

## German Movie, Der Baader Meinhof Komplex- Focusing on granting the justification to the violence

Chang Hyun Cho

Department of German Language and Literature, Chung-Ang University  
[Choch7778@hanmail.net](mailto:Choch7778@hanmail.net)

**Abstract.** The thing that the movie, “Baader Meinhof“ tried to say is not on the proclamation of historic failure of the terrorism of radical leftist. The ignorance of the state and the police not understanding the intention and situation of the people who were driven out to the extreme struggle and circumstances that offered the propriety to this group which, at first, had no other choice but to fail brought misfortune on itself. Through this fact we see all the terrorists becoming stained with the blood and also our past. Irrespective of the fact that who is right or who is wrong, we witnessed the countless people falling a victim to the violence. Through the life of countless people sacrificed to the violence, we are in agony, by the fact that the violence could really be justified. Through this paper, I want to find that from where did the violence of public power were begun and by whom the justification to such violence was granted.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, The leftist, revolution, violence, peace, Justification

### 1 Introduction

To our society where from the words like “the leftist”, “the socialism” we Koreans show the unconditional denial and the allergy reaction, it is very burdensome to take out the topic about R.A.F (Red Army Faction).

This movie has never beautified R.A.F. But I was very surprised at the cultural basis of Europe that can make the movie of such a subject matter with investing the greatest production cost in successive generations.

At that time when the tide of a revolution had cooled off and when both you and I had gone back to every-day life with a wave of improving in claiming that “a ceremonial feast had been finished”, they developed more radical struggle not by putting on an end to a quarrel of revolution. Against a system that became more solid to the direction that is different from their ideal, they offered a stubborn resistance.

This movie is the one which is about Baader Meinhof Group of west-Germany that was composed by Andreas Baader, Ulrike Meinhof and Gudrun Ensslin who held a rifle at the ready for the terror as a means to an end.

## 2 Violence and Peace

In order to investigate their acts, it is necessary to have a study about violence and peace. Violence and terror, are they really a heinous crime? And also, does the peace mean the silent situation without any disagreement and resistance? Why the leftists or the opposition group heading for the peaceful world and for the freedom of mankind establish their influence on the horribly and illegally violent struggle among their strategies? I don't want to justify the violence itself. Throughout the history of mankind, under the name of the moral obligation and the just and righteous cause, the mistakenly violent acts were happened in so many times. Such acts made our mankind and society throw into confusion. The cruelty and appalling resulting from such acts, which are the historical lesson that we should stay in our mind over and over again.

Fighting against the violence committed by the government, their crying had begun with the innocent resistance. Like the one that they made an objection to invasion upon Vietnam by the U.S.A, the center of capitalism, their small crying had the persuasive power. But their crying was in a low voice that couldn't attract public attention or couldn't be accepted by the people.

As the result of it, what they selected was the terror through a fire of department store. The effectiveness was the talk of the country that could receive much publicity from the press with swiftness. Their pure passion, without knowing it, got connected with committing homicide or with extreme kidnapping.

The people who acted in concert with them began to be strangled from them, by ones and twos, and turned their back to them. In order to come up to their expectations, they were indiscreet in employing means to show the double personal appearance like the one to cut off connection with the parents and the children. To make matters worse, even when they were arrested by the police to stand trial for murder, they gave directions to the group acting upon them for the terror and the abduction with dreaming to escape from confinement. However, to the feeble people who were exposed to an act of violence of everyday directly and indirectly (whether it is the violence of the country or the arrogance of market, the demand to the spontaneous submission) the only one means to carry out their intention is to do the irrational and violent exercise. For a righteous democracy we must bleed.

Before the violence of the people, the violence of the capital, of the nation and of the powerful was necessarily preceded. In history people has never taken precedence to choose the violence. Nonviolence is not always correct. Rather than the nonviolence making an outcry under the peaceful and safe situation, the nonviolence giving full play to the violent situation at the risk of their life is authentic. The assertion that violence should never be justified under any situation is always the logic of the strong and the majority of the weak that are attacked by the strong align themselves with such claim.

The word, "peace", if we put a construction on this word by dictionary, is explained as the calmness without any wars, any factional rivalry or without the whole of any complications.

If so, keeping this situation without any conflict or without any change, or the acts encouraging with that way could be an attitude taken by the pacifists? What we have felt about a peace is not the peace, but is nothing but the safety and danger of the

individual? In fact, politically we are under the situation of an armed peace. Outwardly, we insist on the peace, but inwardly, we increase armaments to keep the peace with balance of military strength. That is the present situation, I think. The characters within the movie get over a matter of vital importance to the welfare of the individual to be sensitive to the problems of peace. We guess it from the dialogue between Meinhof and Gudrun.

- Meinhof : By setting fire to a department store we could stop the massacre of Vietnam.
- Gudrun : No, Never. We made a mistake too. That aspect, I, also, told to a low court. However, at the times of Hitler regime when Fascism was spreading out, we all only watched such terrible situation. We must protest, as much as we could do, on the wrongdoing of Vietnam to be fair to future generations. Both we and American people want to eat continuously and want to do their shopping. But they don't think. They only want to consume. To make them live on their thought, we gave them a warning.

The words of Gudrun in the movie "Please, live on their thought..." had a meaning that she wanted to make the ordinary people realize the looks of passive life. Let's take an example of photo. Today, it is very rare to be afraid of camera with the thought that like the people of primitive ages a photo is made by the part of human body that are falling apart from the part of it. Despite of it, such indications of magic speculation is still remaining. For example, the photo of the loving person, especially we could meet such persons as not to tear a photo to pieces or not to throw away the photo of the loving persons who had already been dead or had been estranged.

Such attitude is a gesture of merciless refusal. A hero Jude in "The misfortune of Jude", to the wedding day with Arabela, passes her his photo that is put in a photo frame made by a maple tree. But when he knew that Arabela had sold this photo frame together with his photo, he thought that "the feeling of his wife toward him had disappeared." He concluded that he had to remove all the feeling toward her entirely. But, really, the modern primitivism doesn't regard the image as the practical objects. The actual has a likeness to the image that we can see through camera more and more. Often, the people of today willingly tell that it looked like a movie about the explosion of terrorists, shooting at random and air plane collision, violent accident that people must go through, as if they were not to speak of their own experience, sufficiently in a different way.

As we integrate this discussion, rather than the unconditional affirmation of than the unconditional negation, the contact detonation existing to the other side, in other words, the question, why, should be preceded. A point of view that we see through this movie should also be the same. We examined ourselves about their wrong acts.

Why they had to be a human weapon?

What is the revolution? What is their mistakes? These questions arise from the movie. To contemplate the message that this movie gives us would become the reason for being of this movie.

### 3 Revolution, an Impressive Word

They, also would not be extremists. They adopted the gun and bomb as a last resort. Their purpose was the revolution overthrowing the world.

68 movements being stirred by the repulsion against Vietnam War, Ho Chi Minh, the ideal of European younger generation in these days crying out for the power to the imagination, exploitation by the capital, obliteration of humanity within the consuming society, sexual suppression, supervision and violence by the imperialistic countries, the liberation from all the authority restricting and oppressing the human being, the resistance to obtain the liberation.

Gudrun in the movie explained the reason why she set up an explosive to the department store that is the symbol of the capital. She told that “she had to protest the indifference of all the people only to see the sights of Vietnam Massacre”.

What is the revolution? Mao told that “revolution would never be elegant and beautiful. That(Revolution) is the violent acts overturning class in itself”. The belief that the inhumane and cruel acts would, finally, be the heroic act and would be estimated as the height of their humanity may be the faith and be a magic formula that is held down to the mind of revolutionists.

The presumptuous younger generation in Europe in these days could know of this facts perfectly? Or innocent enough to believe that someday they could accomplish the revolution, if they would fire a gun as Mao and Che Guevara do? Or would they firmly believe that they wanted to be pioneers in history, as Baader told in the movie, that we would be appraised after many generations.

The radicalism of R.A.F that was manifested in the struggle that didn't want to place the revolution that 68 movements possesses until to the last moments emerged from the obstinacy of a political line that is recklessly clear and from the ideal like the revolution.

According to the original works of movie, “The Time of a Myth”, Ulrike Meinhof, immediately before the organization of R.A.F, told that the reproduction conditions and the absolute fallacy through the whole part of a superstructure and after feeling nausea to the complete marketablization, and also after getting frustrated to the movements of the Opposition and of the students he thought of the need to make propaganda about an ideology of an armed uprising. They were not foolish to believe that they had been able to lead the success of revolution in Germany with such initiative. They did imagine that they could be hit by the bullet and be placed under arrest. They didn't wrongly assess the situation that the people would simply rise against oppression with some signaling.

Their aim was to illuminate the general understanding to the 68 movements and also their campaign was not split in two. What the movie, “Baader Meinhof”, tried to tell us is not to ruminate the cruelty of reckless terror, not to ruminate their downfall scornfully and not to feel homesick of those days. The meaning and suggestion that this movie gives we could know through this dialogue. “To throw one stone is a crime, but to throw one thousand stone are political activities. To burn one car is a crime, but to burn one thousand cars are political activities. But R.A.F did only stay as an organization with waywardness trying to throw 'one stone'. They wanted to become avant-gardists throwing 'one-thousand stones', but had to result in staying only one insignificant organization. As they explained, vividly, to a declaration to

disorganization, their genuine and intolerant armed-uprising brought about the result that made an armed uprising not trust even in the period when an armed uprising is required. If some human beings don't want to hesitate to express the truth, they will lead their life in a different way. The problem is that we all don't know that from what truth is started and to what result is incurred. The question that is the most important and is raising an objection against them would be the following ones. "Could it be justified to kill another people?" "Could it be upright to win over the violence by another violence?" "Could you tolerate the killings of the minor for the majority?" We all lead our life with the firm belief that we do know the answer for such questions. This could be possible to the time when we are the disinterested party keeping away from all the situations. No matter what the accident is the one before my face, or is a bitter struggle within my soul, under the circumstances where the part of my life or the loving subject are trampled down it is very rare for us to find such people as not to find out the reason for the anger and the fight. If we don't find out such reason it will not be easy for such person with falsehood to be fair after giving orders to release bombs over the heads of innocent people with moral justification to set up the democracy and to expel a tyrant from the country.

Human beings, often, seem to be foolish, but, in another case, they are thoughtful. Therefore, they understand the fact that the violence and hatred are not, completely, the responsibility of the person who expressed the violence and hatred.

#### 4. Conclusion

The final conclusion that the ideology and practice of R.A.F is heading toward is no more than the justification of violent system, uniformity of totalitarianism and another totalitarianism. Despite of it, the reason why we should be in agony to the terror of R.A.F and why we should not be able to condemn the blind practice in an easy way are existing in some respects. One of the answers for such reasons is the following : They had led their life to the end with the innocent will and the honest attitude that are undeniable facts. They were human beings that had jumped into a suffering battlefield in this world of an unanswerable question.

#### References

1. Fuhr, E.: Badder Meinhof Komplex. Terror als Action. In:Die welt. 18. Sept. (2008).
2. Diestelmeyer, Jan: Baader. Christopher Roths Terroristen-Biografie scheitert an ihren vorgaben. In: epd Film, Nr.10, 02, 10. 2002
3. Aust, Stefan: Der Baader Meinhof Komplex, Hamburg, (1985).
4. Krebs, M.: Ulrike Meinhof. Ein Leben im Widerspruch, Frankfurt am Main, (1988).
5. Stern, K., Hermann, J.: Andreas Baader-Das Leben eines Staatsfeindes, Munchen, (2007).
6. Kerilholz S.: [Filmkritik. www.critic.de/film/es-kommt-der-tag-1750](http://www.critic.de/film/es-kommt-der-tag-1750), (2009).
7. Fels, G.: Die Aufruhr der 68er. Zu den geistigen Grundlagen der Studentenbewegung und der RAF, Bonn Bouvier, (1998).