in two languages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Giannetti, Louis. *Understanding Movies*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008.

Hanssen, Beatrice. "On the Politics of Pure Means: Benjamin, Arendt, Foucault." *Violence, Identity, and Self-Determination.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997. 236-252, 381-385.

Harris, Nigel. "Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum: The Problem of Violence." *The Narrative Fiction of Heinrich Böll: Social Conscience and Literary Achievement*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 198-218.

Hoerschelmann, Olaf. *"'Memoria Dextera Est': Film and Public Memory in Postwar Germany." Cinema Journal* 40.3 (2001): 78-97.

Horchem, Hans Josef. *Terrorism in West Germany.* London: Institute for the Study of Conflict, 1986.

Howes, Geoffrey. "Classicism and Modernity in Bertolt Brecht's Poetry." *Seminar* 4 (1981): 283-295.

Knoll, Johanna. "Fiktion eines Berichts. Narrative Reflexe sozialgeschichtlicher Konstellationen in Heinrichs Bölls *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum.*" *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik.*35.2 (2003): 101-17.

Kubiak, Anthony. "Spelling It Out: Narrative Typologies of Terror." *Studies in the Novel* 36.3 (2004): 294-301.

Laqueur, Walther. *A History of Terrorism.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

---. *The New Terrorism.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Lapham, Lewis H. "Seen but Not Heard." *Harper's Magazine* 291.1742 (1995): 29-36.

Lentricchia, Frank and Jody McAuliffe. *Crimes of Art + Terror.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2003.

Preece, Julian. "Between Identification and Documentation, 'Autofiction' and 'Biopic': The Lives of the RAF." *German Life and Letters* 56 (2003): 363-376.

Primoratz, Igor. "What is Terrorism?" *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 15-27.

"Poster." *New Standard Encyclopedia.* 4th ed. 1993.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Grundfragen der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.

Scanlan, Margaret. *Plotting Terror: Novelists and Terrorists in Contemporary Fiction.* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain:The Making and Unmaking of the World.*New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Schmid, Alex Peter and Janny de Graaf. *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western News Media.* London: Sage, 1982.

Scholz, Leander. "Hyperrealitat oder das Traumbild der RAF."*Akzente: Zeitschrift für Literatur* 48.3 (2001): 214-220.

---. *Rosenfest.* München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001.

Searle, John and Daniel Vanderveken. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic.* New York: Cambridge U P, 1985.

Silberman, Marc. "The Subject of Identity: Margarethe von Trotta's *Marianne and Juliane." German Cinema: Texts in Context.* Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1995. 198-213.

Simon, Fritz B. *Terror im System: Der 11. September und die Folgen.* Heidelberg: Carl-Auer-Systeme, 2002.

Stephan, Inge. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte.* Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1994.

Stille nach dem Schuss (Die). Dir. Volker Schlöndorff. Perf. Bibiana Beglau, Martin Wuttke, Nadja Uhl. Babelsberg Film, 2001.

Sofsky, Wolfgang. *Traktat zur Gewalt.* Frankfurt: Fischer, 2000.

Teraoka, Arlene A. "Terrorism and the Essay: The Case of Ulrike Meinhof." *The Politics of the Essay: Feminist Perspectives.* Ed. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher Joeres and Elizabeth Mittmann. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1993.

"terrifying." *Merriam Webster.*
http://aolsvc.merriam-webster.aol.com/dictionary/terrifying.

Townshend, Charles. *Terrorismus: Eine kurze Einführung.* Ditzingen: Reclam, 2005.

Trotta, Margarethe von. *Die bleierne Zeit.* Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1985.

United States. Dept. of Defense. *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. dtic.mil.* Information for the Defense Community. 22 March 2007.

United States. Dept. of Defense. *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. dtic.mil.* Information for the Defense Community. 8 Nov 2010. Web. 26 Jul. 2011.

Viett, Inge. *Nie war ich furchtloser.* Hamburg: Nautilus, 1996.

Was tun wenn's brennt. Dir. Gregor Schnitzler. Perf. Til Schweiger, Martin Feifel, Sebastian Blomberg, Nadja Uhl, Matthias Matschke, Doris Schretzmayer, and Klaus Löwitsch. Colombia, 2002.

Wilpert, Gero von. *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur.* Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2001.

Winkler, Willi. *Die Geschichte der RAF.* Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2008.