

embracing humanity - Menschlichkeit als Maß

what are the former nazi party rally grounds? from “sleeping” cipher to productive monument for the future of remembrance

Idea and concept: Marietta Piekenbrock on behalf of the Bid Office, N2025 -
European Capital of Culture, Director: Prof. Dr. Hans-Joachim Wagner, May 2020

Everyone living in Western democracies has Nuremberg in their history. The former *Reichsparteitagsgelände*, known in English as the Nazi party rally grounds is one of the largest places of remembrance in Europe. The Zeppelin grandstand and the unfinished Congress Hall illustrate the architectural militarism of National Socialism. The scaleless psychological function of its architecture was to mould individuals into a *Volksgemeinschaft*, a national or ethnic community that is willing to make sacrifices and to use violence.

There are reasons to doubt the effectiveness of our public culture of remembrance. Two generations after the Holocaust, anti-Semitism and racism are again on the rise, not only in our urban and media spaces, but also among the elites. Where does this sinister trend originate? In what gestures is it manifested in urban planning? What driving forces result from these dynamics for dealing with monuments and national myths? What driving forces result from these dynamics for dealing with monuments and places of remembrance? Not only government and scholars, but also art and culture are facing new challenges and tasks.

The German word *Schauplatz* describes an arena, a scene, a setting or location and, literally, a showplace. If we probe the meaning, we are soon examining the history of the theatre, a genre from which the eventful, presentational character attached to the term is derived. The setting of a drama is often a plot carrier. This nuance of meaning provides the key to the idea of a setting as a carrier of history. If we want being present within the structural legacies of the Nazi dictatorship to trigger a stronger experience in 2025, then today we must start thinking together about the future of our memories.

We have invited architectural historians, memory researchers, political scientists, curators and artists to report about their very specific work on and with these settings. What can we do to make the effectiveness of our culture of remembrance and commemoration viable in the face of troubling developments? How do we make our historical heritage accessible to a post-migrant, international audience? How can we enable new ideas and open new pathways in this debate?

Until now, contemporary witnesses have cast vigilant, real-life spotlights on the present-day. Their passing leaves a vacuum and a mission for a generation that can no longer question them. What if places of remembrance not only remove the weight of the past through admonishing rituals, but if they also open up a new field of action that transforms the huge relics into rehearsal stages for social and artistic productions? Today, active politics of remembrance can also mean designing places in such a way that we do not perceive them as lifeless scenery or inventory, but rediscover them anew.

The history of Nuremberg presently offers the largest possible horizon for this. What would happen if the grounds surrounding the Nazi party rally buildings became a stage for the power of art, the future of memory and the society to come?

Marietta Piekenbrock is an author, curator and cultural manager. She worked in the management team of the European Capital of Culture RUHR.2010, as head dramaturge of the Ruhrtriennale 2012-2014 and then as programme director of the Volksbühne Berlin. She is presently curating the exhibition Global Groove. A West-Eastern Cultural History of Contact. Art, Dance, Performance and Protest (2021). She lives and works in Berlin and Munich.

4

Stephan Trüby

Architecture's ability to be a factor of social change:
From the fascist "Volksgemeinschaft" to today's distancing

5

Alexander Yendell

Escape into authoritarianism:
Findings from research of right-wing extremism

6

Claus Leggewie

(How) can we (in Nuremberg) create supranational remembrance?

7

Anke Hoffsten

Institutional culture of remembrance must not
impose cultural or national borders

8

Alexander Schmidt

What language do stones speak?
The everyday provocation of architecture

9

HG Merz

Monument or document

9

Leon Kahane

Nuremberg continuities

10

Simon Fujiwara

Everything Anne

11

Boris Charmatz

For an architecture of the body, a history
without pathos, an institution without walls

12

Peter Haimlerl

We must position ourselves architecturally
as contemporaries in the historical inventory

12

Andres Lepik

More ethics and more aesthetics:
On the social turn in contemporary architecture

Stephan Trüby

Architecture's ability to be a factor of social change: From the fascist "Volksgemeinschaft" to today's distancing

Of course it was a coincidence in 1985 when the launch of the exhibition *Fascination and Violence* in the substructure of the Zeppelin grandstand of the former Nuremberg Nazi party rally grounds took place in the same year as that when the European Union awarded the title "European City of Culture" for the first time (to the city of Athens). But this coincidence may soon grow to its full discursive potential if, at the end of October this year, Nuremberg and its motto "Past Forward" should be chosen European Capital of Culture 2025. For this would mean, among other things, that a new way of dealing with the most important built legacies of National Socialism would be on the city's agenda.

Places like the former Nazi party rally grounds, which always run the risk of becoming "right-wing spaces" (e.g. the torch-lit march of 18 right-wing extremists on 23 February 2019), should be made stages for artistic and civil society interventions more resolutely than before. As the Swiss architect Bernard Tschumi, who has made the theory and practice of architectural functions, uses and programmes the core of his life's work since the 1970s, wrote in his essay "Violence of Architecture" (1981), "There is no architecture without action, no architecture without events, no architecture without program." He thus brought about a politicization of architectural thinking, which he elucidated in the anthology *Architecture and Disjunction* (1996) as follows: "Not to include the uncertainties of use, action, and movement in the definition of architecture meant that the architecture's ability to be a factor of social change was simply denied." Tschumi speaks out here against the identification of architecture and programme, writing, "a bank must not look like a bank, nor an opera house like an opera house, nor a park like a park."

As a result, he established a first system with which architecture defines the broad field of "programming." Tschumi defines *trans-*

programming as the combination of two programmes, no matter how incompatible, e.g. "planetarium + roller coaster"; *disprogramming* is the combination of two programmes, whereby a required spatial configuration of one programme contaminates another; and *crossprogramming*, finally, is conversion: a town hall inside a prison, for example. The potential of this theoretical approach to architecture has not been realized for a possible use of the former Nazi party rally grounds – and would certainly be an asset for Nuremberg's bid for the Capital of Culture. After all, in "Violence of Architecture" Tschumi already developed his dystopia of a *ballet mécanique* of architecture in which every movement is prescribed – and described it there as a "a permanent Nuremberg Rally of everyday life."

We cannot rule out that not just the decision on the 2025 Capital of Culture, but also the implementation of cultural activities may still be affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. What does this mean for future events held on the grounds of mass fascist events, which, like the former Nazi party rally grounds, were built to densely pack in masses of human formations for perverse performances of inclusion and exclusion called the "Volksgemeinschaft"? Spaces of historical fascism, whose root word "fascio" is derived from the Italian word for bundle or bundle of rods, should represent a particularly exciting spatial challenge for future distanced societies.

Prof. Dr. Stephan Trüby is professor for architecture and cultural theory and has been director of the IGmA at the University of Stuttgart since 2018. He edited an issue of the magazine ARCH+ for architecture and urbanism on "Right-wing Spaces. Report on a European Journey," which documents rollback dynamics in the western democratic present.

Alexander Yendell

Escape into authoritarianism:
Findings from research
of right-wing extremism

The University of Leipzig has carried out a representative survey on right-wing extremist attitudes in the population every two years since 2002. The definition of right-wing extremism on which the study is based originated from a meeting of a consensus group: "Right-wing extremism is a pattern of attitudes, the common characteristics of which are ideas of inequality. In the political arena, these are expressed in the affinity to dictatorial forms of government, chauvinistic attitudes and a trivialization or justification of National Socialism. In the social arena they are characterized by anti-Semitic, xenophobic and social Darwinist attitudes." (Decker & Brähler 2006). In 2018, the proportion of manifest right-wing extremists was around 6 percent of the total German population (5 percent in the west, 9 percent in the east). In the overall trend since 2002, the number has tended to decline. In 2002, the proportion was 10 percent (11% in the west and 8% in the east). The downward trend may come as a surprise, because the strengthening of right-wing parties in Germany and other countries is just as visible as xenophobic, in particular anti-Semitic and Islamophobic hate crimes. The study documents that there is a high potential for anti-Muslim, xenophobic and anti-Romani attitudes in the German population. A radicalization has taken place here that is dangerous.

Under what conditions does right-wing extremism arise and when does it show its ugly face? There are many explanatory approaches in right-wing extremism research. For this brief presentation, however, I will examine one important theory in more detail, which empirically demonstrably has a particularly high explanatory potential and the understanding of which may have effects on remembering and prevention.

One of the best-known explanations in social psychology is the concept of the authoritarian personality. It explains derogatory attitudes towards strangers by an authoritarian personality structure, which includes adherence to conventions, power

orientation and submission. In addition, projection or the shifting of internal psychological conflicts to others plays a role: 'I myself am not aggressive or untruthful; it is the other, the foreigner, the Jew or the Muslim who is.' Another characteristic is identification with the aggressor, for example with an authoritarian dictator. Because an authoritarian leader is strong, he can demand submission. Identifying with his strength allows the underdog to participate in this violence. Other characteristics include extreme obedience and a penchant for superstition and mystical thinking. The concept of authoritarianism had its origins in Sigmund Freud's book *Civilization and Its Discontents*, in which the term "narcissism of small differences" was already closely related to the concept of narcissism. It's not surprising, therefore, that psychiatrists also grappled with the causes of National Socialism. A very interesting study, little known in Germany, was written by Henry Dicks, who not only treated Rudolf Hess, but also examined members of the Waffen-SS psychiatrically. Dicks ascertained a combination of narcissistic and paranoid personality traits in the members of the Waffen-SS. In his socio-psychological study, he emphasized that it was only the combination of these personality traits with the societal context during the Nazi era that led to excessively anti-social behaviour.

A more recent study with pupils in Leipzig again shows the correlation between personality traits such as narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathology, also known as the dark triad, and right-wing violence. At the same time, the study shows how dark personality traits and adverse upbringing and socialization conditions interact. Prominent cases of right-wing extremist offenders in recent years who acted as individual perpetrators or as members of a right-wing extremist association confirm the connection between severe trauma and psychologically stressed personalities. Often the accusation is made that psychologization plays down and excuses the political dimension of the crime. From the point of view of authoritarianism research, psychologization and politicization are not contradictions in terms, but rather show that right-wing extremism is not just a political mindset, but demonstrates delusional traits, the main cause of which is inherent in the individual.

As we know from meta-analyses of studies on the prevention of right-wing extremism, education that

only aims to impart knowledge is not enough on its own. It requires compassion, empathy with the victims' suffering and grief over the atrocities that authoritarians are capable of. A peaceful democracy requires compassion.

Dr. Alexander Yendell is a sociologist and board member of the Competence Center for Right-Wing Extremism and Democracy Research at the University of Leipzig and co-author of the 2018 Authoritarianism Study. His main research topics are right-wing extremism, political protest, religious plurality, Islamophobia and social cohesion.

Claus Leggewie

(How) can we (in Nuremberg) create supranational remembrance?

European Capitals of Culture address an international European audience at an "authentic place," in this case at one where the Nazi dictatorship staged its communion with the masses and documented it on film (i.e., *Triumph of the Will*). Abroad, Nuremberg is associated as the city of the Nazi party rallies, but it is also associated with the Nuremberg Trials, the birth of international law that persecutes crimes against humanity regardless of where they originated or were brought to judgement.

Any update to historical experience is problematic. But propagandistic disinformation and violations of international law are undoubtedly topical and have actually increased in recent years. An historical and artistically elaborated combination of these contrasting images of Nuremberg would lend itself to creating a place of supranational and transnational remembrance at the ominous site of the Nazi party rally grounds. Places of remembrance are not intended to reconstruct "how it really was" (Leopold Ranke); at a meta-level, they focus on constructs and the use of history/stories in the public space. The European and transnational dimension is required here.

The House of European History in Brussels is a courageous attempt not just to string together 28 national histories, but to combine the often antagonistic experience of the peoples of Europe without drawing a veil over the conflicts. This does not require consensus on the interpretation of European history, rather the approach is based on the difference and divergence in the consideration of past eras not only between, but also within the peoples, who – and this is the point – can only develop a common perspective in (civil) dispute.

The French historian Pierre Nora saw *les lieux de mémoire* as inventories of public memory, that is, places that have "weight for the formation of the political identity of 'a nation,'" which "are simple and ambiguous, natural and artificial, at once immediately available in concrete sensual experience and susceptible to the most abstract elaboration." These include physically distinctive places that are often staged to awaken and maintain memory (memorials, museums, documentation centres), but also events and commemorative celebrations, personalities and organizations, rituals and emblems as well as scholarly, literary and legal writings, each of which possess a material, symbolic and functional meaning. Places of remembrance have not "just always been there" physically, they have been constructed historically; their symbolism is not inherent, but is ascribed to them; their meaning is not static, but constantly changing.

Collective memory and collective identity are anti-essentialistically understood as only provisional results of historical construct processes. What does that mean for Nuremberg and its ice-cold Nazi relic? What is the "ruin value" (Albert Speer) of the "authentic place" that has undergone so many, often bizarre metamorphoses? What does it say to foreign visitors today? Is it a suitable transnational place of remembrance?

In addition, the critical question of the contemporary historian: How, in 2025, can adventure tourism be prevented, the continued existence of an "infrastructurally ever more perfected, but intellectually increasingly empty memory politics, which no longer knows any opponents, no longer touches anyone and is at risk to produce, at best, upscale entertainment, or infotainment in media terms" (Norbert Frei). I believe this can be achieved

if the site is removed from the German domestic debate, i.e. primarily aims at an international audience, which, incidentally, has long been present in the city of Nuremberg, in the state of Bavaria and among German visitors themselves: people with “migration backgrounds” for whom genocide is not only connected with the Holocaust (without relativizing it) and for whom a motivation for their escape and relocation to Europe was to flee war crimes and crimes against humanity. “No more war! No more Auschwitz!” has never been redeemed on a global scale in eighty years.

To avoid abstraction, I would therefore like to suggest a thematic connection between the aspects of “propaganda” and “court.” In 2009, Peter Weiss’s documentary play *The Investigation* was performed by the Nuremberg State Theater. A congenial appraisal of the Nuremberg Trials could underpin the above apostrophized “defeat” of Hitler and, for mass communication, a living democracy in the age of so-called fake news should finally experiment with practicable gathering formats (but not on this site!).

Prof. Dr. Claus Leggewie is a political scientist, journalist and first holder of the Ludwig Börne professorship at the Justus Liebig University in Giessen. In his research and publications he is devoted to cultural globalization, the European culture of remembrance, democracies in non-western societies and the “climate culture.”

Anke Hoffsten

Institutional culture of remembrance must not impose cultural or national borders

The Munich Documentation Centre for the History of National Socialism opened just five years ago – and the world has changed immensely since then. Globalization and digitization are having ever more rapid effects that were recently accelerated once again by the coronavirus pandemic. Knowledge

and information multiply and spread with unparalleled speed. Museums and cultural institutions are also constantly faced with new tasks. In addition, social processes such as the loss of the generation of contemporary witnesses and growing diversity are increasingly penetrating public awareness. More than ever, the rapid change in political, social and cultural conditions demands a continuously changing culture of remembrance. The practices and rituals, content and goals of remembrance and commemoration of National Socialism were and are never fixed, but have always been the result of social negotiation processes.

The Munich Documentation Centre was created against the background of a complex and long-term public debate about content and form. As a guiding principle, the project ultimately prevailed to provide the most comprehensive possible documentation of the Nazi past using Munich as an example and to convey well-founded historical knowledge to a broad public. The result is an exhibition of high encyclopaedic quality: over 800 individual exhibits, mostly reproductions of photographs and documents from the period 1914 to 2014, are accompanied by texts and linked to a chronological, cross-epoch narrative.

But how can a supposedly self-contained historical account remain relevant in the face of volatile present-day developments? How can it also be accessible to a post-migrant, international audience? In search of answers to these questions, in 2018 the Documentation Centre came up with the idea of radically challenging the permanent exhibition, but also the entire museum and the historical site with its “authentic” architectural relics using the means of international, contemporary art.

Art functions by using emotional and aesthetic means, it is subjective and open to interpretation. It allows for associations where science has to limit itself to rational statements and factually verifiable explanations. As contradictory as it may seem, it is precisely these two different approaches that can jointly create new spaces in which an analysis of history takes place and its echo becomes visible and understandable in the present.

With the exhibition *Tell me about yesterday tomorrow*, we quite deliberately took a step into new, unknown territory. It set a process of learning

and experience in motion that we have been actively pursuing ever since. It expanded the views of our own work, including what we can “expect” or “ask” of the audience. For all participating artists as well as the scholars, educators, designers and exhibition technicians, it was impressive to experience how productively works of art and historical representation actually combine, comment on one another, provoke, expand and give one another new relevance and meaning.

The visitors intuitively and naturally integrate the works of art into their visit to the exhibition and the conversations about it. One thing is certain: People are constantly making free associations between what they know about history and what they experience every day. The task of documentation centres and cultural institutions is to constructively support this process. Only then can it be possible to get to the core of what it is actually about – where violence by people against people comes from and how it can be overcome.

The exhibition project *Tell me about yesterday tomorrow* reveals that historical and contemporary experiences of racism, anti-Semitism, nationalism, war and genocide are systemically linked. It does not negate the complexity of this situation, but it helps us find new ways to talk about it and to develop a deeper understanding of correlations and differences. If the institutional culture of remembrance wants to overcome our growing distance from the Nazi past and reach people in a diverse society, it must not impose – or allow the imposition of – any cultural or national borders on itself.

Art historian Dr. Anke Hoffsten is the deputy director of the Munich Documentation Centre for the History of National Socialism and project leader of the 2019 exhibition Tell me about yesterday tomorrow curated by Mirjam Zadoff, Nicolaus Schafhausen and Juliane Bischoff.

Alexander Schmidt

What language do stones speak? The everyday provocation of architecture

The architecture of the former rally grounds from the Nazi era now stands out in the Nuremberg urban area as an everyday impertinence. It has provoked various reactions: Young architects wanted to completely eliminate them for a “more beautiful Nuremberg.” In their film *Brutality in Stone* (1961) filmmakers Alexander Kluge and Peter Schamoni pointed to the demon associated with these buildings. And Günter Domenig developed his Documentation Center Nazi Party Rally Grounds as a striking counter-architecture to the Nazi era Congress Hall. Even in the twenty-first century it seems important and right not to leave the architecture of the Nazi party rally buildings, conceived as “word made of stone,” in the urban space without comment, but to contend with it using historical commentary and also artistic and architectural means.

The “second history” of the site after 1945, that is, how we deal with the structural relics of the Nazi era, is an important and contemporary approach to the history of the Nazi party rally grounds as a whole. We must create a stronger presence on the site as a democratic urban society. Not only the straggly gathering of fewer than 20 right-wing radicals with torches on the Zeppelin grandstand in 2019 (often incorrectly referred to as a “torch march”) demonstrates that the former Nazi party rally grounds have the potential to degenerate into a “right-wing space” (Stephan Trüby). The democratic occupation of the site, through historical education, but also everyday and leisure use, has largely prevented this. This must be innovatively shaped and further developed through events, educational offers, information days and temporary campaigns (also, but not only in the field of visual arts). The former Nazi party rally grounds are neither a history park nor a closed memorial.

Dr. Alexander Schmidt is an historian, exhibition designer and research assistant at the Documentation Center Nazi Party Rally Grounds, Nuremberg.

HG Merz

Monument or document

In every attempt to take possession of our history, an idea must also reveal itself about how we want to shape society in the future. Otherwise memory freezes to a pose. Enlightenment and education at places of remembrance and learning is a way of sensitizing the population to an appraisal of the darkest chapter in German history, which a large part of Germans still refuse to do. The reality and immediate effect of these places still tops any other preoccupation with the subject. We have to strengthen and visualize communications at authentic sites of the crimes and demonstrate that these places are spread across the whole republic and that the population was involved as perpetrators, followers and spectators.

For me as a designer, it's about the de-contextualization and re-contextualization of these places. They were made unrecognizable, reshaped, torn from their context and placed in a new one. In short, we have to transform forgotten or repressed history into tradition, into our own and appropriated history, in order to at least partially close the gap between today and yesterday. These sites, if we can help them to an "expository resurrection," are places of events, are keys to history, even if they no longer exist as they were at the time of the crimes. Memory must be addressable or it will not be remembered – memory must be rhetorically dramatized or it will not be perceived. Only the "PUNCTUM," that which catches the eye, leads me to "STUDIUM," as Roland Barthes would say.

When dealing with the legacies of National Socialism, the aim must be to make a clear distinction between the scenes of the crime, the "historical bearer," and the documentation and exhibition level with the infrastructure facilities. In addition, objects that serve as evidence for the crimes should not be exhibited and staged, but should actually be set aside as evidence, like in a court's evidence room. The structural remains that characterize the perpetrator sites should also just be set aside, neither maintained nor restored – they may by no means be treated like ruins from antiquity.

Prof. Dr. HG Merz is an architect and director of hg merz architekten und museumsgestalter, Stuttgart/Berlin. The firm hg merz developed master plans and museum exhibition concepts for the redesign of the Sachsenhausen and Hohenschönhausen, Berlin memorials.

Leon Kahane

Nuremberg continuities

I've never been to Nuremberg. I am familiar with the city only from historical pictures. But it still has a personal and cultural meaning for me. My grandfather was a reporter for the Soviet press and thus a witness at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal. He was there with my grandmother. The collected trial files from my grandparents' possessions are now in the holdings of the German Historical Museum in Berlin. I have looked at the files – so far only briefly – and found a many notes in my grandmother's handwriting in the margins. So she was also involved in reporting the trial. In my artistic work, I deal a lot with the cultural circumstances that paved the way for Nazi politics and how these conditions developed into cultural continuities that have prevailed up to the present day.

German history of the twentieth century is often incorrectly described as a history full of breaks when in fact it's a history full of continuities. The Shoah was a breach of civilization. But it was mainly the victims who were affected and not the perpetrators. Even after 1945 there was no break in German history. Instead, we still struggle with the same anti-modern and culturally pessimistic worldviews that paved the way for National Socialism. We can speak of an anti-modern continuity in German cultural history. As the European Capital of Culture, Nuremberg would be predestined to further research the connections between anti-modern culture and anti-modern politics and thus to make the continuities that extend to the present day more visible. However, a corresponding project would need to be designed in an international framework. Because, as Ralf Dahrendorf wrote in the foreword to the first

edition of Fritz Stern's *The Politics of Cultural Despair* published in 1963, "In many countries around the world, the memory of Nazi Germany is much stronger than their understanding of Germany's problems today. This may be one reason that foreign works are still in the majority among important studies on the pre- and post-history of German National Socialism."

Leon Kahane is a visual artist and lives in Berlin. For the exhibition tell me about yesterday tomorrow (2019, NS Documentation Centre Munich) he developed the video work "Pitchipoi" about the modernist residential complex Cité de la Muette in Drancy, France. Confiscated by the German Wehrmacht, it served as the largest Nazi transit camp in France.

Simon Fujiwara

Everything Anne

Last week the Anne Frank House launched a YouTube series called Anne Frank's Video Diaries. They were released to coincide with the 75th anniversary of the end of WWII and incidentally during Europe's Covid 19 containment lockdown, although the project was in the making some months before. The premise of the vlog is a simple question: What if Anne Frank had a camera? I watched her vlogging some scenes from her life. Her cat, her friends, her sister goofing around. Then she went into hiding, and she showed me the walk they did across the city laden with suitcases, before going into a building on Prinsengracht 263, sneaking behind a bookcase into a series of small spaces where they lived for some two years in hiding.

Anne Frank died just over 75 years ago, she left a diary behind, some years later the house was purchased and became a museum. There are Hollywood movies, plays, exhibitions and articles about her, and now she is one of the most famous historic figures in the world. These products from vlogs to merchandise mark a unique historical

moment in which sensitive historical narratives and materials face the challenge of remaining relevant in an age of entertainment, hyper consumption, mass participation and democratic, inclusive idealism. When the President of the world's most powerful countries is a former reality show host, surely historical figures can have their own YouTube channels?

It can take three hours of waiting to enter the Anne Frank House. I was told on a private tour that when the Anne Frank House wanted to alleviate the queue by making an online ticketing system, the public was outraged. It turned out that the queue was one of the most important aspects of the Anne Frank House experience for both the visitors and even for some of the public onlookers. The queue is a visual symbol of empathy, respect and the enduring power of the Anne Frank Story. It was a symbol that people still care, like a street protest – people didn't want it to disappear into a set of hidden numbers online. Here we see the conundrum of what it means when mass attention or even adoration congregates around a single figure or narrative and what human factors we sacrifice in our search for meaning and an encounter with the authentic. When I watch Riefenstahl's footage of the Nazi Rally at Nuremberg, I see a literal example of the dangers of 'loving' blindly, of believing without question and of being swept away in a theatre of emotion. But, as the Anne Frank House knows, today we have new demands on how we absorb information and history – text books are no longer enough – we need proximity, participation and emotion. The once hallowed aura of 'history as an objective pursuit' has revealed itself to many of us as a fraudulent narrative peddled by an elite group of largely white, academic men. Now we aspire to a history that is personal, multi-voiced, conflicting, emotional, inconclusive and inclusive. But how can we build a place where tragedy and truth can coexist with emotion and experience and nothing is compromised in the process? What would a place like this look like, how long would we have to queue for it and where would the gender-neutral toilets be located? What about the font for the wall labels, or how about removing those didactic texts altogether and replacing them with holograms of holocaust survivors telling us the story in their words? And how large is this place, how comfortable

should we be made to feel there? Can we mourn or take a selfie there or do both, simultaneously? How appropriate to laugh or cry, be confused, angry, elated or just feel nothing? Who will design us this safe, magical place – where everybody matters, where conflicts are joyously unresolved – this battleground where every one of us can emerge victorious?

In his installations and performances, Simon Fujiwara deals with the ambivalence of subjective and collective myths. His highly acclaimed work for the Kunsthau Bregenz "Hope House" (2019) reflects the marketing of site of remembrance using the example of the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam. He lives in Berlin.

Boris Charmatz

For an architecture of the body, a history without pathos, an institution without walls

For a long time I was just a "son of," the child of a generation marked by trauma, but today, when contemporary witnesses are gradually dying out, I have the feeling that I have to rethink what it means to be a Jew, socially and personally, what Europe means, or the freedom to dance. I have to admit that I am extremely drawn to the EMPTINESS of the building: the space allowing nature to come back to its own at the bottom of the walls, the space without a roof, which for me is more like the idea of an "architecture" of the body than an architecture of power. Dance and performance have triggered a kind of museum revolution through which ideas and movements found their way into art collections that were previously reserved for so-called material objects. Hence the idea that dance might be a good medium to think of architecture "without" walls, history "without" overwhelming pathos or even institutions "without" protocol.

For years I have been searching for the ideal architecture for a dance institution. In the end, I had the rather mad idea to simply found an institution without walls, without a roof; a green, urban, choreographic "terrain." I have the impression that a fundamental, contemporary paradigm shift is taking place. For centuries, artists have "dreamed" of nature and the extra-urban. Now everyone is busy reinventing nature in the city! I think a choreographer should deal with a green meadow rather than with a theatre in order to create an institution that lives up to the new dogmas of climate neutrality and biodiversity, albeit with a strong art coefficient. In the midst of all the environmental protection regulations, the freest art must be able to flourish, otherwise culture will be reduced to being nothing but a secondary side dish, without seasoning, without its own flavour ... I like allotment gardens, collective vegetable patches, beehives on the roofs of office buildings. But it also takes the most fervent art to make the green spaces and wastelands of the city of tomorrow habitable and to fill them with new ideas.

I remember an anecdote about my dance teacher Jean-Luc Chirpaz when I was twelve years old. He showed me the logo of a supermarket and asked me what I was seeing. It was the Carrefour logo, which is also known in Germany. I replied that I saw some kind of red arrow with a blue triangle, but I didn't know why ... He "showed" me what I couldn't see, the C formed by the void in the middle of the logo, and explained that this is exactly the essence of dance: The arms form a crown, but this is done less to form a sculpture with arms raised than to encompass the void that offers resistance between the arms. I have the impression that there is something to be learned from this metaphor for the Congress Hall: the building "leaves much to be desired," despite all the adversities, it reminds us that our bodies need air to breathe. The gigantism of the building should challenge us to pay attention to the fragility and longings of our life, our habits and movements ... then we will perhaps see that this place, however ossified, has begun, slowly and imperceptibly, to move the burden of its extreme history.

The celebration of communities, conflicts in collectives and the expansion of the concept of dance are the main

themes of the French choreographer and dancer Boris Charmatz. In 2019, he launched his new artistic research lab terrain, which not only prepares the ground for his projects but also his vision of a green urban space for choreography where bodies form the architecture of a new institution.

Peter Haimerl

We must position ourselves architecturally as contemporaries in the historical inventory

There are those who would like to escape from the architectural legacy of the Nazi era, would like to level its remnants, dispose of them in landfills and, on the areas thus emptied, develop the future with property managers. But we are no interim heirs who can turn down our inheritance. The city of Nuremberg has accepted this inheritance and is ready to engage with the buildings of the architectural megalomania of the Nazi dictatorship in order to learn from and about the past and to develop concepts for the future. I think that's right and important. I argue against the "controlled decay" of the buildings and on principle speak out against the demolition of the buildings of the Nazi era and against the redevelopment of the land – even if it is polarizing. It is our social responsibility to face the question of how we want to deal with historically occupied sites and how we will take them into the future. Through maximum preservation of substance and the simultaneous introduction of modern spatial interventions in contemporary architectural language, we position ourselves vis-a-vis the past and point from the present to the future.

The future shape of the site must architecturally express our relationship to history, document our critical and at the same time visionary contemporaneity and also architecturally formulate our goals of transculturality, equity and opportunity, sustainability and internationality. The action space

within the framework of the Capital of Culture year seeks answers to important questions about the future of the cities of Europe with the means of art and culture. It would offer a suitable space within which, in cooperation with architects from Europe, a guideline for a participatory and architecturally future-oriented approach to buildings, the continuation of which causes collective pain, could be developed. We can only justify the preservation of the historical buildings by using them. Germany in particular has to architecturally position itself appropriately when dealing with historical inventory.

As a working architect with his own office in Munich since 1991, Peter Haimerl concentrates on projects that exceed the limits of conventional architecture. One of his best-known works is the Blaibach concert hall, which has received multiple awards.

Andres Lepik

More ethics and more aesthetics: On the social turn in contemporary architecture

Germany in April 2020: a country in a state of emergency. Football stadiums, restaurants, opera houses, museums, universities, schools and kindergartens have been more or less empty for over a month due to the coronavirus crisis. And in spite of all the painful consequences that this crisis means, one insight will remain: A society can only be sustainably successful in future if its coexistence is responsibly planned. This requires intelligent leadership (at the political level), ethical awareness (in the entire population) and a reliable infrastructure.

Architecture plans and designs infrastructure, buildings and rooms for communal use. From the smallest flats to hospitals, from football stadiums to airports, from mosques to museums, architecture creates places where people spend time, meet, work, celebrate, relax and educate. Massive global migrations, the dramatic effects of climate change

and increasing economic inequality make the importance and responsibility of architecture for social coexistence on this planet obvious.

The changed perception corresponds with a large number of practical initiatives with which architects have tried since the 2000s to bring the ethical dimension of building back to the fore. This development has been described as a “social turn” in architecture. One important representative of this is Francis Kéré, who, after studying at the Technical University of Berlin, has been creating schools, hospitals and cultural spaces from clay bricks in his homeland of Burkina Faso since 2004. He is building places of hope, education and training in this developing country, places that create new perspectives for the users, but also for the artisans and village communities involved. The new turn to the social mission of architecture is not limited to the planning and implementation of new buildings. In many cases, architects, sometimes in close cooperation with local communities and organizations, have also turned to renovation and conversion. One essential planning instrument for this is participation, i.e. involving the users in concept development and partly also in the execution of neighbourhood projects.

Examples of the social turn in architecture have been researched, published and presented in numerous books, articles and exhibitions in recent years. And right now, in the midst of the coronavirus crisis, it is abundantly clear that the social turn has to have a far deeper impact on architecture as a planning and building discipline. For social life will be permanently changed by this crisis and the changed spatial and social demands necessitate profound changes in the conception, planning and design of the spaces in which society will move after the crisis.

The architectural historian Andres Lepik has been Director of the Architecture Museum and Professor of Architectural History at TUM since 2012. His teaching, publications and exhibitions focus on the role of architecture in a global context. He is an expert on social, sustainable building and has organized numerous exhibitions on these topics.