# Terrorism as Communication in Gregor Schnitzler's Was tun wenn's brennt (2001) and Leander Scholz's Rosenfest (2001)

### Sandra I Dillon

## **Synopsis**

This essay explores the connection of terrorism to communication, specifically to illocutionary and perlocutionary acts in Gregor Schnitzler's *Was tun wenn's brennt* and Leander Scholz's novel *Rosenfest*. One cannot deny that violence plays an important role in German narratives about terrorism; however, the main focus of the works analyzed here is communication, which the narrative structure, the role of the spectator or reader and the main characters within the novel illustrate.

# **Biography**

Sandra Dillon is a graduate student at the University of Oregon and a full time instructor at Idaho State University. The paper presented here is the first chapter in her dissertation titled, *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.

## **Essay**

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 analyzed in this paper 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. This paper, will show how Gregor Schnitzler's comedy *Was tun wenn's brennt* (2001) and the novel *Rosenfest* (2001) by Leander Scholz 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 text and film under analysis 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).

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

In addition, Kubiak addresses the role of the spectator within the 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 spectators ideally understand the narrative as the terrorists intended it. The requirement that the message is understood as intended is an illocutionary effect of an illocutionary act. However, persuasion, 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 is understood as they intended it (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.* 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 (35). 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 not only connect terrorism and communication in general, but they specifically connect it to writing through the rotary press (9). 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 is: what connection is there between a terrorist narrative and a narrative about terrorism? 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.* 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 (1).

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 Literatur Geschichte*. 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 (Stephan 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'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 between "victim, double and rival."

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," which at first glance writers attain through language but not through violence. However, "undo[ing] the West's 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 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 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, specifically the perlocutionary act, 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. 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 is understood as they intend it, which is not a characteristic of a perlocutionary but an illocutionary act. The letter Group 36 writes is also an attempt at controlling the process of communication to reduce the possibility for misunderstandings.

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 (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.

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 text and film under analysis also emphasize. However, the works also comment on speech act theories, specifically the tension between the illocutionary and the perlocutionary acts. Scholz and Schnitzler accomplish this by writing or telling a story about the individual terrorists detached from their group identity. Even though Scholz and Schnitzler 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, Scholz and Schnitzler 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 text and film under

analysis, and language plays an integral role in this communication. Although the main characters in the text and film 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 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 the mimesis and the 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 "exactly" and "listen," 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 perlocutionary acts as J.L. 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 illocutionary acts. Here the illocutionary 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 illocutionary 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 this 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.

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 words "Step Down" 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 not only emphasizes the performative aspect of protesting, but it ties the linguistic aspect to this form of

communication. 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. One of the illocutionary characteristics that is retained, after Andreas and Gudrun focus solely on perlocutionary acts, is the act of explaining their actions. Searle and Vanderveken assert that part of an illocutionary act is that the interlocutor has to understand the message of the utterance, whereas understanding is not the goal of a perlocutionary act but what the subsequent effects of an utterance is. Even though Gudrun and Andreas are focused on the subsequent effects of their perlocutionary acts, they also keep explaining their actions because they want to make sure that their interlocutors understand the message they are trying to send.

Language and communication are central in the Scholz's novel and Schnitzler's film, 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 text and film 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, "[s]ome recent narrative theory, [...], 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 my argument 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.

Unlike the movie 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. 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 (Hyperrealität 218). The 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. 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 actions are supposed to communicate by themselves, which is a characteristic of a perlocutionary act, but explaining things in order for the actions to be understood as intended is part of illocutionary acts.

Terrorism in the film and text 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 officer, who links the terrorist groups to the cause for which they are fighting. Dr Henkel claims that the danger and unpredictability of the group stems from the cause for which they are fighting (*Was tun wenn's brennt*), which in turn is also their identity, their reason to exist.

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.

Finally, that the text and film 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 mentioned earlier, 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 through the information the reader or film viewer brings to the narrative in order to complete the story. However, the spectator/reader is not free to interpret the narrative, which is illustrated through the emphasis on the control of the process to communicate. By controlling 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 an illocutionary 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 Scholz's narrative, the reader 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, "June 2nd, 1967 became a historical date, a turning point in the thinking and feeling of many, not only of the students" (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 Julianne. 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 Julianne" she claims that the viewer adds an intertext to the movie's narrative. 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 represents terrorism not only as a form of communication through their main characters, but also through the narratives they create. Scholz's narrative collage requires information brought by the viewer and information provided by the group itself to illustrate the representation of terrorism as a form of communication, which is specifically what Kubiak refers to as "terrorist narrative."

In this presentation I have shown how Gregor Schnitzler's comedy *Was tun wenn's brennt* and the novel *Rosenfest* by Leander Scholz represent terrorism as a form of communication that starts with language. Communication is not limited to written and spoken language, but also extends to the performative qualities of the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Schnitzler and Scholz 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. The communicative aspect of their speech acts is also highlighted through the role of an interlocutor, which 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.

### **Works Cited**

Appelbaum, Robert, and Alexis Paknadel. "Terrorism and the Novel, 1970-2001." *Poetics Today* 29.3 (2008): 387-436.

Aust, Stefan. Der Baader Meinhof Komplex. München: Goldmann, 1998.

Austin, J.L. How to do things with word. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.

Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." Image-Music-

Text. Ed. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Berendse, Gerrit-Jan. Schreiben im Terrordrom: Gewaltkodierung, kulturelle
Erinnerung und das Bedingungsverhältnis zwischen Literatur und RAF- Terrorismus. München:
Edition Text + Kritik. 2005.

Coady, C.A.J. *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Emde, Silke von der. "Intertextuality as Political Strategy in Margarethe von Trotta's Film Marianne and Julianne." West Virginia University Philological Papers 38.(1992): 270-279.

Giannetti, Louis. Understanding Movies. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008.

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.

Scanlan, Margaret. *Plotting Terror: Novelists and Terrorists in Contemporary Fiction.* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001.

- Scholz, Leander. "Hyperrealitat oder das Traumbild der RAF." *Akzente: Zeitschrift für Literatur* 48.3 (2001): 214-220.
- ---. Rosenfest. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001.
- Stephan, Inge. Deutsche Literatur Geschichte. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1994.
- Stille nach dem Schuss (Die). Dir. Volker Schlöndorff. Perf. Bibiana Beglau, Martin Wuttke, Nadja Uhl. Babelsberg Film, 2001.
- 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.