

Chapter Title: Remembering the 'Murdered City' Berlin 1957—1974

Book Title: Urban Memory and Visual Culture in Berlin

Book Author(s): Simon Ward

Published by: Amsterdam University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv8pzdev.5>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



JSTOR

Amsterdam University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Urban Memory and Visual Culture in Berlin*

1. Remembering the ‘Murdered City’

Berlin 1957-1974

This chapter traces the tentative emergence of post-war urban memory from the late 1950s through to the mid-1970s. The chapter begins in 1957, the year of the Hauptstadt Berlin International Building Exhibition, an event that illustrates how the synchronic urban gaze of the planners was displayed in constructing a form of civic perception adapted to the new urban infrastructure. At this moment, in local resistance to the planned demolition of the Kaiser William Memorial Church, for example, we can begin to see the production of spatial images of resistance. Other technologies examined include the musealization of vernacular ‘islands of tradition’, in the form of urban façades, in the rather limited official policy of *Stadtbildpflege* (preservation of the city image). This musealization process becomes visible in both halves of the city in the late 1960s.

This points to the tentative emergence of a museal gaze in response to the ‘murdered city’, as post-war West Berlin was polemically described by Wolf-Jobst Siedler. The chapter focuses on how urban reconstruction is exhibited and debated in city space, and the accompanying critique of the synchronic gaze in the writings of Siedler and of the social psychologist Alexander Mitscherlich, the photography of Elizabeth Niggemeyer and in Wim Wenders’s early film, *Summer in the City* (1970), which investigates movement through urban spaces in its foregrounding of the rhythms of space and time within the encounter with the city under threat of demolition.

Designing and displaying the synchronic city

1957 can be seen as the high point of the hegemony of the post-war concept-city in West Berlin. This year sees the culmination in the western half of Berlin of the initial planning that had begun in the immediate post-war period to conceive a reconstructed city amidst the rubble of 1945 as a *Stadt von morgen* (city of tomorrow). This was visible in the utopian plans submitted to the Hauptstadt Berlin architectural competition, and in material form in the construction of the Hansa quarter, which was the central exhibit of the Interbau (International Building Exhibition) of that year.

The connection between these two visualizations was made by Berlin’s Senator for Building and Housing, Rolf Schwedler, in two related speeches

he gave in 1957, firstly at the 102nd Schinkel festival in Berlin on 13 March, and then at the conference of the International Association for Housing and Urban Construction and Planning, and its German counterpart, on 26 August. Common to both the Hauptstadt exhibition and the Hansa Quarter projects was their (dis)regard for the existing building stock. Schwedler framed it as follows:

The war produced such a level of destruction, that in 1945 many experts believed that one should develop a completely new conception for a new Berlin – perhaps even at a different location. [...] All people of insight soon recognized that one could only consider a new urban order, whereby of course interventions into the remaining building stock were and are not to be avoided. [...] In this regard, the demands and requirements of modern man are to be taken fully into consideration.¹

According to Schwedler, in a paradigmatic statement of the synchronic urban gaze, this intervention was to take the form of a ‘structural purification’ of ‘ugly mixed-usage neighbourhoods’; such work was an essential precondition for the ends of ‘traffic planning.’ This process of ‘gutting’ (*Entkernung*) would be facilitated by the fact [sic] that the inner city had already been ‘destroyed’. For Schwedler, traffic infrastructure formed the ‘arteries of economic life’, and their presence was the precondition for the ‘frictionless functioning of the capital.’² This philosophy also shaped the guidelines for the Hauptstadt competition, where the prescriptions for the plans focused almost completely on traffic infrastructure: primarily the road network, where, beyond the roads that would encircle the city centre and the Strasse des 17. Juni and Friedrichstrasse, ‘all other roads may be altered, if it appears to be necessary for the completion of the task.’

The Hauptstadt plans pay little or no attention to what the West Berlin Senate had wished to retain as monumental landmarks (*Festpunkte*). These have no role to play in the envisioning of the cityscape. According to the plans, they would be translated into true ‘islands’, disconnected from the spatial practices and the milieu of the new city dwellers. The vernacular ‘old’ was simply disregarded:

The so-called ‘Hansaviertel’, whose total destruction offered the space for a uniform solution [...], belongs to those parts of the rapidly expanding young Imperial Capital [of the late nineteenth century – SW] that contained literally no buildings of artistic merit, or even of only local-historical interest.³

Harald Bodenschatz later underlined that, in the area of the Hansaviertel on which the planning focuses, there were still 20 buildings (out of originally 160), containing 283 apartments and 22 businesses.⁴ The cellar foundations of the destroyed buildings were still intact, the streets and the underground infrastructure were largely untouched, while the ownership of the land itself was overwhelmingly in private hands. The refusal to perceive this ongoing presence of the 'former' Hansaviertel is of a piece with the more abstract perspectives of the Hauptstadt Berlin competition. The gaze that meets the vernacular ruins sees only space at its disposal.

This gaze also seeks to shape a particular form of interaction with the built environment. It is a city without pedestrian interaction, as is somewhat exaggeratedly described in the literary-textual accompaniment to Otto Hagemann's photobook of contemporary Berlin in 1957:

If, one morning, suspecting nothing, one wants to set one's foot out on the street – it's gone. A little later the suspicious eye notices a new, much broader, much straighter, much longer street. Somewhere or other, it opens its jaws, spits out a tunnel and swallows cars like shooting stars. And the pedestrians? Our new streets cannot deal with such incorrigible Neanderthals. If you want to get somewhere, sit in a car, and if you don't have one, then you are merely going for an idle stroll and would be best placed as swiftly as possible in the nearest park.⁵

Hagemann's celebration of the new city contrasted the 'over-intricate façades' [of the few buildings that had not been demolished] on the edge of the Hansaviertel with 'the new', which was 'more healthy and honest'.⁶ The old was thus also associated with the decadent (in an echo of the rhetoric of the moral obsolescence of the 'old' which we will see in the GDR).

As Bodenschatz later described it, the aim of this new urban planning, of which the Hansaviertel was the first manifestation, was the production of the 'new human' as individualized house-occupant, as automobile driver, as a member of a classless society.⁷ This implies not just a different form of living and another form of city, but also a new rhythmic form, one that emerges in dialogue with the technologically defined environment. The city is organized around circulation, the circulation of goods, but also the circulation of bodies, with almost complete disregard for the existing infrastructure (and the spatial practices associated with it).

Hagemann's photobook is typical of a form through which the synchronic gaze's disregard for former structures was transmitted; another paradigmatic example is H.C. Artus's *Zehn Jahre Danach* (Ten Years After), which

juxtaposes photographs of the ruined German cities (including Berlin) with images of the reconstructed urban environments ten years on in 1955. Socio-psychological amnesia may be at work (as it would be diagnosed by Alexander Mitscherlich ten years further on), but such a diagnosis fails to take into account Berlin's place in a wider context of European post-war urban reconstruction.⁸ Other visual media were also employed to communicate the vision of the synchronic urban gaze, such as *Verliebt in Berlin* (1957), a film made to 'sell' Berlin as a consumer success story to a West German audience. The film is also strikingly attuned to the synchronic rhythms of the city that exceed the conventional tourist-consumer gaze; at one point, our female tourist-protagonist visits a *Verkehrsschule* (traffic school) in West Berlin, where the children are learning the rules of the road (not just crossing the road, but how to navigate a car round the city). The 'traffic school', a phenomenon born of the 1950s – the Steglitz school in the film was in fact established in 1957 – is of course an explicit training for the synchronic experience of the city.

City officials employed a variety of technologies to manage public awareness of the transforming city, including the decision to build on the success of the Interbau by having a bi-annual exhibition of building projects in West Berlin, entitled the 'Berliner Bauwochen' (the Berlin Construction Weeks). The importance of the Hansaviertel was underlined by its ongoing presence in the visual material advertising the first Berliner Bauwochen, which ran, within the frame of the German Industrial Exhibition, from 15 September to 2 October 1960. The cover of the brochure showed one of the high-rise towers from the Hansaviertel and the foreword, by Rolf Schwedler, reinforced this continuity:

In recent years – triggered by the International Building Exhibition in 1957 – the construction of Berlin has been followed with attention and participation by the citizens of the city and its friends around the world.⁹

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the Bauwochen themselves were entirely devoted to the new synchronic city; there were two lectures on 'Monument Preservation and New Building',¹⁰ one on 'Urbanity and Neighbourhood', as well as, less surprisingly, sessions on 'Traffic Planning', the experiences of the Hansaviertel project and the opening of the second section of the urban motorway (between Hohenzollerndamm and Schmargendorf).¹¹ Of these topics, the first was illustrated in the brochure by the reconstruction of the 'Deutsche Oper' in Charlottenburg – exemplifying, once more, how 'monument preservation' was less focused on the urban



3. Bauwochen exhibition tour of the urban motorway between the Funkturm and Jakob-Kaiser-Platz, at the 'Nordwestbogen' bridge in Charlottenburg. 9 September 1962. Photograph: Karl-Heinz Schubert. Courtesy of Berlin Landesarchiv.

milieu, ensemble or vernacular, and more on the unique object. The question of motorized traffic in the city came up in two articles in the brochure. First, the opening of the North-West bridge on the Fürstbrünner Weg over the Spree in Charlottenburg was addressed by Rolf Schwedler. Schwedler thanked those who had understood the need for the construction of broad, open roads, and he praised the bridge, in particular for the fact that it provided a lovely view over the 'landscape', though precisely how this view was to be appreciated remained unclear (Fig. 3). The second article related to this was a piece by the Senator's building director, Erwin Klotz, outlining the principles of the urban motorways in Berlin. The article was illustrated by four images: two diagrams – an arterial map that reiterates the plan for the Hauptstadt competition and a cross-section of the roadscape – and two photographs, one illustrating traffic accessing and leaving the motorway at Halensee, and one demonstrating the signage at the Hohenzollerndamm exit. The sparse, technical functionality of these images mirrored the dry, technical prose that explained the function of the motorway, pausing only briefly to remark on the 'interesting' bridges. The didactic tone of the prose was underlined in an article on the Hansaviertel buildings that discussed

how inhabitants were using the new residences ‘in the wrong way’, a useful reminder that the training intentions of the synchronic gaze may not always be seamlessly translated at ground level.

Overall, in terms of display, the past had no place at the Bauwochen of 1960. Citizens were invited to a series of ‘tours’ of sites of new construction; these were either of new transport infrastructure developments (underground stations, the aforementioned bridges, the motorway openings), new public structures (schools, swimming pools) and, strikingly, a ‘view of the city’ from the (then) tallest structure in Berlin, the Telefunken-house on Ernst-Reuter Platz. These tours familiarized the citizens with the new way of seeing the city, and the exhibitions of the Bauwochen were similarly interested in the display of the new and coming urban infrastructure (‘Streets of Today and Tomorrow’, ‘10 years of construction in Berlin’).¹²

The cityscape and history

1957, the year of the Hauptstadt competition, was also the year in which the public discussion of the fate of the Kaiser William Memorial Church reached its peak. Dating back to the 1910s, the Wilhelmine church had been long considered an obstacle to frictionless circulation in the city and in its post-war ruined condition seemed ripe for demolition, especially as it belonged architecturally to the neo-historicist phase for which monument preservation had little time. The public response expressed dissatisfaction with the wholesale restructuring of the urban environment under the synchronic urban gaze and this led to the concomitant production of ‘spatial images’ of the site, particularly in the media.¹³ With the case of the Kaiser William Memorial Church, former spatial practices and images and encounters with the cityscape become discursively present for the first time since the war. This perhaps explains why ‘the past’ was more explicitly visible in the Bauwochen programme of 1962, the centrepiece of which was a ‘discussion event about “Cityscape and History”’ (*Stadtbild und Geschichte*).

This event can be understood as an attempt to regulate the emergence of the museal urban gaze. It was led by cultural figures such as the German architectural historian, Julius Posener. Conceptions of time in the city were presented here by experts who shared a set of common assumptions and fears about a technologized society that was most visible in the modern city. The debate reiterated a traditional concern in German culture, between a profound and rooted *Kultur* (cultural tradition) and a technologized (mass)

civilization. In that context, Heinrich Gremmels, Director of Town Planning in Königsllutter in Lower Saxony, gave a helpful summary of this position:

The fundamental rift in the structure of the modern world between domestic urbanity and machine civilization can be brought back to the fundamental opposition between house and machine. The house was always on the side of tradition, but [this has] long since been surpassed by the mechanical organism that storms without consideration into the pure future.¹⁴

The mismatch between the technology of modernity and the means for discussing it, effectively traditional public speaking to an interested cultural elite in a privileged corner of the city (the Academy of the Arts), does not apply so straightforwardly to Julius Posener's talk, which did not take up these questions of 'culture' that so obsessed the other contributors. Rather, Posener addressed the question of the cityscape, and the tension between the idea and the practice of an urban gaze. 'We have grown accustomed', he suggested, 'to recognizing images when we look landscapes – but we are looking at cities', which, he argues, are something different. For Posener, 'planned' cityscapes are 'empty'; what is needed is not 'the monumental' or 'the image', but a view of the city as a vernacular structure from which life is generated. Emptiness for Posener is both the absence of life and the absence of history, a cityscape without history.

An important irony is that Posener contrasts the 'empty' landscape not with the 'immediate' material city but a set of images. He refers to a 'charming' exhibition of amateur photographs of Berlin that ran concurrently to the Bauwochen in 1962 (Fig. 4). This photographic exhibition illustrates two connected technologies of the museal urban gaze. First, there was the gaze of the photographer, whose 'beam of attention'¹⁵ is motivated by a 'will to remember'¹⁶ place in resisting the threat of destruction by the production of a 'spatial image' of a particular detail of the vernacular urban landscape. Second, there was the display of the photographs in the exhibition, which resituated that initial moment of resistance into the form of civic seeing organized by the city authorities who were ultimately responsible for the competition and the exhibition of its results (with the associated evaluative ranking).

Posener described these photographers as 'lovers of the city, in the true sense of the word, [who] have represented Berlin scenes with a romantic magic which the eye that is used to the everyday in Berlin scarcely expects.'¹⁷ Many motifs in the exhibition, such as the Charlottenburg Palace



4. Opening of the exhibition of the amateur photograph competition, 'History in the Cityscape'. 30 August 1962. Left, first-prize winner Heinz Gronau; right, Senator Rolf Schwedler. Photograph: Johann Willa. Courtesy of Berlin Landesarchiv.

for example, are also present in photobooks of the period, such as *Junges altes Berlin*. Posener in fact remarked on the omnipresent phenomenon of the Berlin photobook, observing that 'on average there appear about two a week.' *Junges, altes Berlin* and other photobooks of this ilk, work much more ambivalently than Artus's book, mentioned earlier, in their sympathetic presentation of the former cityscapes. Whereas the exhibition showed many vernacular elements, the photobooks, Posener argued, focused on the 'monumental.' In the exhibition, 'one sees old street lamps and iron cast sewer hole covers, the like of which are still to be found in side streets'; one also sees houses, house fronts and parts of house fronts from the previous century.' This focus on detail is striking and typical of what would become a more general museal urban gaze. Posener concluded that 'we have to keep hold of the Charlottenburg Palace, of the old house fronts in the Christstrasse, of the green squares in Kreuzberg. We have to preserve them, just as we have to preserve the street lamps and the old water pumps. [...] We have to preserve them, because we are poor.'¹⁸ Posener is here giving voice to what Halbwachs calls the 'resistance of local tradition', albeit one that is mediated through the official channels of exhibition.

Remembering the 'murdered' city

This resistance, and its concern with vernacular remains, had also been taking on a more concrete form in the public sphere in the voice of the publicist Wolf Jobst Siedler's essays, which had been appearing in the *Tagesspiegel* from the late 1950s onwards. Siedler's essays were collected in a book, *The Murdered City* (*Die Gemordete Stadt*), first published in 1961, along with photographs by the recently graduated Elisabeth Niggemeyer. While Siedler's book had a claim to general validity for the Federal Republic, it is Berlin that remained the focus, both in his text and in Niggemeyer's photographs. The essays originally appeared in the newspaper without illustration, but now the essays and the images combined to dissect the synchronic urban gaze, and formulate place memory with 'an ironic affection for yesterday'.¹⁹ Siedler's textual critique of the synchronic urban gaze and verbal exposition of a museal urban gaze was accompanied by photographs that reiterated and professionally evolved the practice of the Bauwochen exhibition. The tenor of Siedler's essays echoed the cultural critique of the contributors to the Bauwochen discussion. His central critique of the synchronic urban gaze was derived from Ernst Jünger and 1920s conservative critiques of modernity and mass society. This is evident in the introduction to the first edition, where he makes it clear that, in his opinion, the city square did not fall victim to modern urban planning, but to 'new forms of order in society'. At the conclusion to the essay entitled 'Farewell to Nineveh', his position finds perhaps its clearest expression:

At midnight it makes no difference if one is standing amongst the skyscrapers of Houston or the ruins of Berlin. In these two ways the spirit of the age of the masses has achieved its aim: emptiness.²⁰

In their 'self-deprecating romanticization' of the encounter with urban phenomena such as the back courtyard, the essays invoke an 'emotional experience of the urban environment', that is particularly visual. Siedler may want to facilitate a memory of 'the urban', but urban memory is not always explicitly invoked. It is implicit in certain formulations regarding the 'atmosphere' or 'living quality' of a quarter; and always has less to do with individual buildings than with ways of looking at a city's milieu, a focus on the vernacular rather than the monumental.

The introduction to the opening essay, 'Romanticization of the Back Courtyard' (*Verklärung des Hinterhofs*) highlights the importance of the gaze, as it remarks not so much on the loss produced by new urban planning, as upon the fact that this loss has now become *visible*, as a spatial image. Up

to this point, there had been a blindness to this loss, but ‘even someone who had no desire to defend rickets-inducing back courtyards’ must now see it.²¹ What disappears is the visual evidence of the past. In the essay, ‘Requiem for Putti’ he talks of the ‘spirit of the nineteenth century’ having been legible from the house walls and street vistas that bore witness to the increasing representative presence of the Wilhelmine empire, and draws attention to the gaze that generates this memory value in a manner that echoes Halbwachs’s formulation of understanding how the built environment of the past functioned. For this memory value only exists now ‘if our eyes even only slowly become aware of the quality of building in the second half of the previous century, and even if we still have to learn to comprehend that generation in their particular intentions.’²² Siedler invokes key aspects of Halbwachs’s model of place memory: this visibility is predicated on a particular form of gaze that echoes Halbwachs’s observations on how place memory was to be remembered, but also adds a rejection of homogenization, which is at the heart of Siedler’s argument: the local and particular versus the homogenized. The perception of ‘place’ is based on local spatial practices, but the prerequisite of the visibility of ‘local’ place memory is, in fact, the recognition of loss. Siedler’s essays are profoundly attuned to the conditions that produce a museal urban gaze, in that he recognizes that it is linked to vanishing features of the urban environment.

It is the tragedy of the reconstruction that we are able to recognize the bare facade structures of the Schinkel-inheritors of the [eighteen] sixties and seventies and the vegetative stucco of the *Gruenderzeit* houses of 1880 to 1895 only at that moment when the plaster-addicted wave of modernization in association with household-style calculations liberates the facades of the German cities from all ornamental decoration, in order to cover them with plain unified plaster.²³

The moment of recognition coincides with the moment of disappearance, but always through the visual perception of atmosphere, as he suggests in ‘World without Shadows’:

Atmospheric transformations of this kind are almost always tangible through the visual. In the case [of the shift to purpose-driven perception – SW], the bird’s eye perspective would already signal that changes in a society’s ‘structure of feeling’ have taken place: alongside the gaslit green of the old quarters of town comes the bright glare of the new treeless environments.²⁴

It is not just the sensual impact of the visual that is invoked, but the contrast with a synchronic urban gaze that dismantles the visual experience of the city. Siedler describes the aura of an obsolete modernity that becomes visible at a moment of technological transformation.

For Siedler, the 'office, shopping and housing centres' are seldom seen as a menace to the 'culture that is being threatened at its roots' by the synchronic urban gaze (which he terms a 'rationalistic drawing-board mentality'). As Siedler describes it, the signature of that culture was the clear togetherness of its citizens in a milieu that had up to now been 'historical', i.e. rooted in historical experience. By implication, the new space will be 'without history', just as it is without (rooted) trees. Siedler's analysis of the synchronic urban gaze also observes that gaze's concern with circulation:

[For the city renewers,] the city should be made to function again. The concept of the functioning of streets, squares and city areas relates to frictionlessness ... like all words that come from the water-economy. Water as a stream flowing ceaselessly and irreversibly in the same direction is the ideal of urban planning. This is an ideal that is opposed to the spirit of the urban, which lives from the blockage, friction and congestion, from the back and forth, to and fro; the push and shove of the streets draws our attention to cities that are full of life, and *only* those boulevards that are full of people and invite us to stroll (*flanieren*).²⁵

Elisabeth Niggemeyer's photographs inserted between the essays are the visual manifestation of a 'stroll' through the city, and the idea of the flâneur is here central, as it is a form of movement without direction and purpose. Niggemeyer's photographs are organized into categories of minor urban objects that one might easily overlook; streets, lamps, façades, windows, trees, squares, doors, doorhandles, halls, greenhouses, courtyards, shops, public houses, villas, towers and gardens. These are particularly highlighted in part of the final section of the book, which is devoted to Chamissoplatz (in Kreuzberg) and, in contrast, the new housing development in Britz-Süd. This final section encapsulates one particular strategy in the visual part of the book: the juxtaposition of 'old' and 'new', but any definition of 'old' and 'new' is shaped by the gaze which has selected the fragment of the city to photograph; in other words, in each case, the framing is directed towards the generation of an auratic effect of 'age value.' The framing seeks to generate the place memory embodied in the form of city square.

The photographs' emphasis is on the face of the square; the façades, but also the more literal inscriptions on the walls. There is a celebration of



5. *Die gemordete Stadt*, pp. 182/183. Photograph: Elisabeth Niggemeyer. Courtesy of Elisabeth Niggemeyer-Pfefferkorn.

the non-linear, both in the formal framing of the scenes and in the layout on the page (Fig. 5). On the first double-page of photographs, there is a large-format picture of one corner of the square, alongside which are placed six smaller images, all of the same size, presenting aspects of the square; on the third page are twelve images, arranged in rows of three images of equal heights, but of irregular width. The subject of the photographs is interestingly balanced between people and architecture. In the set of six, there are four whose main subject is the façade or streetscape, one focused on young girls with a doll, and one where the presence of the people is evident but marginal to the dominant effect of the façade.

In the set of twelve, there are three devoted solely to the façade (two verandas, one shop window); of the other nine, two seem exclusively concentrated on the human subject, but even they explicitly set the human subject within the urban environment, so there is the implication of an interactive relationship. In other words, this set of photographs highlights the connection between spatial practice and the production of space. They reveal spatial practice as a set of human traces left specifically by the inscriptions on the façades, but also on the street, such as the cart standing outside the 'wood and coal' shop. This is a photograph apparently without human presence, but actually gesturing towards the continuity of human presence.

This sequence produces a spatial image of urban memory, but, as in Siedler's essays, it is also placed in contrast to a framing of the synchronic urban gaze in the set of photographs that document Britz-Süd, a social housing development built in the south-east of West Berlin in 1956-57. These are printed over two pages: the first, as on the facing page from Chamissoplatz, has twelve images, but these are of a uniform size. The focus is uniformly on the architecture; there are no human subjects and only one photograph contains a single car. The images appear as a panoramic series taken from a single standpoint, and this serves to draw attention to the varied standpoints from which the Chamissoplatz photographs were taken. The camera thus mimics the static viewpoint of the synchronic urban gaze, but also *demonstrates* through *imitation* the sterility of that gaze. The camera deliberately chooses subjects that do not function as coherent photographic subjects, implying this absence of coherence is a result of the design. The notion of serial repetition, which is generated by the uniformity, is underscored by placing the images in a grid, and by the fact that the first and last images are almost identical (in fact they are not, the last one is tighter to the balcony, and thus cuts off the two furthest windows in the first photograph).

This final photographic section of the book functions as the culmination of a strategy that has been visible throughout the photographic sections in the book, one that includes the juxtaposition of 'new' and 'old', illustrating how the synchronic gaze envisions the urban environment by reproducing that gaze. The photographs in this section make sense as part of a series: children appear captured *in motion* on the next two pages, running over cardboard boxes on the pavement of the Nehringstrasse, whereas the following large-format photograph spread over two pages, offers a bird's eye perspective of a spartan playpark in the Goethestrasse in Charlottenburg, with two children sitting statically on a geometrically situated bench. The synchronic urban gaze is visually associated with stasis and emptiness. The supplementary captions in this section include a list of the 'vocabulary of the urban planners, building authorities and architects', accompanying another grid arrangement of images of 'prohibition'.²⁶ The linguistic regulation of spatial practice is complemented by the (monotonous) regulation of seeing imitated by the camera.²⁷

By contrast, elsewhere in the book, where the camera projects a museal gaze, the focus is on specific objects, such as the full-page photograph of a cast-iron water pump from the Karl-August-Platz in Charlottenburg. The accompanying caption's topographical detail here and elsewhere reminds us not to draw too clear a distinction between text and image in the book;

this is underlined by the fact that the essays are interspersed between the photographic series. The new Hansa quarter is a key reference point for the camera that is dissecting the synchronic urban gaze, and a full page is devoted to the image (which also appears on the book's cover) of a builder apparently carelessly tossing a piece of decorative stucco from the roof of a building; the caption simply describes the location as 'Old Hansa Quarter, demolished'. This is the camera as documenter of the city; the collection of photographs then as the production of an archive of cultural memory.²⁸

The image of Riehmer's Hofgarten (from 1964, one of five areas protected by the city façade regulations) is accompanied by a textual narrative about its builder, Wilhelm Riehmer. This is an archetypal example of cultural memory underpinned by communicative strategies, in that the image becomes the evidence for the story that is told, but the encounter with the images of the 'age value' of the place plays a key role as a guarantee for the validity of the narrative.²⁹

(Psycho-) analysing the inhospitable city

The Murdered City developed the technology of recovering place memory through a certain mode of encounter. The book illustrates the importance of the visual as a means of communicating the critique of a synchronic gaze and the formulation of a museal urban gaze. Whereas Siedler's verbal formulation of the memorial urban gaze was complemented and expanded in the photographs and captions of Elisabeth Niggemeyer, Alexander Mitscherlich's invocation of 'collective place memory' in *The Inhospitability of Our Cities* was exclusively textual. Central to Mitscherlich's gaze is the assumption that post-war reconstruction represents a form of wilful collective amnesia. The maintenance of the built environment could, then, ideally, construct a different kind of collective – identity. He analyses post-war West German society as a 'society which carries out its atonement – which equates to a healing of the soul – by pretending there had been no catastrophe and moreover, as if the process of ongoing industrialization and bureaucratization would have no pressing consequences for the whole calibre of their life [...]'. Mitscherlich implies that the built environment is the expression of a collective psychological state of amnesia. Dieter Bartetzko also suggests that the towns became the architectural expression of Mitscherlich's central socio-psychological concept, the Germans' 'inability to mourn'.³⁰ This is predicated on the model of place memory in which the built environment is a faithful mirror of a collective:

We have wasted the chance granted us after the war to build more cleverly thought-out, genuinely new cities. Or, to put it another way, if cities are collective self-representations, then that which we encounter here in terms of self-representation, is alarming.³¹

Siedler and Mitscherlich have in common a critique of technocratic modern rationalization, as it was symptomatically manifested in the synchronic urban gaze that disregards the value of tradition. Mitscherlich views post-war reconstruction as a thoughtless, technocratic destruction of tradition, but identifies the historical roots of that gaze in National Socialism, arguing that 'the reconstruction, which we have experienced and permitted, is still an awkward after-phase of the collective psychosis that was "National Socialism", which led to the destruction of our most noble urban substance.'³² This is an important argument, as it suggests that the interrogation of the experiences under National Socialism, absent other than subliminally in references to 'the war' in Siedler's book, is central to an 'overcoming' of the authoritarian, anti-democratic worldview of which the synchronic urban gaze is a symptom. This approach is important to understanding the forms of the museal gaze and the associated 'place memory work' that will emerge in the 1970s. Initially, as with Mitscherlich, this work is not based on identifying and working through traces of the past, but on identifying the psychological roots of the synchronic urban gaze. Mitscherlich claims that 'inadequate urban planning participates in the destruction of public consciousness whenever it takes only commercial interests and traffic infrastructure into account.'³³ He thus introduces a conception of a cohesive, democratic public sphere that is absent in Siedler's considerations, and thereby implies that the maintenance of the built environment could construct a different kind of collective identity through a different kind of consciousness, in other words, a different kind of relationship with the built environment. What this might mean in practical terms is not explained by Mitscherlich, but, at the end of *The Murdered City*, Siedler offers a way forward that addresses contemporary developments and seeks to move beyond 'islands of tradition' to 'milieux of memory' (where the rhythm is determinate), which will become increasingly important in coming years:

We are not dealing here with a 'save the stucco' movement, which has only been the fig leaf for reckless interventions in the historical substance of the city, and cityscape preservation [*Stadtbildpflege*] can, in its conservation of islands of tradition, only be of secondary importance for an overall building policy which deals with the revitalization of old quarters – from

the medieval Spandau, exclusively ruined by planning, down to the Wedding of the nineteenth century. This, and not another new quarter, would be a bold and future-directing task for an IBA in Berlin.³⁴

The start of this excerpt refers to a Senate policy of the time, 'Save the Stucco' (*Rettet den Stuck*), one of the ways in which the authorities in West Berlin sought to soften the resistance of local tradition to its urban renewal plans. In institutional terms, the Senate subordinated the 'memory value' of urban space to the exchange value of space, primarily by situating the section for 'monumental preservation and museal art objects' as one of five sections within the department of 'State and Urban Planning', within the Senate Administration for Building and Housing. The Head of Conservation for the (West) Berlin region had been administratively situated outside this framework (being part of the Senate Administration for Science and Art). The 'Office for Monument Preservation' was however described in the commentary to the 'Building Regulations' of 1959, as a subordinate office of the Senator for Building and Housing, which took on the tasks of the former Head of Conservation. The position of Head of Conservation had remained unfilled after the departure of Prof. Hinnerk Scheper in that watershed year of 1957. At that point, Wolfgang Konwiarz had taken on the supervision of 'monument preservation' in his role within the State and Urban Planning department. The complex relationship between *Stadtbildpflege* (preservation of the city image) and *Denkmalpflege* (monument preservation) finds expression in the administrative structures that evolve at this point: *Stadtbildpflege* is separated off from *Denkmalpflege* and becomes the responsibility of Konwiarz and his department. It is therefore ever more clearly bound within planning structures and its dictates.

Stadtbildpflege as a form of museal urban gaze is a technology that aims to preserve the visual mode of encounter with the cityscape. As urban memory, it involves not the explicit narrativization of a collective past that it preserves – as would be the model in cultural memory – but rather an inexplicit encounter with the façade as an 'unintended monument' which possesses age value. The principle is directed towards the 'surface value' rather than 'historical value' of the building; though it is often equated with the slogan 'Save the Stucco', *Stadtbildpflege* works not just with the 'old', but also with the harmonious in the cityscape. In 1964 five areas in Berlin were selected to be protected from alterations which would affect their 'uniqueness': these were the aforementioned Riehmers Hofgarten, Chamissoplatz and Planufer in Kreuzberg, the Schloß-/ Christstraße in

Charlottenburg und a part of Alt-Spandau. Here the plaster and stucco decorations from the pre-1914 era, along with the gas lanterns, water pumps and other aspects of street furniture were to be maintained.

The museal urban gaze in East Berlin

International modernist architecture had been frowned upon in the early, Stalinist-dominated years of the GDR. While, as a result, it is possible to read the GDR cityscape in terms of the intentional ideological codings embedded within them, this can lead us to neglect the role played by remnants and their ambiguous codes, but also the way in which the GDR's vision of the cityscape, like that in the West of the city, corresponded, post-Stalin, with other international tendencies in urban planning. Yet the conception of the cityscape as a 'technical problem' in East Berlin becomes evident if we return to the infamous decision to demolish the Stadtschloss in the heart of the city centre in 1950. Bernd Maether, in his study of the 'destruction' of the Berlin Palace follows the conventional line of argument that it was the leadership of the SED, and in particular Walter Ulbricht, who was responsible for the decision to demolish the Stadtschloss, because the destruction of the historical heritage of the Prussian monarchy was a fundamental component of their ideology: 'the idea was to rewrite history by ignoring, indeed destroying the old.'³⁵ Elsewhere Maether asserts that the Communist Party (KPD) was in favour of demolition from the very start.³⁶ This is the archetypal 'ideological' reading of the cityscape, but this explanation is only rarely evident in the documents relating to the Palace. These documents can be productively read in terms of how they regard or disregard the site, highlighting the important distinction which Maether elides in his use of 'ignored and 'destroyed'.

On June 26 1950, at a session of the ZK of the SED, point 5 of the agenda considered the order for the removal of ruins and the reconstruction of those cities in the GDR destroyed by the war. The financial cost of reconstruction was central to these proposals: the reconfiguration of useable ruins was to be allowed as long as the cost of reconstruction was below that of demolition and new build; in other words, this was an economic calculation.³⁷

A report prepared by the Institute for Urban Planning in the Ministry of Construction addressed not the fate of the Palace, but rather the construction of a large-scale space for political demonstrations in the centre of Berlin and in its calculations it considers the demolition of both the Dom and the Schloss.³⁸ Although the space was to serve an ideological purpose,

the conclusion drawn is formulated in terms of a calculation framed within historical coordinates: the Lustgarten was the 'historical location for demonstrations', and has space for 140,000 demonstrators taking part in a non-mobile demonstration; with the demolition of both the Palace and the Cathedral, that number would increase to 300,000.³⁹ The report then suggested that if a decision were made in favour of a space for mobile demonstrations, the 'historical' square could be retained. The wall of the Schloss would form the background to the demonstrations. This certainly does not imply, as Maether infers, that the demolition of the Palace was a foregone conclusion, but rather that the value of the space was primarily being calculated according to the principles of urban circulation.⁴⁰

Maether asserts that Walter Ulbricht expressed himself very strongly against the maintenance of the Palace in his speech at the 3rd Party Conference of the SED on 22 July 1950. Yet, again, the focus in Ulbricht's speech in the section 'Large-Scale Buildings in the Five Year Plan' betrays a fundamental disregard for the Stadtschloss, which appears almost marginally in the section:

The centre of the city is to be determined by monumental buildings and an architectonic composition which does justice to the importance of the German capital [...] The centre of our capital, the Lustgarten and the area taken up now by the ruin of the Schloss must become a space for demonstrations in which the willingness of people to struggle and build must find its expression.⁴¹

While it is clear that the future cityscape is to serve ideological ends, the reference to the *area* occupied by the Schloss ruin indicates, from Ulbricht's perspective, both the neutral emptiness of the space and the soon-to-be-removed obsolescence of the Palace. The debate documented in Maether's collection in fact highlights the question of the Schloss's supposed obsolescence, revolving around, on the one hand, the cultural-historical and antiquarian-historical value of the architecture as asserted from the Western perspective, and on the other, the question of the extent of the Palace's ruination (estimated at 80%) and the cost of renovation, as opposed to demolition and new construction.⁴² Gerhard Strauss, who was leading the preservationist activities at the demolition site, posted his 'Theses' about the Schloss both in the Palace and in the Humboldt University. This was the one point at which the ideological obsolescence of the building was cited as an obstacle to the construction of a new socialist city.⁴³

The urban planning questions addressed so far contain an implicit visualization of urban space, but on 10 October 1950, Strauss wrote to Kurt Liebknecht, director of the Institute for Urban Planning in the Ministry of Construction, reminding him that he had previously suggested making a *Kulturfilm* about the work being carried out at the Palace, with the intention of demonstrating two things: the necessity of demolition as well as the painstaking work being undertaken by the government in salvaging valuable material. He appended to this letter an outline for the proposed film.⁴⁴

The film was to begin by juxtaposing images of the undestroyed and the destroyed Palace, illustrating the culturally hostile barbarism of the Fascist war and the Allied terror attacks. It would also demonstrate that the government's decision to demolish the Palace was the right one, through the great extent of the destruction, i.e. the building's physical obsolescence, while simultaneously pointing to the maintenance of all extant valuable elements. In order to provide a context for the Schloss's situation and the need to deal with the obsolescence brought about by the war, this would be followed by images of destroyed parts of Berlin and other cities in Germany. Again emphasizing the technical problem of the city, it would be made clear that the demolition of the Palace ruin would be shown to open up the centre of the German capital for a comprehensive restructuring, which would allow for the large-scale solution of most of the long-term urban infrastructure problems. The film was then to conclude with images of models for the new city centre.⁴⁵

While there was doubtless an ideological dimension to the demolition of the Stadtschloss, the building was not demolished because of what it represented. Rather, what it represented meant that it was not accorded any value as an element of the past. Instead there was an interplay of technocratic and ideological concerns in which the calculable and visually demonstrable obsolescence of the building grounded an argument that was aligned with the perception of its ideological obsolescence. The 'empty space' created by the demolition of the Palace was to be filled by ideological content, but the principle which underpinned the clearing of the site was a calculation about space that pays no attention to the historical time present in the Palace buildings. Laurenz Demps comes to this conclusion on the basis that, for the GDR regime, 'the total urban environment was material at its disposal, whose historical contours they believed they had every right to ignore.'⁴⁶ As the sixteen principles of urban planning, published during considerations of the Palace on 27 July 1950, made clear, the organization of urban space was ultimately subordinate to the needs of circulation.⁴⁷

The initial phase of (re)construction, under the guidelines of the Sixteen Principles, was underpinned by a search for a 'national German architectural style', as in the first phase of the Stalinallee, and by plans that proposed the 'careful renewal' of old districts such as the Fischerkiez.⁴⁸ Urban planning in East Berlin and beyond was however increasingly dominated by what Simone Hain terms the 'establishment of the most modern building structures within conventional international parameters'.⁴⁹ This meant a continuing disregard for existing urban structures and habitual spatial practices, as seen in Henselmann's 1956 vision for the Friedrichshain district, and the plans submitted for the 'socialist restructuring of the city centre' in 1958. Allied to this was an emphasis on a more efficient industrialization of building production.⁵⁰ At the heart of this was a synchronic urban gaze that had no conception of former time and space, and envisioned the future as a site of circulatory automobile activity, just as the former site of the Schloss had been viewed as a site of synchronic marching. This vision was disseminated to the GDR public in a series of photobooks produced throughout the 1950s, such as *Berlin: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow (Berlin: Gestern, Heute, Morgen)* or *Ten Years of National Construction Work in the Capital Berlin (10 Jahre Nationales Aufbauwerk Hauptstadt Berlin)*,⁵¹ which juxtaposed images of the 'obsolescent' city of 1945 with images of the emerging 'new' city, or *Berlin Heute und Morgen* or *Unser Berlin: Die Hauptstadt Berlin*, which celebrated the new architectural and industrial achievements of the nascent socialist state.⁵² These volumes demonstrate how, in a manner similar to that intended by Strauss, the conceptual vision was translated into the media of visual culture.

From the post-Stalin era onwards, the production of the East Berlin cityscape was primarily visualized as a technical problem, as the 'creation of an intelligible city without a memory of everyday life'.⁵³ Nevertheless we can begin to chart how the remembrance of everyday life begins to emerge almost in spite of itself against the dominance of an economic evaluation of the built environment.

This new perspective manifests itself in two renovation projects in previously disregarded areas of East Berlin in the Prenzlauer Berg in the late 1960s/early 1970s: Arkonaplatz and Arnimplatz. In a 1968 edition of the official state architectural journal, *Deutsche Architektur*, Klaus Pöschk outlined the principles concerning the renovation of Arkonaplatz.⁵⁴ Pöschk had concluded in a prior article in 1967 that earlier renovations nearby had not been effective enough from economic or socio-political perspectives. Although the exchange value of the site remained predominant, Pöschk proposed the renovation of the Arkonaplatz as a model by which the

'obsolescent and out-dated structure of the residential district' could be overcome.⁵⁵ Within this model, a different visualisation of the value of the cityscape, its 'memory value', began to make itself evident in Pöschk's thinking:

The individual streets form a particular focus of the architectural design of the reconstructed 'Altbausubstanz'. The requirement here is that the characteristics of the typical Berlin streetscape are retained, and a meaningful colour scheme, which in a newly developed colourfulness takes into account an adaptation of the original colours, in order to reflect the new social content. It is important to note that the residential district does not belong to those 'reserved zones', such as the Marienstrasse [close to the Friedrichstrasse railway station – SW], which fall under the special conditions of Berlin's monument preservation regulations.⁵⁶

Pöschk's final point is a crucial one: what is being preserved is not an object of 'historical value', but a memory of the network of relationships to the built environment, a 'spatial image' of the past. Attention was to be paid to the relationship of the new colours to the original, as well as the maintenance of certain sections of wall (*Mauerwerksteile*). While the renovation paid attention to the way the buildings looked in the past, Pöschk stressed that any expense incurred was justifiable, and that the underlying criterion, remained the 'physical and moral obsolescence' of the building. This was underlined by the use of illustrative photographs, in particular an image of the 'urban structure and form of the residential area', a dilapidated back courtyard that, according to the caption, was the inheritance of 'the capitalist past' and bore the 'characteristics of the rental barracks of the *Gründerzeit*'. While the caption identified the structure's 'moral obsolescence', this was elided with the photograph's visible evidence of physical obsolescence and juxtaposed a page later with a photograph of a renovated façade.

Two years later, again in *Deutsche Architektur*, Manfred Zache was also keen to justify such remedial maintenance through the evidence of calculations. Despite his emphasis on the calculability of renovation, one of the guiding principles was, as with the Arkonaplatz, an emphasis on the effect of the visual impact of the buildings through the integration of material elements (façades) that are 'culturally historically valuable' or indeed merely 'partially still in existence'.⁵⁷ Zache introduced into the equation a factor ('cultural history') that was subjected neither to the calculability of economics nor to a clear ideologically approved historical narrative. Yet this did not

involve a fundamental change of revaluation of the way in which former structures were viewed.⁵⁸ The objective quantifiability of the cityscape was still the dominant paradigm for visualizing the city.

Rejecting the synchronic city in West Berlin

This quantifiability paradigm was largely still the case in the west of the city, where, however, the generational unrest of the late 1960s also spilled over into concerns about the built environment. Mitscherlich had argued in *The Inhospitability of Our Cities* that ‘such [an amnesiac] society awakens in different parts of its body at different times from their dreams and their denials – but it does awaken.’⁵⁹ This process of awakening manifests itself very strikingly in the place memory work of the 1970s, which the next chapter discusses, but it also begins to become visible in the 1967 protests against the proposed demolition of plot 210 on the Kurfürstendamm. The protests questioned whether Berlin should become ‘like Frankfurt’ (i.e. a city dominated by financial transactions). These protests are evident in ‘Aktion 507’, named after the room in the Technical University appropriated by a set of young architects to make use of the money (18,000 marks) the Senate had provided them with to present their work and ideas. The young architects had taken the money and, after some hesitation from Bausenator Schwedler, had been allowed to use it for their ‘critical engagement with contemporary building practice.’ Following the pattern developed by the emergent extra-parliamentary opposition in the city, the event formed a self-styled ‘anti-Bauwochen’, and was organized in the style of a revolutionary council: 120 architects met in the room, discussing photographs of various building plans. The main target for their opprobrium was the, at that time half-completed, Märkisches Viertel development in the north of the city. By 1972 this new quarter was intended to be housing more than 60,000 people who had been moved out of the ‘obsolete’ workers’ districts of Wedding and Kreuzberg that were in the process of being demolished. The critique was predominately directed against what the young architects saw as the mere transposition of the ‘slums’ from one district to a new one. In line with the argument of Mitscherlich, which had emphasized the continuity of economic structures as one key dimension of Germany’s failure to think itself anew after the war, they also criticized the particular structure of the Berlin building economy that made financial gain the prime driver of housing production. Memory value was not (yet) an element in the discussion. The critique manifests itself primarily within the terms of

exchange value. It was, ironically, the former Nazi architect, Werner March, who produced a *Gutachten* outlining that the renovation and modernization of one particular house (Wassertorstrasse 5 in Kreuzberg) would cost 91,500 marks, whereas the demolition would cost 250,000 marks. Similar calculations were made by the West Berlin sociologist, Ilsa Balg, which suggested that renovation of the Kreuzberg districts would cost 6.4 million marks as opposed to 18.1 million for new building.⁶⁰

This is not a critique of the synchronic urban gaze in terms of how it frames a relationship to time and the city, but accepts the principle of the exchange value of space. The critique accepts, at least on the surface, that a better system of exchange value would produce a more efficient solution; in other words, as with East Berlin's urban renovation policy, the argument accepted the economic and technocratic principles of spatial organization.

The idea that the cityscape might contain value different to a quantifiable exchange value had however begun to manifest itself by the end of the 1960s. The institutional regulation of this shift is visible in the announcement by the *Stadtbildpflege* department in January 1970 that it would be making an inventory of 'historically valuable' house façades in the inner districts of West Berlin, effectively transferring them from the urban repository into a relatively more ordered archive. This act of curating the city was described as a task of 'discovery' and initial results suggested that 229 houses in Kreuzberg were under consideration.⁶¹ None of the official forms of the museal gaze seek to reframe the rhythm of the encounter with the cityscape as a movement through urban space and as such it will ultimately be susceptible to the synchronic rhythms of consumption. It is film where this examination of urban rhythms first emerged.

Summer in the city: Moving through urban space

Wim Wenders's first film, *Summer in the City* (1970) is an investigation of movement through urban spaces. The film's title seems ironic, as the action takes place in winter, and there is little 'urbanity' in the film's depictions of the cityscapes of Munich and Berlin.

Wenders's film explicitly addresses transformations in the built environment when the central character, Hans, addresses his partner across the breakfast table. He remarks (in a non-synchronized voice-over) that jack-hammer noise had awoken him at 7am, and that he was thinking of going to Berlin, where, he reports, a house had been demolished on the

corner of Kurfürstendamm and Bleibtreustrasse. In the terse, almost non-communicative verbal style of the film, he continues:

A grey, five-storey house. There were a bunch of people there and two big bulldozers. It was in the late afternoon. It was almost dark and the sky was blue even though it was November. Over the hole in the ground the sky was divided vertically. On the left side it was blue and on the right side there was a wall of dust and smoke that reached into the horizon. It is said that the sky was almost too blue and too dark.

The city described verbally here is topographically generic, an effect which the rest of the film does little to dispel. Yet it is a film that examines cityscapes and their encounter very closely. This is done most explicitly in those sequences which examine the mode of travelling through urban space. There are eight travelling sequences in the film; the first three in Munich, the fourth a plane journey to Berlin, and the final four in Berlin, but there is little that is specific to either city in any of these journeys. The meandering journeys presented in the film take up approximately a third of the film's running time (ca. 40 minutes of 2 hours), but it is central to these journeys that they have no apparent direction; the absence of narrative thrust, of cause and effect, of action and reaction, allows them to be read as abstract investigations of rhythm and movement in cinema and the city.

The second journey through Berlin begins with a static shot of a newspaper kiosk at a road intersection; the camera moves, and we slowly realize this was a non-character-aligned view from a car that had been waiting at a traffic light; the car turns a corner and comes alongside Hans, who is walking through the snow. The car/camera matches his pace as it follows him for about a minute; at which point the film cuts to a streetscape of an old 'rental barrack' thoroughfare replete with ornate façades, viewed statically from a position in the centre of the road. There is a sudden, low-pitched noise that scatters pigeons across the frame; a distant car moves off, leading us automatically to associate the noise with the car, although the juxtaposition is awkward enough to make this seem a little unlikely (it is more the 'boom' of a demolition). This auditory association of the car with the disruption of the peaceful/old cityscape is one that makes sense within a film in which moving through the city is gradually adapted to walking pace, rejecting automobile movement in favour of contemplation of the built environment, as seen in the concluding view of the 'old' façades in this sequence, as the camera remains static, allowing us to contemplate the static streetscape for another thirty seconds.

This trajectory from automobile transport to walking is taken to its conclusion in the final travelling sequence of the film, which follows Hans as he walks along a snowy path by a canal in Berlin. The camera is not signalled as being transported via car, nor do we have any human figure with whom to identify the gaze beyond that of the camera. In any case, the camera moves at Hans's pace to the accompaniment of the powerful rhythms of The Lovin' Spoonful's 'Summer in the City'. This walk continues uninterrupted for over two minutes until the camera halts while Hans walks on, leaving the spectator to contemplate the 'rhythmic' architectural structure before the music stops.⁶² At this point the built environment, the camera and the soundtrack combine; we are no longer looking at the image of movement (walking). We thought the object of our attention was the (now unlit) walking protagonist, but in fact we realize that it was the brightly lit building behind him for the duration of the shot. The camera allows the protagonist to disappear from the frame as it comes to a halt and we are invited to contemplate the modernist building. Wenders interrupts the habitual regime of cinematic seeing, which focuses on the movement of the body of the protagonist, and engages us in a form of museal gaze, a contemplation of the city through which he (and we) conventionally move without looking – crucially, the protagonist here is *also* not looking at the building, thus causing the encounter with the building to be framed as indirect.

The film's presentation of the encounter with a generic modern city determined by a synchronic urban gaze, is not wholly negative; it is important to note the hypnotic pleasure of the view from the car in the film, one that is underpinned by the use of the rhythmic soundtrack. Nevertheless, the trajectory is towards a contemplative gaze directed at the built environment, away from the 'view from a car' that is the ground-level form of the synchronic gaze. The film analyses how the synchronic urban gaze shapes the automated subject at 'ground level' and the analysis moves towards a positive formulation of an museal urban gaze within the film form, a phenomenological encounter with the 'new' is contrasted with a different gaze that foregrounds different rhythms of space and time as central to the substantive, durational experience of the urban environment.

Film and obsolescent places in East Berlin

The Berlin of *Summer in the City* is also resolutely a Western one. Its diagnosis of the modern city disregards the political divisions that undoubtedly

shaped Berlin and the spatial experience of the city. In East Berlin, film, for more pragmatic reasons, was silent on the capital division, but was also being used as a way of interrogating the urban environment and its relationship to time. In the GDR, a critique of interchangeability now began to manifest itself in the reassertion of an individualism that insists on the stubborn detail in contrast to the grand narrative. This individualism is also a rejection of the *modern* individual with his individualized living cell (apartment) and travelling cell (car), part of the more general critique of modernized existence that emerges in the GDR from the early 1970s onwards.⁶³ This critique is focalized through the figure of Paul at the beginning of *The Legend of Paul and Paula* (*Die Legende von Paul und Paula*, 1973). In *The Legend of Paul and Paula*, the distinction between ‘obsolete’ and ‘modern’ is conveyed in the juxtaposition of two forms of dwelling (the ostensibly obsolete rental barracks and the new apartment block) within the same streetscape. The critique of automobility as a modern urban rhythm is implied within the narrative by the fact that Paula’s son is knocked down by a car, and the fact that Paula is initially offered a way out of her situation by Harry Saft, who owns a tyre workshop, and frequently acts as Paula’s chauffeur. Paula’s refusal to accept this solution is both a gendered response and, in a more subtle way, a refusal to submit the body to the rhythms demanded by the city. Similarly, while Paul and Paula’s refuge is an interstitial marginalized location amongst the building sites, it is also the place where Paul keeps his stylishly obsolete car as a kind of hidden relic. As my analysis here suggests, the obsolescent works here, as a silent, but visible emblem of dissent towards the synchronic regime of the GDR city (and state). The formulation of a specifically museal urban gaze remains cinematically unworked-through in GDR film at this point, but will be developed in *Solo Sunny*, released in the GDR in 1979 and discussed in the next chapter.

Public discourse and the urban past

By the mid-1970s in both halves of divided Berlin, the memory value of the urban past was emerging as a key motif. While it remains largely ‘sub-textual’ within public discourse in the East, the growing interest in the urban past in West Berlin was manifesting itself in public discourse before 1975. For example, *Der Tagesspiegel* had a long-running series on structures that were ‘amongst Berlin’s listed buildings’, which ran from the end of March 1971, just after the publication of the official ‘List of Building

Monuments' in February, through to 1974. That official list contained 'only' 192 buildings for the 12 districts. The series mutated in June 1971 to run in a parallel with a series of buildings that were 'not listed' and thus can be thought of as unintended vernacular monuments to the urban past.

The first article in this parallel series, authored by Günter Kühne, presented Kurfürstendamm 37, a spatial image of a building under threat (with an explicit reference to the demolition of Kurfürstendamm 210). It was not so much the building which is at stake, but the 'typical atmosphere' of the milieu, to which the individual façade contributes. Kühne's gaze produces a spatial image of the former city but the form of memory value is simultaneously superficial and intangible, and certainly imprecise in terms of its conception of 'the past', other than in contrast to a system that does not value a building other than for its exchange value. As Kühne writes of Block 37, 'a new owner can do the calculation, and work out that a complete new structure would be more profitable in terms of rent income.'⁶⁴

Kühne followed these parallel series with another, more prominent and regular series for the Sunday edition of the *Tagesspiegel*, from April 1974 onwards, entitled 'Is Berlin losing its Face?'⁶⁵ The programmatic focus on the street's display of the vernacular past is striking, although Kühne's initial article, subtitled *Stadtbild in Gefahr* (The Cityscape in Danger), was effectively a history of post-war planning in Berlin. In this article, he bemoaned the dominance of unspecified 'economic interests' in planning decisions and included a discussion of the concept of the cityscape, in which, reiterating Mitscherlich's critique, the post-1945 era was invoked as a missed opportunity in which 'a convincing planning conception never became visible.' This was expanded in the second article, which described the Hansaviertel in precisely these terms. Kühne's critique of post-war urban planning extended over six articles in total, and despite the overarching title, he rarely referred to the presence or disappearance of past structures (although in the fourth article, he does discuss the disappearance of the *Grundriss* of the medieval settlements of Berlin and Cölln at the centre of the now-divided city). While the visual motif repeated at the top of each article was of a *Gründerzeit* façade gradually crumbling from view, Kühne's article took up a different historical lineage, suggesting that what was missed in the post-war era was a connection to the modernist traditions of the Weimar era, but he took this no further, and indeed it is a lineage that has rarely managed to find much traction even in post-wall Berlin, other than in a most superficial fashion.⁶⁶ The valuing of the 'urban past' at this point was intended at 'making good' the mistakes of the post-war era. Kühne's articles were aimed at an amelioration of the synchronic urban gaze, primarily

through a critique of a misrecognition of spatial practice and the dominance of 'traffic planning', which leads to 'an atomization of the urban structure'. Kühne lamented the absence of public involvement in urban planning at any level. He noted, however, the popularity of the activity of the *Stadtbildpflege* department, though saw this activity as still symptomatic of a piecemeal approach that had determined post-war planning, underpinned by what he saw as the dubious and desperate preservationist theory of 'islands of tradition'. Consequently, he called for a revision of urban policy in the sense in which Siedler described it earlier. Kühne also observed the return to 'inner-city living' that was growing in popularity at this time. This inner-city living is structured by a set of spatial practices that are no longer so closely tied to the automobility on which suburban developments such as the Gropiusstadt and the Märkisches Viertel were predicated.

An attempt to address questions of 'inner-city living' was at the core of the Senate's response to this public resistance to the demolition of neighbourhoods. The formation of urban memory, as a memory of the urban environment, but also of memory *in* the urban environment, is at stake in the following decade: the planning, from 1978 onwards, of an International Building Exhibition (IBA), originally slated to take place in 1984, although ultimately it took place in 1987. This process, and how it helps to refine and develop the museal urban gaze through its 'place memory work', is the focus of the next chapter.