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Notes

Introduction

5. Connerton, p. 121.
7. My discussion of the dynamics of ‘urban memory’ here expands upon and, hopefully, unpacks somewhat Janet Ward’s assertion that ‘we’ ‘need’ both communicative and cultural memory. Ward, 2011, p. 98.
8. One of the aims of this book is to open out the horizons as well as clarify what is specific about ‘urban memory’. The term is used explicitly in, for example, Mark Crinson, Urban Memory: History and Amnesia in the Modern City, but also two uses of the term, in specific reference to Daniel Libeskind, in Janet Ward’s Post-Wall Berlin, p. 329 and p. 330.
9. Halbwachs, p. 133
11. Lefebvre, 1974, p. 307
12. Janet Ward uses the term ‘metropolitan memory’ to describe this phenomenon, referring to the work of Aldo Rossi; Ward, 2011, p. 224. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of Rossi’s particular influence on this specific form of urban memory in Berlin.
16. The production of the ‘spatial image’ generates a combined form of communicative and cultural memory (see also footnote 8).
17. Connerton, p. 34 [my italics].
21. Ibid.
22. De Certeau, 1984, p. 89.
23. Assmann, 2006b, p. 300 [my translation].
26. Bennett, p. 263.
27. Frisby, p. 312.


32. Bennett, p. 264.


35. Huysen, 1994, p. 34.


41. Bennett, p. 273.

42. Huysen, 1994, p. 34.

43. Huysen, 1994, p. 34.


47. Hein, p. 118.


56. Cf. Till, p. 102, for a Benjamin-influenced account of this reworking of perception through the ‘shock’ effect of ‘age value’.


60. Sheringham, p. 7.

61. Sheringham, p. 9.

62. Sheringham, p. 16.

63. Assmann, 2006b, p. 309.

64. Assmann, 2006b, p. 309.

There is a fascinating footnote in Karen Till’s book that opens up the question of the ‘insider’/‘outsider’s sense of place’: Till, p. 252, footnote 1. By contrast, Janet Ward constantly shifts between the positions of ‘we’ (scholars?) and ‘tourists/visitors’ and ‘Berliners’ in her book. The question of the collective address of the ‘spatial image’ is one that I address specifically in the conclusion.

There is a curious consonance between Dehio’s position and that of Janet Ward in *Post-Wall Berlin*, in their denigration of the ‘obsolescent’, and the need for ‘public history’ to play a didactic role. Ward assigns obsolescent spaces a very particular role in the history of the city that has effectively been overcome in the post-unification period.

It is this focus on visual culture and its practices that distinguishes this book from Andrew Webber’s Benjaminitian archaeology of Berlin in the twentieth century, which is focused predominantly through the lens of national identity.

Compare Rudy Koshar’s rather abrupt dismissal of a related artistic practice of the countermonument in Neukölln in the 1980s. The discussion of aesthetic practice is explained by the ‘fact’ that ‘the very notion of a disappearing monument, a celebration of absence, had much to do with the special anxiety of how it felt to imagine being German.’ Koshar, pp. 266-67.

For a reading of these functions of ‘rubble photography’ see, for example, Steven Hoelscher, “Dresden, a Camera Accuses”: Rubble Photography and the Politics of Memory in a Divided Germany’, *History of Photography* 36, no. 3 (2012): 288-305.

Indeed the opening dialogue between the two principal characters of the film (Elle and Lui) expresses the conventional critique of musealization, summarized by Andreas Huyssen as a process that is ‘freezing, sterilizing, dehistoricizing and decontextualizing’; the reduction of the past to a framed image, ‘drained of life’. Huyssen, 1994, p. 30.
87. Deleuze, p. 8.
88. Kleihues, 1993b, p. 33
89. Cf. Colomb, 2007, for a comprehensive summary of this period. Colomb’s argument that this case study shows the need to move beyond identity debates to consider the renegotiation of the social uses and public nature of a strategic inner-city site in a market economy is one that overlaps with my own. Her emphasis on the ‘interim use’ is one that I expand on by treating the artistic works in detail in themselves. Lars Ramberg’s Zweifel, for example, is mentioned briefly in footnote 82.

1. **Remembering the ‘Murdered City’**

1. Schwedler, p. 3 [my translation, as are all following citations from Schwedler]
2. Schwedler, p. 11.
3. Interbau, p. 12.
5. Hagemann, p. 4.
8. To apply such a hermeneutics of suspicion to these photo books and view every demolition as evidence not of the operations of the synchronic gaze, but of national amnesia, is plausible. It however not only lacks evidential basis, but any lack of evidence can simply be used as evidence of amnesia.
10. See, for example, Professor Paul Clemens’s article in the Tagesspiegel of 4 May 1957 on the tasks of monument preservation today and tomorrow, which illustrates neatly the problems of formulating the role of preservation at a time when it is merely one voice of (at least) three – the others (including Hans Scharoun) argued that ‘urban planning has become the “symbol” of a new age’. Clemens is reduced to reiterating the role of a marginalized voice warning against the transgression of the laws and foundations of the ‘Gewordenen’.
11. If nothing else, this should remind us that there is nothing particularly new or surprising about the municipal display of building projects. Cf. Janet Ward, 2011, pp. 305-307.
12. For extensive discussions of this case, see Simon Ward, 2006a, pp. 250-255, and Warnke, pp. 220-231.
16. Posener, p. 52 [my translation, as are all following citations from Posener].
17. Posener, p. 53.
18. Siedler, p. 4.
26. This formal celebration of automobilized perception is exemplified in one final photo book from this era: Horst Cornelsen’s *Gebaut in 25 Jahren* (1973), which functions as an apposite summary of the outcome of the plans for Berlin’s reconstruction first formulated by Hans Scharoun in 1946, to which Cornelsen also refers.

27. The camera elsewhere records remnants of collective spatial practice: shop fronts, pubs with billiard tables.

28. This process is reinforced by captions which elaborate the stories that would have been part of the oral memory of the local collective if it had not required the preservation in this form of memorialization that not only records, but also shapes a visual encounter. For example, in the section on ‘shops’, on p. 137, we have the story of the second-hand shop in a cellar in Kreuzberg. On the following page, a portrait of the fishmongers Margarethe and Max Kuhn, is amplified through a narrative about the practices in their shop. Similarly the pub of Gerhard and Luci Leydicke not only records the history of the building in Schöneberg, and with it the collective spatial practice of the neighbourhood, but also includes the letters received in May and July 1963 by the Leydickes from a real estate firm regarding the future demolition of their pub as part of the urban regeneration in that part of the city.

29. Bartetzko, p. 55. One further example: ‘In the case of Germany after 1945, it is the swift extension of the industrial production bases and not the working-through of the responsibility for the senseless murder of millions, and for the destruction of one own’s homeland, which caused something to be started – if that has indeed happened at all.’ Mitscherlich, p. 68.

31. Mitscherlich, p. 16.
32. Mitscherlich, p. 66.
33. Mitscherlich, p. 70.
34. Siedler, p. 199.
35. Maether, p. 72.
36. Maether, p. 36.
40. Maether, p. 62.
42. Maether, p. 152, 276, 280, 281.
43. Maether, p. 257.
44. Maether, p. 326.
45. Strauss’s film was not made. From a Western perspective, Leo de Laforgue did make a film, Berlin wie es war (1951), which instrumentalized still images of the Schloss demolition to make a propaganda point about the ‘cultural philistinism’ of the GDR regime.
46. Demps, p. 64. For a similar, if less grounded conclusion, see Ladd, 1997, p. 57.
47. These principles are reproduced in von Beyme and Durth, pp. 30-31.
49. Hain, p. 49.
53. For such a reading of urban planning in Berlin in the twentieth century, see Sonne.
54. Pöschk, p. 605.
55. Pöschk, p. 605.
56. Pöschk, p. 608.
58. Zache’s article also used a photograph of a ‘typische[n] Fassade’ as illustration, but this did not so overtly serve the same function of displaying ‘physical obsolescence’, although it was juxtaposed with a scaffold-filled streetscape on the same page.
59. Mitscherlich, p. 66.
60. The information for this section was taken from a Spiegel article about the Bauwochen and the anti-Bauwochen events. This article is also interesting due to its visual presentation of obsolescence and the blankness of the modern urban environment. ‘Slums verschoben’, Der Spiegel, 9 September 1968.
61. All the office could offer however was advice; there would be no financial support to owners once they had been notified.
62. This is Emil Fahrenkamp’s modernist Shell House (from 1930).
63. Emmerich, pp. 239-395.

2. ‘Place Memory Work’ in Berlin 1975-1989

2. Aldo Rossi, p. 87. See also Boyer, 187-88.
According to Hoffmann-Axthelm, the synchronic urban gaze's production of a lack of connection for the new inhabitants of the southern Friedrichstadt is doubled here, as it is related not only to the built environment as it was (the source of place memory), but also to contemporary spatial practices. As a space it is not recognizable, as the site is covered by the ‘Auto­drom’ – ironically, something with which most Kreuzberg citizens at that time would have been familiar.
his intended North-South axis. The map has an interesting gap. In the far-right centre of the plan, where the Berlin Wall runs in a straight east-west direction, on the Niederkirchnerstrasse, there are two ‘former’ buildings, neither of which are named. This space, as the map indicates, was due to be ‘filled in’ by the urban motorway. The space was, however, later not seen as ‘empty’.

27. Kraus, p. 36.
29. Rurup, p. 205.
30. Rurup, p. 212.
32. Hämer, p. 32.
33. Friedrich, p. 81.
34. Hoffmann-Axthelm, 1995a, p. 68.
35. Hoffmann-Axthelm, 1995a, p. 98.
36. Burgin, p. 29.
37. Young, p. 85.
38. On the history of the Anhalter Bahnhof, see Maier, 1984. Maier’s use of archive photographs, in particular of the demolition of the station in 1962, would be worthy of interrogation.

40. Mülhaupt, p. 25.
42. Engert, n.p.
44. Bischoff, p. 8.
47. Frecot, 1982b, p. 7.
50. Ullmann, p. 12.
52. Frecot, 1982b, p. 7.
56. On ‘media archaeology’ and indexicality, see Parikka, pp. 62-64.
58. Parikka, p. 64.
60. Seidenstücker, pp. 503-11.
The distinction to be foregrounded primarily here is to the nostalgic, melancholic practice of Siedler and Niggemeyer, who share Frecot’s rejection of post-war urban reconstruction, but are fatalistically bound to a conservative, pessimistic view of historical agency.

The Schmidt archive does not have digital copies of Schmidt’s early collections, which is interesting in itself. Schmidt’s 2005 collection, Berlin nach 45, includes many of his photographs from the early 1980s and in its use of blank pages echoes Wenders’s reading of Berlin’s cityscape after 1945. I choose the illustration here because it reinforces (more subtly!) the strategy of ‘old and new’ from 1973, while also ‘representing’ the Anhalter Bahnhof, a location which runs throughout this book, at the centre of its broad panorama.

The German here is begegnen, a verb that does not take a direct, but rather an indirect object. I discuss the resonances of this indirectness in the conclusion.

It was published by Stapp, who also published Young, Old Berlin, for example.

The fact that the name of a former inhabitant’s girlfriend, ‘Rita’, is inscribed within a heart on a door in Sunny’s boyfriend’s apartment is a direct citation of the Paul/a inscribed within a heart on Paula’s door in the earlier film.

See, for example, the installation at the Wall: http://www.frauenstudien-muenchen.de/wp-content/gallery/redupers/H_S_Redupers_Wall_300.jpg (Accessed 31 August 2015).

The Remembered City On Display, 1984-1993

1. Peterek, p. 4.
17. In this context, we are looking at some of the effects of the Honecker-era attempt to create a more comfortable living experience for the GDR citizens, on the self-proclaimed basis of a ‘real existing Socialism’, which was, however, more an admission of the limits of the progress which the state could hope to make.
18. This overlap between the ‘real’ visual culture scene in East Berlin and that of the film is also evident in the posters for the work of Frank Seidel and Christian Brachwitz that decorate Brenner’s apartment (until he moves out), and in the appearance of Seidel in a non-speaking role as the sculptor of the ultimately rejected monument that should form a provocative adornment to Brenner’s development.
19. This echoes the economic rationale for renovation applied to earlier GDR projects.
20. The film also shares with *Good Bye, Lenin* a common GDR joke about the quality of the Trabant.
22. Webber, p. 264.
23. For details of the projects, see Glasmeier, pp. 43-228.
24. On the relation between these two categories, see the distinction Christine Boyer makes between the antiquarian curator and the collector as historical materialist in a Benjaminian sense. What she does not account for is the shift in the meaning of ‘curation’ in the context of urban memory and artistic practice, as demonstrated by Boltanksi and other artists discussed in Chapters Two, Three and Four of this book. See Boyer, p. 191.
25. Czaplicka, p. 156.
27. Czaplicka, p. 171.
31. Attie, p. 75. Accessible, including Attie’s photographs of the project, at: http://www.jstor.org/view/00043249/06x00455/0
32. The arrival of ‘Western’ art practice in the East did meet with resistance, for example, at the attempt to say ‘farewell’ to Lenin by the exile Polish artist, Krzysztof Wodiczko at Leninplatz, or Via Lewandowsky’s intervention at the former House of the Ministries, which was destroyed by anti-unification protesters on 7 October 1989.
4. **In Search of a City?**

2. Janet Ward's approach in *Post-Wall Berlin* is framed by prescriptions of how ‘the city’ should function. Berlin's specific qualities are measured against the logic of an economic model in which the calculations of ‘world city ranking’ go hand in hand with the calculations as to the economic cost-benefit analysis of the transformations in Berlin. Ward privileges the synchronic organization of the urban infrastructure, and by implication accepts the principle that the ‘denizens’ (her term) of Berlin should be better trained in how to see and function within that synchronic city.

3. In *Post-Wall Berlin*, Janet Ward is consistently scathing of those who suffer from a ‘melancholic nostalgia over the demise of Berlin’s voids’ (p. 320), and of those would wish to ‘petrify’ the wounds and empty spaces of the city. As I have consistently argued throughout this book, the point of the encounter with the wound is that it eludes such petrification as a fixed image.

5. For a sociological reading of this process, see Colomb, 2010.
10. Rossi, p. 87. See also Boyer, 187-88.
11. Cf. Kähler, pp. 386-87. That the point of origin is ‘1940’ is demonstrated by the use of this date as the first point of reference in those maps that show the development of Berlin’s street networks.
16. Baudrillard, p. 75.
17. Burgin, p. 28.
18. Janet Ward suggests that the Wall’s presence at Potsdamer Platz would not be very ‘satisfying’ for tourists. Ward, 2011, p. 96.
19. The mutability of the memory landscape is neatly demonstrated by the fact that since I wrote these particular paragraphs, the city (clearly aware of this ‘failing’) has placed another sign, indicating the presence of the Volksgerichtshof, this time on the sidewalk beside the main thoroughfare of the Potsdamer Strasse. A photograph of this sign can be seen on the Chapter Four section of the website associated with this book.
21. An interesting comparison to this artistic work at the ‘city centre’ is that carried out in gentrifying East Berlin districts, such as Prenzlauer Berg
and Friedrichshain, by the artist Joachim Seinfeld from the 1990s onwards. Seinfeld removed the ‘old’ wallpaper from hallways about to be renovated, and then developed projections of ‘old’ photographs on the material surface of the wallpaper. These works were then named after the address where the wallpaper had hung. These works also play with the illusion of the visual immediacy and indexicality of material traces, and the illusion of a separate and definitive supplementarity which text can supply, while also reminding us of the layers of a past that are threatened and soon to become invisible. Seinfeld’s work can be seen at http://www.lichtundsilber.de/js-berlin0.html (Accessed 10 July 2015)


26. Sander, p. 646.


28. Schadt, 2002b, p. 76.

29. This strategy of invoking earlier ways of seeing is also evident in Wenders’s Faraway, So Close. Here, a key scene shows Cassiel (Otto Sander) entering the Altes Museum, in which, upon seeing Tony Baker (Horst Buchholz), he suddenly falls into a reverie and finds himself looking at the 1937 Entartete Kunst exhibition from a strangely canted angle. Wenders deliberately reproduces the skewed modernist perspective so detested by those with traditional understandings of art. As in Wings of Desire, where he had carefully constructed a mise-en-scène of Otto Dix’s portrait of Sylvia von Harden in the climactic Esplanade scene, Wenders once more invokes, in that film’s sequel, a painterly perspective as a historical model for a complex and reflective ‘way of seeing’ that counteracts conventional patterns of perception.

30. Schadt, 2002a, p. 46. I refer, as far as possible, to stills from the film reproduced in Schadt’s volume, cited earlier, for the reader’s cross-reference. Page numbers will appear in brackets in the text. The aesthetic resonance of these stills is a clear indication that Schadt’s film aspires to the condition of the photographic still image, for which observation I am indebted to Andrew Webber and his paper on Schadt and Ruttmann given at the CUTG in Leeds in April 2006.


32. Simmel, p. 177.


34. A fascination with dilapidated cinemas as evidence of former urban spatial practices is evident in Steven Barber’s Projected Cities.

38. Preuss, p. 128.
41. Schadt, 2002b, p. 99, citing the photographer Diane Arbus.
42. Janet Ward discusses the same problem from the position of the accountability of ‘public history’ in relation to Peter Eisenman’s Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in *Post-Wall Berlin*, pp. 249-253.
43. Preuss, p. 135.
44. Preuss, p. 128.
47. Huyssen, 2003b, p. 36.
49. Lefebvre, 1974, p. 222.
52. Huyssen, 2003a, p. 81.
53. Virilio, p. 441.
54. Other spaces, such as the Holocaust Memorial, have been constructed to address a global audience. These sites offer an aesthetic and possibly monumental experience, but critical memory work is intended to be enabled by the accompanying documentation centre.
55. In the case of Michael Majerus’s 2002 installation of an image of the Palastbunker it can also be reutilized to play radically with questions of centre and periphery.
56. This film could have formed part of the analysis of GDR film in the 1970s in Chapter Two, given that its plot concerns a builder coming from the provinces to the city, and many of his early adventures involve him adapting to the synchronic rhythms of the urban environment. It shows, however, no critical interest in obsolescent structures.
58. For example, Hans Jacobus, ‘Erinnerungen.’ Indeed many of the contributions to *Kampf um den Palast* and *Der Palast muß weg weg weg* invoke this kind of memory value.
60. Kuppinger, ‘Friede den Palästen’.
62. Much of this is collated in Schlug.
63. Letter from the Bundespräsidialamt, 25 April 1996, reproduced in *Der Palast muß weg weg weg*. For more of the many examples of official use of the
palimpsest paradigm in the reuse of administrative buildings, see Simon Ward, 2006a.

64. Dean, p. 95.
65. Rainbird, p. 7.
66. Bädicker’s photography is on display at www.baedicker.de (accessed 1 March 2015). It is a remarkable archive that, probably unintentionally, plays with the referentiality of the photographs Bädicker took between 1984 and 1994.
67. Diederichsen, p. 31.
69. This form of presentation parodies the presentation of the historical lineage that justifies the Planwerk Innenstadt. See: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/planwerke/de/planwerk_innenstadt/planwerkstaetten/spittelmarkt/entwicklung.shtml (accessed 22 May 2014). 1940 is also, ironically, the first point of reference in Hans Stimmann’s collection of maps that show the development of Berlin’s street networks. Stimmann, 2002.
70. Accessed 22 May 2012. The site is no longer accessible.
71. Accessed 22 May 2012. The site is no longer accessible.
72. Crary, p. 147.
73. Berlin’s memory cityscape appears in more refined virtual form, for example, in Rimini Protokoll’s 2011 mobile ‘radio play’ about the Stasi (‘50 Kilometers of Files’), or the Hypercities thick mapping of historical Berlin maps at http://www.berlin.ucla.edu/research/ (Accessed 10 July 2015).

Conclusion

1. Till, p. 228.
3. The square had indeed been an abandoned location since the end of the Second World War. The mosaic was installed in the 1990s, before the square was officially named Bethlehemkirchplatz in 1999. See: http://www.kkbs.de/page/214/bethlehemskirche (Accessed 10 July 2015)
4. It needs to be observed (and my attentive reader may have already observed it in the illustration) that ‘Memoria Urbana’ shares the Bethlehemkirchplatz with an earlier installation, the sculpture ‘Houseball’, which was created by Claes Oldenburg and Coosje van Bruggen in 1993, and ultimately located on this site, after a rather peripatetic career. It is striking that this installation also connects to the question of refugees, even if ‘Houseball’ works more with material shock value of incongruity than the subtle play with visibility and invisibility of ‘Memoria Urbana’. For more information, and images, of ‘Houseball’, see: http://oldenburgvanbruggen.com/largescaleprojects/houseball.htm (Accessed 1 June 2015)
5. Farocki, p. 25.
6. Not to mention the international academics who have come to study its memory culture (e.g. Ladd, Till, Webber, Jordan, Ward – and Ward).

Epilogue

2. Smithson, p. 70.