DIFFICULT HERITAGE

How do a city and a nation deal with a legacy of perpetrating atrocity? How are contemporary identities negotiated and shaped in the face of concrete reminders of a past that most wish they did not have?

Difficult Heritage focuses on the case of Nuremberg – a city whose name is indelibly linked with Nazism – to explore these questions and their implications. Using an original in-depth research, using archival, interview and ethnographic sources, it provides not only fascinating new material and perspectives, but also more general original theorizing of the relationship between heritage, identity and material culture.

The book looks at how Nuremberg has dealt with its Nazi past post-1945. It focuses especially, but not exclusively, on the city's architectural heritage, in particular, the former Nazi party rally grounds, on which the Nuremberg rallies were staged. The book draws on original sources, such as city council debates and interviews, to chart a lively picture of debate, action and inaction in relation to this site and significant others, in Nuremberg and elsewhere. In doing so, *Difficult Heritage* seeks to highlight changes over time in the ways in which the Nazi past has been dealt with in Germany, and the underlying cultural assumptions, motivations and sources of friction involved.

Whilst referencing wider debates and giving examples of what was happening elsewhere in Germany and beyond, *Difficult Heritage* provides a rich in-depth account of this most fascinating of cases. It also engages in comparative reflection on developments underway elsewhere in order to contextualize what was happening in Nuremberg and to show similarities to and differences from the ways in which other 'difficult heritages' have been dealt with elsewhere. By doing so, the author offers an informed perspective on ways of dealing with difficult heritage, today and in the future, discussing innovative museological, educational and artistic practice.

Sharon Macdonald is Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester. She has held Alexander von Humboldt Fellowships at the University Erlangen-Nürnberg and the Humboldt University, Berlin. Her publications include *The Politics of Display* (ed. 1998, Routledge).

DIFFICULT HERITAGE

Negotiating the Nazi past in Nuremberg and beyond

Sharon Macdonald

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2009
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Typeset in Garamond by
HWA Text and Data Management, London
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
?APrinter Ltd

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN10: 0–415–41991–3 (hbk)
ISBN10: 0–415–41992–1 (pbk)

ISBN13: 978–0–415–41991–8 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978–0–415–41992–5 (pbk)
ISBN13: 978–0–203–88866–7 (ebk)

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the Arts and Humanities Research Council for financial support for this research; and to colleagues in Sociological Studies at the University of Sheffield and Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester for the research leave that made the work possible and for discussion that enriched it. In Germany, I was fortunate to be hosted as a guest researcher at the Institut für Soziologie at the Friedrich Alexander University of Erlangen-Nürnberg and the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt University, Berlin, and I thank staff and students in these institutes for references, reminiscences, insights and companionship. Professor Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim and Professor Wolfgang Kashuba deserve particular thanks for completing the necessary bureaucratic requirements to make the visits possible, as well as for making them so enjoyable and intellectually rewarding.

In Nuremberg I have received extensive assistance, as evident in the pages that follow; and I thank all of those who gave me time for interviews, many of whom are named in the pages that follow. I offer particular thanks to staff at Nuremberg City Archive, the archive of the *Nürnberger Nachrichten* (especially Roland Schulik), Geschichte für Alle, the City Council, including the Tourism service (especially Michael Weber), the Nuremberg Museums' Service (especially Franz Sonnenberger), and especially the Documentation Centre of the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds. At the latter, Martina Christmeier and especially Hans Christian Täubrich and Eckart Dietzfelbinger and provided invaluable assistance and extensive materials. Hermann Glaser's insight and experience were inspirational; and Siegfried Zelnhefer also shared extensive knowledge. Eckart Dietzfelbinger, Hermann Glaser, Franz Sonnenberger and Michael Weber were also kind enough to read parts of the manuscript and to offer comments that have helped to improve it. Formal thanks are due to the poet Fitzgerald Kusz for permission to quote his poem *Bewältigung*; as well as more informal thanks for his friendly discussion.

Running alongside this research, I participated in a research project on European Historical Consciousness at the Kulturwissenschaftliche Institut, Essen, run by Professor Jörn Rüsen. This fed into my understanding of German historical culture and consciousness and I thank Professor Rüsen for inviting me to participate as well as for his support of my research, as well as for illuminating discussions with him and other members of the project. As this research has been underway, I have published

a number of papers on it, listed in the bibliography; and I thank the various editors and (often anonymous) reviewers who pushed me to improve my work. I have also profited from opportunities to present parts of the ongoing research at the universities of Cardiff, Durham, Edinburgh, Erlangen-Nürnberg, Frankfurt, Hull, the Humboldt University in Berlin, Lancaster, Melbourne, Oxford, Sheffield, Stirling, the Technical University of Lisbon, and University College London; at the European Association of Social Anthropology conference in Cracow, at the Goethe Institute, London, at a conference organised by the Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change, Sheffield, at the Piet Zwart Institute, Rotterdam, at the German Historical Museum and at the International Committee on Museums conference in Vienna. I am grateful to the organisers of these events, as well as to the many people who left me with more questions to try to answer and helpful suggestions to follow up. In addition, I have benefited from many friends and colleagues who have talked and sometimes walked difficult heritage with me. Among all of these various interlocutors, I offer particular thanks to the following: Simone Abram, Marta Anico, Stefan Beck, Rosmarie Beier, Tony Bennett, Peter Blundell-Jones, Mary Bouquet, Jeanette Edwards, Gordon Fyfe, Gottfried Gabriel, Michaela Giebelhausen, Neil Gregor, Nicky Gregson, Chris Healy, Michael Herzfeld, Richard Jenkins, Günther Kress, Fiona MacLean, Morgan Meyer, Danny Miller, Clive Norris, Nuno Porto, Regina Römhild, Alexander Schmidt, Chris Tilley, John Urry, Gisela Welz, members of the Erlangen Runde; and students at the universities of Sheffield, Manchester, the Humboldt University in Berlin and, especially, at the Sociology Institute in Erlangen-Nürnberg. At Routledge, Matt Gibbons and Lalle Pursglove have provided the right mix of support, patience and pressure.

Mike, Tara, Thomas and Harriet Beaney have lived Nuremberg and Germany's and other difficult heritages with me over these years. Thomas helped me with some technical tasks as well as reading and commenting on parts of the manuscript. Only Mike knows just how difficult I have found completing this book. I thank him for helping me to do so, for reading the whole manuscript with his philosopher's attention to detail and argument, and for his reminders of the pleasures of the present and promise of the future.

1

INTRODUCTION

During the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, visible markers of the past – plaques, information boards, museums, monuments – have come to populate more and more land- and cityscapes. History has been gathered up and presented as heritage – as meaningful pasts that should be remembered; and more and more buildings and other sites have been called on to act as witnesses of the past. Many kinds of groups have sought to ensure that they are publicly recognised through identifying and displaying 'their' heritage. At the same time, museums and heritage sites have become key components of 'place-marketing' and 'image-management'; and cultural tourism has massively expanded, often bringing visitors from across the world to places that can claim a heritage worth seeing.

This book explores a particular dimension of this public concern with the past. It looks at what I call 'difficult heritage' – that is, a past that is recognised as meaningful in the present but that is also contested and awkward for public reconciliation with a positive, self-affirming contemporary identity. 'Difficult heritage' may also be troublesome because it threatens to break through into the present in disruptive ways, opening up social divisions, perhaps by playing into imagined, even nightmarish, futures. By looking at heritage that is unsettling and awkward, rather than at that which can be celebrated or at least comfortably acknowledged as part of a nation's or city's valued history, my aim is to throw into relief some of the dilemmas about its public representation and reception. Doing so highlights and unsettles cultural assumptions about and entanglements between identity and memory, and past, present and future. It also raises questions about practices of selection, preservation, cultural comparison and witnessing – practices which are at least partly shared by anthropologists and other researchers of culture and social life.

At its core, this book tells a story about one particular especially difficult heritage.[1] This is the struggle with Nazi heritage – especially remaining architectural heritage – in the city of Nuremberg, Germany; a city which has, perhaps more than any other, found its name linked to the perpetration of the appalling and iconic atrocity of modernity – the Holocaust. To give an account of how Nuremberg has negotiated its difficult heritage, and how visitors to the city experience it today, I draw on a combination of historical and anthropological perspectives in order to explore changes over time as well as to try to see how different players, practices and knowledges – local and from further afield – interact, and are brought into being, to shape the ways

in which the city's past is variously approached and ignored. By telling this detailed and sometimes untidy story, my intention is also to provide a located position from which to think further about – and to some extent complicate – accounts of how Germany has faced its Nazi past and what this might mean to people today. More generally still, it is to provide some coordinates for understanding difficult heritage – wherever it is found – and its implications.

Difficult heritage

Wars, conflict, triumph over foreigners, the plunder of riches from overseas – these are the stuff of most national histories. Yet whether they are perceived as troubling for contemporary identity may vary considerably; and what was once seen as a sign of a country's achievement may later come to be understood as a reason for regret. Colonialism, for example, once a source of great national pride for colonising countries has increasingly – though not unequivocally – come to be regarded as a more problematic and even shameful heritage; and many explicit depictions of colonial might now languish in museum basements. Wartime episodes that were regarded as military triumphs can also become sources of embarrassment. In Japan, for instance, the 1937 Rape of Nanking, in which the Japanese Imperial Army brutally slaughtered or tortured tens of thousands of Chinese, remains a national achievement for some, and is repeated as such in school textbooks, but has become a mortifying memory for many other Japanese who know about it.[2] The allied bombing of Japanese cities during World War II, and of German cities, especially Dresden, have likewise become increasingly controversial over the years, and the subject of continued memorial and museological dispute.[3]

While what counts as 'difficult heritage' – or indeed worthy heritage – may change, however, the idea that places should seek to inscribe what is significant in their histories, and especially their past achievements, on the cityscape is longstanding and widespread. In a pattern consolidated by European nation-making, identifying a distinctive and preferably long history, and substantiating it through material culture, has become the dominant mode of performing identity-legitimacy. 'Having a heritage' – that is, a body of selected history and its material traces – is, in other words, an integral part of 'having an identity', and it affirms the right to exist in the present and continue into the future. This model of identity as rooted in the past, as distinctively individuated, and as expressed through 'evidence', especially material culture, is mobilised not only by nations but by minorities, cities or other localities.[4] Because of the selective and predominantly identity-affirmative nature of heritage-making, it typically focuses on triumphs and achievements, or sacrifices involved in the struggle for realisation and recognition. Events and material remains which do not fit into such narratives are, thus, likely to be publicly ignored or removed from public space, as have numerous monuments erected by socialist regimes or former colonisers. Or, as Ian Buruma writes of the lack of information about Nanking in Japanese school history texts, they may be 'officially killed by silence'.[5] More dramatically, silencing may involve the physical destruction of material heritage, such as the destruction of mosques as part of 'ethnic cleansing' and the obliteration of the Oriental Institute

and Bosnian National Library in Sarajevo – both home to vast archival evidence of Bosnian history – by Serb extremists during the Bosnian War.[6]

Yet ignoring, silencing or destroying are not always options – and the awkward past may break through in some form. This may be because the events are too recent and their effects still being felt, though recency is not a guarantee of public acknowledgment, as we will see below. It may be because some groups or individuals – 'memorial entrepreneurs' – try to propel public remembrance, perhaps of events of which they were victims or which they feel morally driven to commemorate, perhaps because they fear that forgetting risks atrocity being repeated in the future.[7] In some cases, groups or individuals outside the locality, and even beyond the nation, demand that past perpetrations are publicly recalled and exposed. In others, material remains of past events or regimes may defy easy obliteration and thus act as mnemonic intrusions. Archaeological finds or historical scholarship may embarrass accepted narratives. Or public recognition may be prompted by the fact that, while a troubling history may be uncomfortable, it is also of heritage-interest, attracting tourists and bringing revenue. In all such cases – which in reality are likely to be combinations of motives and actors – heritage-management is fraught with multiple dilemmas.

In the field of heritage and tourism management, Tunbridge and Ashworth have devised the term 'dissonant heritage' to express what they see as the inherently contested nature of heritage – stemming from the fact that heritage always 'belongs to someone and logically, therefore, not to someone else'[8] – though which may be relatively 'active or latent'. They chart numerous kinds of dissonance, including where tourist authorities promote a range of differing images of a place and what they call 'the heritage of atrocity' [9], in which, they argue, 'dissonance' may provoke intense emotions and be bound up with memories that have 'profound long-term effects upon [a people's] self-conscious identity'.[10]

Like others, Tunbridge and Ashworth distinguish between atrocity heritage that is primarily concerned with victims – for example, Nazi concentration camps or Khmer Rouge torture buildings – and that which is principally of perpetration.[11] In many cases, of course, it is hard to maintain a clear distinction between sites of victims' suffering and those of perpetration – concentration camps and torture chambers were clearly both. Nevertheless, there are places – such as, say, the Wannsee villa in Berlin or Hitler's complex of buildings on the Obersalzburg in Bavaria – which are part of the apparatus of perpetration but not locations in which suffering was directly inflicted. These might be seen as sites of 'perpetration at a distance', to adapt some language from actor network theory.[12] While all sites of atrocity raise difficulties of public presentation – including the question of how graphically suffering is depicted – there are some specific dilemmas raised by sites of perpetration at a distance. In particular, precisely because heritage-presentation and museumification are typically regarded as markers of worthwhile history – of heritage that deserves admiration or commemoration – their preservation and public display might be interpreted as conferring legitimacy of a sort.[13] This is part of a 'heritage effect' – a sensibility grounded in particular visual and embodied practices prompted by certain kinds of spaces and modes of display.[14] Moreover, there is also the risk that such sites might become pilgrimage destinations for perpetrator admirers. This argument surfaced

in the debates over the legitimacy of later public uses of the sites just mentioned, both of which incorporate educational displays (though Hitler's Eagle's Nest on the Obersalzburg also, controversially, opened as a luxury hotel in 2005). In other instances, as with the site of Hitler's bunker in Berlin, this argument has been used to prevent any kind of public marking.[15]

In this book, my aim is neither to try to classify different types of heritage, nor to present a general survey, as do Tunbridge and Ashworth, useful though these may be. 'Difficult heritage', as I use it here, is more tightly specified than their notion of 'dissonance' insofar as it threatens to trouble collective identities and open up social differences. But beyond that, my approach here is to explore 'difficult heritage' as a historical and ethnographic phenomenon – and as a particular kind of 'assemblage' – rather than to establish it as an analytical category.[16] This means looking at how heritage is assembled both discursively and materially, at the various players involved, at what they may experience as awkward and problematic, and at the ways in which they negotiate this. My interest here includes the kinds of assumptions that are made about the nature of heritage, identity and temporality, the terms in which debates about 'difficult heritage' are conducted, what is ignored or overlooked, and how agency is accorded – all of which can be seen as constituents of what is sometimes called 'historical consciousness' (which is a recognised field of historiography within Germany).[17]. As Jeffrey Olick has noted, the idea of 'historical consciousness' usefully avoids reifying a sometimes spurious distinction between 'history' and 'memory';[18] and it directs attention not just to the *content* of history or memory but also to questions of the media and patterns through which these are structured, as well as where lines between, say, history and memory might be drawn in particular contexts.

In some historical consciousness theorising, especially in the German tradition, there is an emphasis upon identifying universal 'orientations', in, for example, how people understand the relationship between past, present and future. Rather than revealing universally shared patterns, my own more modest aim is to highlight elements of a repertoire of possible approaches to difficult heritage and to chart some of their implications. That is, I seek to identify a non-exhaustive range of negotiating frames and tactics through which some kinds of past are evoked and engaged within public culture. Unlike the universalist approach to historical consciousness, mine here is not concerned with presumed shared mental patterns but addresses the social and cultural situations and frames in which heritage – and difficult heritage – is assembled and negotiated. These situations and frames are simultaneously local and beyond local. That is, they involve specific local conditions and actors but these never act in a vacuum, even when they are actively producing 'locality'. Instead, as we see below, local actions are frequently negotiated through comparisons with other places, through concepts and ideas produced elsewhere and that may even have global circulation, and through the sense of being judged by others. They are also negotiated in relation to legislation, political structures and economic considerations which are rarely exclusively local.

As I am interested in heritage making and historical consciousness as social and cultural practices, I am concerned to look not just at 'history products' (e.g. a heritage site) but at the practical activities and sometimes rather banal events involved in their

production and consumption. I am also concerned with the sometimes messy – and sometimes strikingly consistent, rhythmic and predictable – course of negotiations, and the social alignments and identifications that such negotiations may produce. For these reasons, my focus is on a specific, in-depth case – that of Nuremberg – and my hope is that this can enable me to illuminate better some of the assumptions, oversights, silences and complexities of negotiating difficult heritage than might a wider survey.

As the section below briefly indicates, however, struggles with difficult heritage are extremely widespread, and increasingly likely to result in public display. Moreover, as the Nuremberg study shows too, what goes on in any particular country or city is never culturally isolated – even if it may sometimes feel like it to those involved. Rather, the local is negotiated into being in relation – sometimes through cultural analogy, sometimes via shared concepts and practices, sometimes through the intervention of actors from outside, and sometimes through explicit opposition – to 'elsewhere', be that other cities nearby or other parts of the world.

Other struggles

In many countries the predominant state-supported memorial and museum culture pays little attention to difficult histories, preferring to ignore these and to tell more comfortable or self-affirming narratives. Even in recent years, for example, the destruction of Ottoman heritage in Serbia has paved the way for a nationalist representation of the past that ignores this period of history.[19] More widely, however, it is noticeable that since the 1990s in particular there have been increasing attempts to publicly address problematic heritage and 'difficult pasts'.[20] In many cases, this is in societies that have emerged from previously repressive regimes, where publicly recognising atrocities committed may signal difference from the former regime, as well as a commitment to political openness. Thus in Cambodia, for example, there has been a wave of activity – including building museums at sites of massacre – to mark, commemorate and inform about the atrocities suffered under the Khmer Rouge.[21] Similarly, in post-apartheid South Africa there is a massive ongoing movement to create new heritage sites and memorials and to alter, and sometimes dismantle, earlier ones that legitimated the apartheid regime. Opening up places such as Robben Island, the prison in which Nelson Mandela and others were held for so many years, creating an Apartheid Museum (opened in 2001) and the Slave Lodge, a museum of slavery (currently in preparation), are all part of public cultural strategy to keep alive the memory of the suffering that was endured en route to the new South Africa.[22]

Many former socialist countries have also swept away monuments and exhibitions of socialist periods and instead created museums that turn the spotlight onto the horrors of the recent past, as, for example, in the turning of the former secret police headquarters in Budapest into a museum,[23] or of the maximum security labour camp, Perm-36, into the Gulag Museum in Russia.[24] While in much of South America, there has been little official commemoration of the victims of twentieth-century dictatorial regimes or civil war, this is showing signs of change. In Argentina, for example, there has been a long and continuing campaign by the mothers and grandmothers

of the disappeared (those who were kidnapped and mostly killed by the dictatorial regime of 1976–83) who every Thursday meet in Buenos Aires' Plaza de Mayo to display pictures of their vanished relatives.[25] An initiative to create a lasting material commemoration, the Parque de la Memoria, on the site of a torture camp run by the military, was begun in 1996 and is ongoing. The first sculptural memorial erected there – Monument to the Victims of State Terrorism – has been judged by Andreas Huyssen to be 'persuasive and moving',[26] though the location of the park in the city's outskirts and the fact that it is not yet listed on tourist itineraries or most city information suggests that it may at the same time be being marginalised in public space.

Even the United States of America, which is often at the forefront of museological developments and which has opened up many, and often impressive, Holocaust museums, especially since the 1980s, has been much more nervous of directly addressing its own difficult history of slavery. In 2007 a National Museum of Slavery finally opened in Fredericksburg, Virginia, though this is private rather than federally funded initiative, and was reported to have had difficulty in attracting business sponsors willing to support this socially awkward topic.[27] A new National Museum of African History and Culture has also been approved as part of the Smithsonian complex, its broader scope perhaps making any content on slavery more palatable.[28] The failure to create a museum to slavery is all the more striking given the flourishing of museums to an atrocity that did not take place in the US – the Holocaust of Jews in Europe. While there are various factors involved here, including the political power of Jewish lobby groups in the US, it has been suggested that one reason for the emphasis on Holocaust may be that it helps to relativise the potentially more socially divisive history of slavery.[29]

Within Europe, colonial nations have only recently, if at all, begun any significant public addressing of the colonial past in their museums. In Belgium, for example, the Royal Museum of Central Africa has been revising its displays in recent years in order to address aspects of Belgium's colonial history of terror alongside the display of its plunder. This has, however, been judged fairly limited by Adam Hochschild, whose critical account of the Museum's silences was one impetus for the revision.[30] Likewise, in the Netherlands, where according to James Horton and Johanna Kardux,[31] 'the Netherlands' role in slaveholding and slave trading was so irreconcilable with their sense of national identity that it was long erased from public consciousness'. Museums such as Amsterdam's Tropenmuseum have increasingly come to include at least some appraisal of colonialism in their displays. In Britain, a British Empire and Commonwealth Museum opened in Bristol in 2002, which includes attention to slavery, with a dedicated gallery on the subject opened in 2007, as part of the two hundredth anniversary of the abolition of slavery, at which time an International Slavery Museum – the first museum dedicated to this subject – also opened in Liverpool.[32]

Giving public recognition to suffering endured by minorities within a country – especially where that suffering was inflicted by the majority or another minority – risks igniting social tensions. In the US, exhibitions such as *The West as America* (National Museum of American Art, Washington DC, 1991), which highlighted 'the

displacement of native peoples [and] the suppression of their cultures',[33] have caused fury among self-labelled 'patriots'; and there have been threats against the holders of collections of items relating to slavery that might be included in a museum. Yet, not giving public recognition carries its own risks too – both internally and in the eyes of the outside world. Minorities' resentments may be fuelled by the lack of acknowledgment of wrongs perpetrated, something which has been recognised by the trend for governments to make public apologies. This began in the wake of World War II and has in many cases been bound up with claims for financial reparation but since the 1990s has become a more globally-widespread public performance.[34]

The motivations and implications of this move in many parts of the world to acknowledge and publicly display 'difficult heritage' are discussed later in this book. As the brief discussion here indicates, struggles with difficult heritage are widespread, approaches varied, and social, political and economic implications often considerable. Despite the variety of approaches and the fact that any heritage example is singular in the particular mix that informs its realisation and reworking, there are nevertheless many parallels and connections between even disparate parts of the world. While displaying difficult heritage may be prompted by activist groups within a particular nation-state or locality, they are likely to be acting in awareness of what is done elsewhere, and conduct their campaigns at least partially through concepts and practices – such as, the 'politics of recognition', 'commemoration of victims' and 'heritage' itself – that have widespread global currency, if not necessarily identical local interpretations.[35] More specifically, as Andreas Huyssen has pointed out, local struggles over the public materialisation of memory – as memorials or museums – are frequently performed with reference to debates about the Holocaust, which, he suggests, acts as 'a powerful prism through which we may look at other instances'.[36] Furthermore, not only are local actions refracted through concepts and debates from elsewhere, they are often undertaken in awareness of a potential international – and judgemental – gaze, whether that of tourists or politicians. In dealing with 'their heritage', then, governments and heritage managers of countries or cities enter into imagined or actual negotiations not only with their own populations but often also those of other governments, potential business partners and visitors. Equally, and perhaps increasingly, places may find themselves being interpreted and evaluated – not always as they might wish – in relation to how they present their pasts.

Grass on stone

It is early afternoon on a fine September day in 2003. A man in his early twenties is sitting on the Zeppelin building just in front of the Hitler podium. He is writing in a notebook. I approach him tentatively, not wanting to disturb him from his concentrated activity, yet also intrigued as to what he might be writing there. When he looks puzzled by my question in German about whether I might speak to him, I try English. He is from Spain and although he apologises for his English, it is very good, though with an engagingly thoughtful hunting

for the right word. A student, he is travelling alone through Germany and Austria and had wanted to come to Nuremberg because he had seen the Nazi rallies in film documentaries and had read much about the period. 'I wanted to see the place itself. He was about to go up onto the Hitler podium but then 'I felt so sickened that I had to stop'. He is writing down his thoughts about this. We sit silently for some moments looking out across the former marching fields, now turned into football pitches, while he sorts some of those thoughts and finds words to express them to me. 'Imagine it', he says, gesturing across the field, 'full of all those people. And all that a madman can do, with just words.' The Nazi ideology makes him feel physically sick, he says, especially in a place like this. These buildings 'have hatred in the basement'.

But he is also surprised at the site. 'Why is so little information about it provided?' Pointing to the weeds flourishing in the cracks of the Zeppelin Building steps he asks rhetorically why the place is so neglected and replies that it must be 'because the Germans do not want to remember it': 'Grass growing is like forgetting'. Pointing to the football pitches he explains that he thinks that buildings can be put to new uses but that these football pitches 'are not really necessary'. He compares with Spain where, he says, you have places of Fascism which are used in new ways but their history is also told. He thinks that such buildings with 'hatred in their basements' should be reused rather than protected – and that this is different from, say, using the results of Nazi experiments on Jews – but that this should be accompanied by information. I ask whether he has visited the exhibition in the new Documentation Centre. He has. But although he found it very informative, his comparisons with Spain also again leave him surprised that the exhibition is not 'harder', that is: 'they just explain it [Nazi madness] and do not attack it. I think it is not critical enough'. And he poetically repeats again, 'grass growing is like forgetting', as though the exhibition too has let a layer of grass creep over it.

Germany's difficult heritage

The country that has struggled most and longest over its twentieth-century difficult heritage – with the eyes of the world relentlessly upon it – is Germany. This is especially so in relation to its Holocaust history, though more recently, since German unification in 1990, the country has also faced the question of how to publicly represent the socialist dictatorship of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) and how to commemorate its victims. The ongoing debates are saturated with analogies between the Nazi and GDR periods. How the Nazi past was publicly represented in East and West has been a focus of moral judgements of each by the other. Although both Germanys have accused each other, and have been accused by outsiders, of not having 'properly faced' the Nazi past, the country has nevertheless generated more texts and debates, and, especially more recently, more museums, monuments and art works, about its difficult heritage than has any other. Not only has Germany been at the

Figure 1.1 Grass on stone: weeds on the Zeppelin Building

heart of debates about Holocaust commemoration – though positioned differently from other key players such as the US and Israel[37] – the fact that there have been significant changes in dominant memorial practices over time, as well as variations between and within the two Germanys, means that the country can illustrate many struggles that may be involved in negotiating difficult heritage.

The idea that the past is difficult and needs to be tackled, and even overcome, is summoned up in the German term *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. Much used in debates about public memory since the 1960s, it is sometimes glossed as 'coming to terms with the past' or, more often, as 'mastering the past'.[38] Andreas Glaeser suggests translating it as 'processing the past' in order to grasp it as 'a conscious working-through of the past with the intention to free oneself from its negative, potentially destructive influence';[39] and Klaus Neumann explains that it 'presupposes a difficulty that can be overcome'.[40] While the word for 'heritage' in many languages has an overwhelmingly positive public connotation, the German words for 'heritage', *das Erbe* and *die Erbschaft* (which also mean inheritance or legacy, as in several other languages) have a more patriotic connotation than in some languages.[41] Partly for that very patriotism, they are simultaneously regarded with some ambivalence. They can readily be used to denote what my German-English dictionary calls 'unerwünschtes' – un-wished-for – heritage, and for which it provides as example: '*das Erbe des Faschismus* the legacy of fascism'.[42] There are also other associated and telling German compound nouns. *Vergangenheitsbelästigung* means 'burdening by the past'. More compact, but also incorporating the idea of 'burden', this time coupled with that for heritage is – *die Erblast* – the inherited burden. All of these convey the sense of the past as potentially troublesome for the present. Indeed, even the term 'the past' (*die Vergangenheit*) often acts as a shorthand for the period, sometimes also known by its Nazi name of the Third Reich, between 1933 and 1945, when the NSDAP (National Socialist German Workers Party) – National Socialists or Nazis for short – was in power.[43] While none

of this is not to say that all heritage is regarded in a negative light in Germany – far from it – it does suggest that the idea that heritage can be difficult has pervaded public culture and popular consciousness.

It should be noted here that much of what would be talked about in terms of 'heritage' in English-language debates and policy would be referred to by other terms in Germany. In particular, built heritage is usually discussed in terms of *Denkmäler* – a word that is etymologically related to 'denken', to think', and is usually translated as 'monuments' or 'memorials'. Thus the field of 'heritage conservation' is *Denkmalpflege*, or 'heritage protection laws' are *Denkmalschutzgesetze*. As in Britain, the US and elsewhere, this is a field that has massively grown during the twentieth century, especially since World War II, and has come to widespread prominence especially since the 1970s, though its roots are often said to lie in industrialisation and an associated tendency to see the past as in attrition.[44] Its formalisation and professionalisation, however, is largely twentieth century; and in drawing up their laws and devising their policy and practice countries have been informed by those of others, and have also participated in cross-national initiatives such as European Cultural Heritage Year, first held in 1975, or the World Heritage Convention, first held in 1979, though they also have particular inflections.[45] In Britain, while there has been legislation covering prehistoric sites since the 1880s, the listing of buildings only began in 1947; and in Germany, there have been conservation organisations since the late nineteenth century but concerted development of legislation in the Federal Republic was not until the 1970s, where it was still predominantly at the level of federal states (*Länder*) (see Chapter 4).

Since their introduction, most countries have seen heritage policy and law increasingly broadly applied, moving from a predominant emphasis on aesthetically distinguished high culture or ancient history to the inclusion of sites of wider and more recent 'historical significance'. This has accorded more attention to the heritage of everyday life and also to difficult heritage. In the German case, this includes the formal identification of at least some Nazi buildings as *Denkmäler* (see Chapter 4). Partly because of this broadening definition, the number of sites listed increased massively in both Britain and Germany during the 1980s.[46] So too did controversies over heritage. In Britain, in what are known as the heritage debates, controversies centred around questions of the commercialisation of heritage and the Thatcher government's emphasis upon it.[47] In Germany in the same period, heritage debates were equally politicised and contentious, though here they mainly concerned questions of the commemoration and representation of World War II. In what became known as the historians' debate (*Historikerstreit*) they centred especially on the question of whether comparing Germany's crimes with other atrocities constituted an unacceptable moral relativisation or not, a question which had implications for how the Holocaust was represented in public culture as well as for the kinds of 'processing' of history that were deemed – variously – possible, permissible or necessary.[48]

While the Nazi past is widely recognised as an unavoidable, if contested, aspect of the German 'inheritance', there are significant variations between Germans – as the historian's debate also highlighted – over the extent to which they feel that they should feel responsible for 'their' 'Holocaust heritage'. Not least, there have been important

differences (as well as perhaps more overlaps than is usually recognised) between the East and West, though again with shifts (as well as continuities) over time.

Postwar, in the East 'an official ideology of "anti-fascism" defined the […] perspective on both the Nazi past and the contemporary Federal Republic where, East Germans charged, one form of fascism had simply succeeded another'.[49] This effectively cast Nazism largely as a feature of the West, disinheriting the Socialist state from it. Instead, the East was understood as the location of those who had opposed it. This account was evident in how some of the material remains of the Nazi period, particularly concentration camps, were publicly represented.[50] Opened up for visitors and used as pedagogical sites, the emphasis in the display of concentration camps was on political prisoners, especially communists, all of whom were seen as victims of the 'fascism' that the Socialist state was continuing to oppose. The West, by implication, was the not yet fully repentant offspring of the Fascist perpetrators. In the West itself, where such a comfortable fiction of complete rupture was more difficult to maintain, the relationship with the Nazi past has been more troubled and more complex. It was in the *Bundesrepublik* that terms such as *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* were coined and gained currency, and it was here that an academic sub-specialty of research mentioned above on *Geschichtsbewußtsein* – 'historical consciousness' – has grown up. Concerned with questions of the necessity for human beings of finding 'temporal orientation', this focus is undoubtedly itself shaped by the experience of dealing with Germany's own difficult history; though as noted above it also makes important analytical contributions to debates about memory.

Many of those writing on West Germany's postwar memory cultures suggest that a major shift occurred around the late 1960s, when an earlier period of 'historical silence and willing forgetfulness' was superseded by 'an explosion of critical self-examination'.[51] In recent years there has been a wave of important historical scholarship showing that the depiction of the 1950s as a time of repression of trauma and forgetting of victims is overstated.[52] In part, that depiction was itself produced as part of the moral project of those propelling remembrance from the late 1960s onwards. Nevertheless, even those who challenge the forgetful 1950s thesis acknowledge that there have been changes of emphasis and form over the years, and that, as Robert Moeller, who has highlighted multiple ways in which the Nazi past *was* addressed in the 1950s, explains, remembering was selective.[53]

In particular, the main, though by no means exclusive, emphasis in the 1950s was on Germans as victims; and what emerged in the 1960s and 1970s was 'a much more critical understanding of National Socialism'.[54] This has been characterised by Jörn Rüsen as 'a new moralistic approach'.[55] Often cast as a generational conflict, what he calls the 'second stage' involved calls for active and visible public commemoration especially of Jewish victims of the Nazis, and at least some acknowledgment of Germany as perpetrator.[56] But this 'new' period was by no means homogeneous. On the contrary, as noted above, it has been characterised by major public conflicts over the nature of German history and its commemoration. There have been major controversies over the 'uniqueness' or otherwise of Germany's Nazi crimes,[57] massive disputes generated by an exhibition about the role of 'ordinary' German soldiers – the Wehrmacht – during the War,[58] and years of arguments about whether and then how

to create a national Holocaust memorial.[59] Ambivalence and what I call 'oscillation', and also fragmentation, complexity and continuities with the earlier period, are as much part of the reality as are changes, as can be seen in the localised study that follows.

Paying attention to some of the complexities over time also adds a cautionary note to the compelling temptation – to which those involved in the work of public commemoration sometimes succumb – to depict Germany as on a neat linear trajectory to ever more complete or satisfactory 'facing up to' its past, in a kind of 'allegory of redemption'.[60] Without denying the important developments that there have been, locally as well as nationally, it is important to understand the redemptive story of progressive improvement as part of a process of cultural accounting rather than as a straightforward description of fact. In other words, its significance lies just as much in its status as 'a story people tell themselves about themselves'.[61]

Within the broad shift since the late 1960s, many authors suggest further periods or stages.[62] In particular, the unification of the two Germanys in 1990 clearly poses new dilemmas for public commemoration and self-presentation.[63] These include revision of the GDR's strong emphasis on resistance to fascism, noted above, and finding ways to persuade the world that the 'new' single-nation Germany is very different from the 'old' single-nation Germany, that immediately preceded 1945. The explosion of commemoration and museum representations of the Holocaust in the 1990s might even be seen as a further new more open period of self-reflection and 'facing-up' underway. Jörn Rüsen suggests that we may be at the beginning of a 'third stage', which he calls 'historisation',[64] in which Germans may be beginning to self-identify as perpetrators rather than as victims. Others have suggested the opposite, that publications about traumatic German experiences of war – especially W.G. Sebald's essay 'Air war and literature' (published in 1999 in Germany), Jörg Friedrich's *Der Brand. Deutschland im Bombenkrieg 1940–1945* (2002; *The Fire. Germany during the Bombing 1940–1945*) and Günther Grass's *Im Krebsgang* (2002; *Crabwalk*) – are indications that Germans are at last coming to be able to identify themselves more openly as victims.[65] Taking a somewhat different tack, Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider argue that in the 1990s in many parts of the world, including Germany, we are witnessing the development of what they call 'cosmopolitan memory'.[66] Instead of public memory being largely framed within what they call the 'container' of the nation-state, it is increasingly decontextualised from its historical time and space, consumed by people with no direct connection to it, and turned into more universal stories, especially those of 'good against evil'.[67]

These arguments and debates are ones to which I return in the chapters that follow. I do so, however, not through the more usual routes of looking at the literature and events through which they are usually discussed but in what might be seen, borrowing Grass's metaphor, as a more crab-like sideways approach, through a story of a particular city's politics and remembrance in relation to a striking and historically significant material heritage.

Now and then, ***ab und zu***

A woman in her thirties has been leafing through the visitor book in the Documentation Centre. I approach her and ask if I might interview her about her experience of the exhibition. She agrees and tells me that she is here for the second day running, having spent several hours here the day before but 'you can't do it all in one day' and she is so impressed ('*beeindruckt*') with it. '*Beeindruckend*', 'impressive', is the most common word that visitors use to describe the exhibition here – both in interviews with me and in the visitor books. Born in 1950 and from Berlin, she tells me, her parents were '*Zeitzeugen*' – 'witnesses of that time', and she has a strong interest in German history, especially that of the '*NS-Zeit*' – the National Socialist time, about which she first learnt in school. This interest means that she feels that she has seen many of the images (the *Bildmaterial*) in the exhibition before but she still feels that it is a very good exhibition, 'very intensive' – 'you can't get out at all, you can't even go to the toilet unless you go the whole way through'. Despite her own interest, she has some ambivalence about whether people should keep occupying themselves with this history but thinks that it is important to go back to it now and then (*ab und zu*), and here she searches carefully to find words to explain why, before going on to say of her experience in the exhibition: 'I became clearer about what a person, what an individual, really is. I only went to the DDR eight years ago, and there was there this whole collectivisation, that here [i.e. in the Nazi period] was called "Community" [*Volksgemeinschaft*]. There it was called, I don't know, "Collective" [*Betriebskollektiv*] or something. It is very hard to know how to deal with such uniformity. But what I really learnt from this is that it is really important to remember that every person is an individual, and that you shouldn't see them as merged together'.

She talks too about how she is especially impressed with the architecture of the Documentation centre, the way that, she thinks, the architect has managed to 'break with the monumentality' ['*dieses Monumental*'] of the building. At the same time, the fact that this is one of the places 'where the history actually took place' is especially impressive, as is also the case, she notes, in the *Topographie des Terrors* in Berlin. She describes this as 'direct' and compares it favourably with a memorial site (*Gedänkstätte*) that she visited in Israel, where the floor was from the concentration camp Theresienstadt.

It is important, she says, that the traces ('*die Spuren*') are not allowed to become covered over – as she says has partly happened with the Berlin Wall. Although it is difficult, she emphasises, the site must be retained – and here she hesitates, searching again for the right word – '*als Denkmal*', as a memorial.

Nuremberg

While Germany forms the broad socio-political frame within which I look at questions of identity, heritage and the Nazi past, then, this book also has a more

specific focus on the city of Nuremberg. Still more specifically, it examines the fate since 1945 of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds (the *Reichsparteitagsgelände*) – an area of former marching grounds and monumental fascist buildings – which lie just a short distance away from Nuremberg's scenic old town (*Altstadt*).

The fact that Nuremberg has such strong Nazi associations as well as such a large area of identifiable Nazi buildings makes it a compelling case through which to explore the post-1945 struggle with difficult heritage. The city was given the name 'City of the Nazi Party Rallies' by Hitler in 1933 (though it had held such rallies already, in 1927 and 1929), and its name was engraved with Nazi crimes by being the place where the 'Nuremberg Laws' – those defining 'racial crimes' and denying Jews citizenship – were declared in 1933 and where, postwar, the trials of Nazi criminals were held. As Nuremberg's Head of Tourism and Marketing, Michael Weber, rather ruefully told me, it is those three linkages – laws, rallies and trials – that define the city for many foreigners in particular: 'They always want to know, show me the place of the trials, where the laws were announced and where Hitler used to stand.'[68]

As he was also keen to point out, however, these were not the only Nurembergs. Long dubbed 'Germany's treasure chest' (*Deutschlands Schatzkästlein*), the city has been a significant tourist destination since the mid-nineteenth century, visitors coming to see its beautiful churches, fountains, walled Old Town, medieval castle and the important collections in the Germanic national museum. Although much of the Old Town was destroyed during the War, many of the notable buildings have since been painstakingly reconstructed as part of Germany's postwar heritage movement. Nuremberg is also famous for its Christmas market, its toy-making, gingerbread, and sausages. Indeed, a visitor survey from the 1980s that Michael Weber gave to me showed clearly that for most German visitors these were more significant associations than the Nazi heritage. In response to the question 'What comes into your mind when you hear the name Nuremberg?', while foreign tourists (of whom the majority were Americans) almost all mentioned trials, laws and rallies as the primary associations, fewer than 5 per cent of German visitors mentioned anything to do with the Nazi period. Instead, their associations were *Butzenscheiben* (little bull's eye glass window-panes), *Bratwürste* (sausages), *Lebküchen* (gingerbread) and the *Christkindlesmarkt* (Christmas market). In other words, all things which Michael Weber described as 'small and cute' (*klein und niedlich*), an image that he also thought problematic for a modern dynamic city.

The kind of image that Michael Weber was keen to convey was well set out in a recently produced brochure – entitled *Nürnberg. Ein Erlebnis* (*Nuremberg: An Experience*) – that he gave to me. Beginning 'Be honest: what comes to mind when you think of Nuremberg?' and suggesting that it was likely to be the small and cute responses that the visitor survey had produced, and acknowledging the richness of the city's history and material heritage, the text went on to recommend a correction:

> For that is only one aspect. Today, 950 years after it was founded, Nuremberg is also a modern vibrant city with half a million inhabitants. Not a dusty old museum, but rather a city with a comfortable feel to it, a place that has its own special atmosphere, enticing the visitor to stroll about, take a closer look

> at things, discover something new. You get a sense of this special flair when you amble through the town centre with its many attractions for the sightseer and its reasonably priced shops. Street musicians from all over the world play their music in the shadow of the Church of St. Lawrence and on warm summer evenings you'll find next to the house of the artist Albrecht Dürer all those who today are also engaged in an art form, namely the art of living. That is what makes Nuremberg especially charming: the harmonious coexistence of new and old, of now and then, of live and let live. Nuremberg is full of surprises.

The brochure continues through energetically illustrated pages to reveal some of those 'surprises', including the city's cultural and artistic scene, the sporting offer, its cuisine and hotels, and its strengths in technology. In doing so, it represents important aspects of Nuremberg as a lively and multi-cultural city,[69] which successfully couples the traditional and modern. Nuremberg is presented as the leading city in Northern Bavaria, or, as local people prefer to put it, of *Franken* (Franconia), or more specifically *Mittelfranken* (Middle Franconia, which unlike Franconia constitutes an administrative district). Historically, Franken was a duchy of the Holy Roman Empire and after various splits and revisions of territory, eastern Franken, including Nuremberg, was incorporated into the State of Bavaria by Napoleon at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It thus became 'Bavaria's second city' to the state capital of Munich, about a hundred and sixty kilometres to the South, a relationship that sometimes rankles. Administratively, Nuremberg has its own city council and city administration, which are responsible for most matters directly to do with the city's environment and day-to-day running, though within a framework mainly established by the state capital. Here, it is worth noting another important image of Nuremberg – as a relatively 'red' city within the predominantly Christian Socialist Union (CSU) Bavarian state. Postwar, the city has had a Social Democrat (SPD) mayor – a position directly elected by the population – continuously except for between 1996 and 2002 when the incumbent was CSU.[70] This identity as left-of-centre also extends to the prewar period, and is reasonably well-known in Germany, even though the wider Franken region is regarded as culturally and politically conservative. As will be evident in the chapters that follow, this political context, and the various possible historical images that Nuremberg can seek to project, are an important part of its telling – and sometimes not telling – its Nazi past.

As I leafed through the brochure that the tourism minister had handed me, I noted to him – no doubt disappointingly confirming his fears about foreigners' preoccupations – that the Nazi Party Rally Grounds seemed not to be mentioned. '*Doch!*' ('On the contrary'), he exclaimed, and turned to a page busy with a collage of pictures of people having a boating joust, a Rastafarian giving a victory sign, a smartly-dressed waiter, a view of the historic *Altstadt* and children on a fairground ride. In the background of the latter he pointed out the Congress Hall on the Rally Grounds (though no label identified it as such). '*Profanierung!*' ('profanation') he announced, and went on to explain to me a 'strategy' for dealing with the Nazi heritage by 'profaning' it with banal or everyday activities. Articulated by the city's culture minister (*Kulturreferent*), the renowned social historian Dr Hermann Glaser,

in the 1980s, I discuss it further in Chapter 4. As Michael Weber also observed, this was not the only approach to the city's past. In particular, as the brochure also noted, in 1995 Nuremberg established a biannual Human Rights award. This was part of a raft of Human Rights activities, discussed further in Chapter 5, which are part of Nuremberg's late twentieth-century self-presentation as 'City of Human Rights' rather than 'City of the Nazi Party Rallies'. Also significant here, as he also noted, was the fact that the city was then (2000) in the process of building a new documentation centre and exhibition about, and in, the Rally Grounds, due to open the following year.

These various developments, the historical complexities and layerings, and processes of coupling history and the present – as in the production of tourist literature – were all features that made Nuremberg an interesting, and telling, place to explore negotiations over the Nazi past. Although Nuremberg has been called 'the most German of cities' (including by National Socialist mayor – following a long tradition – in 1938, and although it has been suggested that the various ways in which the Rally Grounds have been treated over the years could act as 'a seismograph of German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*',[71] my argument here is not that the city is somehow 'typical' of Germany, or even West Germany. Instead, Nuremberg and the Rally Grounds can act as a focus for telling at least part of a wider story about German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, not because they constitute the bigger frame writ small, but because those acting locally often do so in awareness of debates ongoing elsewhere, because of shared institutional factors, such as available funding and sometimes because of common assumptions or ways of acting. What the more detailed focus that I provide here also reveals, however, is a story of locally ignoring or rejecting aspects of wider discourses and movements; of local reconfigurations of apparently more broadly (sometimes internationally) shared knowledge and practice; of new initiatives; and of the more specific local concerns and politics in which decisions are made.

Arrival story

The 'Writing Culture' debates of the 1980s drew attention to the rhetorical and sometimes self-legitimating role of anthropologists' 'arrival stories' – perhaps tales of their overcoming of obstacles to get to their chosen location. Nevertheless, arrivals at a place for the first time have a powerful capacity to generate impressions and questions, or to challenge preconceptions, and not only for anthropologists. In my case, in September 1999, when I was still working out what my research focus might be, I found myself at a tram-stop uncertain which tram I should take to get to 'Luitpoldhain', the name of the stop at the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds. I asked a woman for direction and, as she was going that way too, she invited me to come with her. We talked a little as we went along, about the lovely fresh vegetables that she had bought in the market, the fine weather, about where I was from and where I had

learnt German, but not about where I was heading. Tram 9 trundled through stops that were later to become engrained in my memory: … Wodanstraße, Holzgartenstraße, Platz der Opfer des Faschismus, Meistersingerhalle, Luitpoldhain. When we alighted she must have registered surprise in my face for she asked 'You're here to see the Reich party Rally Grounds?', and when I nodded, she laughed and said 'Hitler certainly knew how to choose a beautiful place'. She was right that the peaceful parkland and greenery was what first struck me and that I hadn't expected this. My imagination was filled with black-and-white images of vast marching grounds and monstrous buildings.

She then led me over the busy Bayernstraße further into the grounds, telling me as she did so that her father had been an engineer responsible for some of the electrical work connected with the party rallies, though he had not been a party member. She lived in house nearby, there being some very nice houses around here, she observed, still enjoying the conflict between my expectation and what I was encountering.

As I wandered further around the Rally Grounds area that day I became fascinated by what seemed to me to be contradictions between the terrible history with which the site was imbued – and which it had been designed to glorify – and its current appearance and uses. The overall impression of the place was of a public park or even nature reserve, leafy and green, with mature trees and woodland walks, and lakes with ducks, moorhens and pleasure boats. There was a yacht club, a beer-garden and, in the side of one of the Nazi buildings, something called a 'Serenadenhof' which I later learnt was an area for holding classical concerts. Next to information stands about the history of the site were kiosks selling hot-dogs and fizzy drinks. Fairground rides of the annual Volksfest were still in place. My eye could travel from the Ferris wheel and roller coasters of the fair to the Congress Hall – the enormous Colosseum-like building begun by the Nazis but never completed. I could survey the length of the Great Road, the granite-clad marching road along which so many soldiers would have goose-stepped, and see children learning to ride their bikes or people parking their cars to take their dogs for a walk. Everywhere were people roller-blading, hurtling around clad in helmets and knee- and elbow-pads. On benches looking out onto the lake and across to the Congress Hall elderly people sat chatting or simply gazing at the view of the Nazi building romantically reflected in the water. At the Zeppelin Building, which film-footage of Hitler ranting to the troops has made the most instantly recognisable Nazi building, groups of youths were perfecting their skate-boarding jumps next to the 'Führer podium', and, against another wall, beside a pair of sculptures made from pieces of spent ammunition (Jan Breuste's 'Overkill 1 & 2'), a man was practising his tennis strokes.

I had been expecting a bleak empty place – a space neglected by the present, a space in which the 'feel' of the past would be overwhelming. Instead I found myself struggling to reconcile past and present, and with my sense of

contradiction between what I knew about the site and what I could see today. I could, and did, find some of the buildings and marching grounds chilling – especially the cavernous raw inside of the Congress Hall, belying its classical exterior, and the cool, long, angular lines of the Zeppelin Building. But I also found the Congress Hall, with its allusions to the Roman Colosseum and artful positioning on the edge of the lake, elegantly attractive; and I found the Zeppelin Building, with its side wings now gone (removed in the late 1960s and 1970s) and with weeds growing up among the crumbling steps, rather pitiful. On that day I became compelled to know just when, how and why the site had become what it was. Why had some parts of the site been left intact since the war and others – such as some of the marching grounds – grassed-over? Why had parts of the Zeppelin Building been destroyed, in a peculiar amputation, but not all of it? Who made such decisions and were they the subject of public debate? I also wanted to know more about what the site might mean to the numerous people who used it. Were they aware of its history? And, if so, did it matter to them? Did they feel a sense of conflicting meanings as I was doing myself? These 'arrival questions' – which tapped into more longstanding theoretical interests in identity formation, historical consciousness and material culture – motivated my Nuremberg research.

Figure 1.2 Scenic Nazi Party Rally Grounds. Congress Hall and Lake

Negotiating material heritage

In this book I focus primarily on the ways in which Nuremberg's most striking physical heritage of Nazism – the former Nazi (or 'Reich') Party Rally Grounds, the *Reichsparteitagsgelände* – has been variously used, debated and neglected, and partly blown up, grassed-over, restored and exhibited. Built by the Nazis in the 1930s to stage the Nazi Party rallies (or the Nuremberg rallies as they are often known), the grounds today consist of a large area of former marching grounds and buildings in monumental fascist style. Lying a few miles outside Nuremberg's historic walled old town, about three miles from the city's main railway station, this largest existing area of Fascist architecture has remained a material presence and reminder of Nuremberg's Nazi past. Not only an area listed under monument protection laws, the site is also one of Nuremberg's largest green spaces and acts as an important leisure area, especially for those who live in the surrounding suburbs.

The struggle over the Nazi past in Nuremberg has taken place in many civic and private spaces, including the trials, immediate postwar 'denazification' and continuing wrangling over compensation for forced labour, in the content of school education and in family memories. In looking at how a material, physical presence is dealt with, my aim is to bring debates about the public representation and consumption of the past together with those on material culture and the media of remembering and forgetting. Put crudely, Nuremberg's Nazi Party Rally Grounds raise questions of how far forgetting is possible in the face of an enormous physical presence, and how far meaning and historical understanding are constrained or shaped by materiality. On laying a foundation stone at the Rally Grounds Hitler expressed the wish that the buildings would 'speak as eternal witnesses' ('*rede als ewiger Zeuge*') and architect Albert Speer, who was responsible for the overall design of the site, referred to them as 'Words in stone' ('*Worte aus Stein*') (see Chapter 2). But how far do architectural styles inscribe meanings? Are these fixed by the architect or are they available for reinterpretation later? Can buildings and crafted landscapes continue to speak across the decades? This book looks at some of the debates about these as they have occurred in Nuremberg's negotiations of the Party Rally Grounds and in academia.

In using the term 'negotiating' I seek to draw attention to debates and arguments, and to the fact that dealings with difficult heritage typically involve ongoing conflicts of interest and differences of view. A negotiated social practice is differentiated, mobile and emergent rather than homogeneous, fixed or the product of underlying laws. Additionally, I use 'negotiating' because it can also refer to physical movement in relation to objects – negotiation can be an embodied or material as well as a discursive practice. The physical dealings with the site – the destruction, partial destruction or restoration of parts of it and the movement and sensations of individuals encountering it – are part of its negotiation. This is not, however, simply movement between or around fixed positions. Rather, negotiating is a more active process in which spaces, identifications, alignments and even objects are positioned and given recognition. Guided tours, for example, negotiate the Rally Grounds into being as an educational and tourist space. Debates about what should be done with the Nazi buildings consolidate or instigate groupings and alignments.

In using the term negotiating, I am also purposefully choosing a less evocative or discourse-specific term than some of those that have been used by others – often to interesting effect – in discussion of Germany's landscapes. Several commentators, for example, have talked of 'ghosts' – of being 'haunted by' the Nazi and other pasts; and many have used psychoanalytical terms such as 'repression' and 'trauma'.[72] As we will see in the account that follows, these are tropes that are sometimes employed locally too. Because I am interested in exploring such uses ethnographically and historically – that is, looking at their deployment and implications – I avoid using them as tools in my own analysis of what is involved in Nuremberg's heritage negotiations. Moreover, rather than trying to infer transcendent psychological mechanisms – which risks blurring differentiations and ignoring historically located social processes – I am concerned to try to identify the particular cultural assumptions and understandings, and the players and tensions, involved in negotiations and particular courses of action. These, no less than supposedly universal processes, can give insight into other cases, though they do so more modestly, by calling for attention to the possible specificities and complexities alongside an attempt to identify possibly shared concepts, practices and contexts.

Layered history: *Schichte/Geschichte*

Anselm Kiefer is one of Germany's most controversial postwar artists, especially on account of his series of paintings and photographs (with titles such as 'Heroic Symbols' and 'Occupations')in which he poses as Hitler in front of various monuments in Europe. Long intrigued by Kiefer, I was fascinated to discover that he has made several paintings entitled 'Nuremberg'. Like many of his other works, these have dense textured surfaces, thick with layers of paint and other materials. Scenes of Nuremberg's historic old town and vast fields (references to the Nazi marching grounds) are overlaid with layers of straw and dark paint, and words such as '*Festspeilwiese*' (festival ground') and '*Meistersinger*' ('Mastersingers' – from Wagner's famous opera, much loved by Hitler, about Nuremberg) are scratched into the surface. In these paintings, it seems to me, Kiefer is playing with the fact that the German word for history – *Geschichte* – also contains the idea of layers (*Schichte*). He suggests that the past is substantially obscured by later layers and only ever partially glimpsed. Simultaneously, the past is depicted as intruding, as finding its way, again partially, through the accumulated layers into the present.[73]

Approach

In order to provide an account of negotiating difficult heritage at the Rally Grounds in Nuremberg, I combine historical and ethnographic research. This has involved work in archives – looking primarily at matters such as city council debates, tourist brochures and city image policies, newspaper reports and visitor books – as well as secondary historical research. It includes interviews with people who I call 'history

Figure 1.3 Anselm Kiefer 1945 Nürnberg, 1982 (Source: © Anselm Kiefer. Oil, straw, and mixed media on canvas; 110 3/8 × 149 7/8 inches. The Eli and Edythe L. Broad Collection, Los Angeles. Photography credit: Douglas M. Parker Studio, Los Angeles)

workers' – those who are involved in presenting the past in the public realm, such as Michael Weber of the tourism office as well as those involved in the making of exhibitions (past as well as present) at and of the Rally Grounds; those involved in establishing and running guided tours; and a range of others whose activities also impinge on the uses and interpretations of the site, such as the city's building minister, people in the historical preservation office (the *Denkmalschutzbehörde*) and journalists who have made it their task to write about the site in the local newspaper, the *Nürnberger Nachrichten*. As part of the gloriously unavoidable nature of human interaction, it also includes all sorts of casual conversations with individuals from Nuremberg and elsewhere who have expressed interest in my work and who have volunteered memories and insights.

In addition, I carried out participant-observation fieldwork, primarily on the Rally Grounds site, including on guided-tours and in the Documentation Centre, and have undergone some of the training provided for guides and taken some friends and relatives, as well as a group of university sociology students, on tours myself. As well as discussions with the students and with friends and acquaintances, I conducted interviews with visitors – either singly or in groups – to the Rally Grounds, including, but not only, to the Documentation Centre (see Chapter 8). Those who I interviewed included local people who live nearby and people who work in the grounds, some of whom I met and chatted with on other occasions too; as well as visitors from other parts of Germany and abroad. My interviews were with people sitting on

benches, roller-bladers, families having barbecues, and those trying to learn more about the Nazi past. They included pensioners who lived through the Nazi period, schoolchildren who learn about it in school, older people who never learnt about it in school, members of the Bundeswehr (the German army) who are expected to learn about it as part of their training, and people from many parts of the world who have somehow felt compelled to visit the site.

Any study is inevitably selective. Even though this account has a fairly tight central focus – the Rally Grounds – it is only able to relate some of the events and debates, and some of the commentaries and actions, from the rich material available. In making my selections, I have picked those actions and inactions, commentaries and silences, events and debates, which seem to me – on the basis of the materials in which I became immersed – to best give insights into what may be at issue in negotiating and experiencing difficult heritage.

By bringing together historical and contemporary material, it is possible to understand better the specificities of what was going on at certain time periods by comparing and contrasting them with others. This is not just a one-way process. Providing a primarily chronological account seems the best way to show how those coming later have to deal with the material heritage that has resulted from earlier decisions or neglect. But my own thinking and research process has been 'multi-temporal' insofar as my interrogation of earlier times has been at least partly shaped by my conversations with people in Nuremberg today, as well as my own experiences of the site and commentaries by others. To try to reflect this, as well as to emphasise the multiple and not easily contained readings and uses of the Rally Grounds site, my main narrative is also interspersed with 'interventions', that is, with perspectives on or related to the Rally Grounds or linked themes, that are intended to supplement, and sometimes disrupt or complicate, the main account, and sometimes to lay clues and traces for later arguments.

I write as an interested outsider. I have no direct family connections with Germany, and no relatives who were victims of the Holocaust. My husband works on German philosophy and we have long enjoyed German literature, film and music, and, as part of a longstanding interest in nationhood, history and identity that I have explored in other places, I have been fascinated by the case of Germany. Unlike so many German commentators, I didn't begin with a sense of motivating emotional investment in the subject matter, nor with a feeling of compulsion to make normative statements on how the past should or should not be 'dealt with'. While doing so is not my aim, I do nevertheless attempt to map out what I see as some of the implications of particular approaches to the past for the ways in which they are understood as shaped primarily by my understanding of what I have observed and heard in the course of my research. My project is thus conceived as a democratic anthropology in that it is not just 'about' a group of people but is also engaged in many of the same negotiations, and takes its cues from arguments and ideas presented by those 'studied', as well as offering contributions for future negotiation.

On learning of the subject of my research, the immediate response of many of my German acquaintances was to say that they thought it good that I, as a non-German, should be tackling this subject. 'It will be good to have somebody from outside looking

at our peculiar German obsessions', joked one German professor. Such comments reflect part of a deeper uncertainty over whether, given the emotional and historical baggage involved, Germans can really trust themselves to know themselves and deal with their own history – even if, at the same time, there is a massive outpouring of attempts to craft such stories. Contrary to, say, the Japanese, who anthropologists have reported as believing that only the Japanese can properly understand Japan,[74] many Germans fear lurking repressions and unconscious drives that undermine their confidence in their own views of themselves. There is consequently a feeling that an outsider's account might be more 'objective', though often accompanied by the suspicion that outsiders will not grasp the difficulty of what is involved. Equally, the fact that an outsider is also interested in these matters is itself a validation that they are worth obsessing over.

If some thought it good that I should be doing this research, others were disappointed in my choice of focus. That my husband and I had learnt German (something always commented upon as unusual, if not astonishing, for *Engländer*), participated in local events, made friends, visited all the places that people said we should visit, and sent our children to German schools, was regarded by many as a welcome affirmation that not everybody from England held the crude negative stereotypes of Germans that are peddled in some parts of the British media. While I find such stereotypes, and constant references to the War, offensively reductive and morally complacent, the fact that I too was spending much of my time engaged with Nazi heritage implied that this figured large in my own understanding of Germany and Germanness. I had no way of really resolving this, for the topic seemed to me not only valid but indeed an unavoidable aspect of understanding contemporary German identity, even if, as I also want to strongly emphasise, it is only part of it.

Is this how they see us?

A man in his late twenties with a large camera slung around his neck is walking on the Zeppelin Building. He tells me that he has come not to see the buildings themselves but because he is interested in sites of car crashes. A few days previously there had been a fatal crash in front of the Zeppelin Building, when a 'joy-ride' went wrong. We talk a bit about how attractive this stretch of road – sometimes officially used as part of a race track – is for speeding; but also how dangerous it is without the crash barriers that are erected for races. I ask him my usual questions – and he tells me, among other things, that he is a salesman who has lived in Nuremberg for many years (though he emphasises that he is not 'from here'), that he has read much about the City's history, has visited the older and new Dokuzentrum exhibition ('excellent, very good'), and that he thinks that there should be even more information available on the site 'though there is a danger of turning it into a temple or something'. Then, as I switch off my tape-recorder, he turns the tables. Is it true, he asks, that there are newspapers in England that refer to Germans as Krauts and even as Nazis?

What are these newspapers? Are they like the *Bild* (the most popular German tabloid newspaper)? Do many people read them? And does it mean that lots of people see Germans in this way? He expresses astonishment that people would label people today through such references to something that happened so long ago and to the fact that this can be 'allowed'. I find myself apologising for newspapers like the Sun and trying to emphasise that many English people, myself included, find them deeply embarrassing and offensive. But he still looks hurt and baffled. I go away not only reminded of this unpleasant use of the past but also aware that my questions to him prompted the voicing of his concerns.

* * * * *

The following chapter, Building heritage: words in stone?, addresses some of the particular issues raised by material, especially architectural, heritage. It does so by examining Nazi architectural practice – including ideas about the agency and 'impact' of certain scales, forms and staging – especially in relation to the building and uses of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds. The remaining chapters discuss the negotiations of what was left of this material heritage after the War. In doing so, they explore a wide range of different possible approaches to difficult heritage. Chapters three to six are partially chronological. Chapter 3, Demolition, cleansing and moving on, discusses some of the most predominant approaches the immediate postwar period – though ones that also continue since and are also widely found elsewhere. Official heritage preservation, beginning in the 1970s, and various attempts to work with or against this, is the subject of Chapter 4: Preservation, profanation and image-management. Chapter 5, Accompanied witnessing: education, art and alibis, considers education, and especially exhibitions, about difficult heritage, and other artistic reflections on it. Much of this began in earnest in Nuremberg the 1980s. Chapter 6, Cosmopolitan memory in the City of Human Rights, sets out the most recent developments in Nuremberg to create a documentation centre about the Nazi past and to present the city as one of freedom and human rights. This discusses the development of more 'cosmopolitan' approaches to public representation of the past; and highlights some of the particular dilemmas that those directly involved in presenting difficult heritage to the public may face as they try to do so. This theme is continued in Chapter 7, Negotiating on the ground(s): guided tours of Nazi heritage, which looks at the work of tour guides at the Rally Grounds – and the challenges involved in dealing with the materiality as well as meaning of difficult heritage. Chapter 8, Visiting difficult heritage, turns to those many people who come to the site – either as tourists or as local people – in order to explore how they, variously, negotiate it, both physically and verbally. The final chapter, Unsettling difficult heritage, concludes the book by considering the implications of the Nuremberg case for others beyond – and for the future.

8

VISITING DIFFICULT HERITAGE

The number of sites of difficult heritage, especially those of atrocity, has grown massively during the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first.[1] In part, as I noted in the introduction, this is a dimension of a wider expansion of heritage in general. But it is also a development in its own right, showing particularly high levels of increase both in the number of such sites and the number of people visiting them. Hundreds of thousands of visitors from across the globe make their way to former concentration camps such as Auschwitz and Dachau, or to other sites of terror, such as the House of Slaves on Gorée Island, Senegal or the House of Terror in Budapest; or to museums of Holocaust, slavery or genocide. Since the Documentation Centre at the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds opened in 2001 it has received over 1.2 million visitors.[2]

Why do people visit such sites? This chapter addresses this question on the basis of empirical research carried out at the Rally Grounds and Dokuzentrum.[3] It is concerned not only with stated motivations but also with the ways in which people negotiate their visits, both in terms of how they talk about and frame them and what they actually do while there. It is also concerned with questions raised in earlier chapters about the negotiation of the materiality – the architectural monumentality – of the site, and interpretations of the *Fascination and Terror* exhibition, especially insofar as these may give wider insights into negotiations of difficult heritage.

My research was not only carried out at the Dokuzentrum but also involved participant-observation and interviewing of people present at other parts of the site, engaged in activities such as sitting on benches, playing tennis or roller-blading, as well as on guided tours. This is dissimilar from many other sites of difficult heritage, which typically are more bounded and single-purpose than the Rally Grounds. Nevertheless, the boundaries and seepage between a heritage site – and the interlude of a heritage visit – and the rest of life are a consideration in all kinds of heritage sites both for those managing and for those visiting them.[4] Here, where there is what some visitors perceive as a peculiar, and even objectionable, mixing of activities, these questions of boundaries, seepage and 'appropriateness' are more evident, especially in the moralised commentary by some of those who come to the place.

Researching visiting

My account is partly informed by participant-observation – walking around the area, alone or with others, sitting on the benches, drinking coffee in the cafés, going to the fair and other events held at the site, attending tours and visiting the Dokuzentrum and, earlier, the exhibition in the Zeppelin Building. As well as people who I met at the site, there are many who came to visit it with me – friends and relatives, and also a group of students from the Institute of Sociology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, who also answered a questionnaire for me and participated in group discussions. In addition, I read through thousands of entries in the visitor comment books held by the Dokuzentrum and the earlier exhibition in the Zeppelin Building; and have talked to tour-guides and staff at the Dokuzentrum about their experiences (see also Chapter 7) and research.[5] The main source of the discussion that follows, however, are sixty semi-structured interviews that I carried out with people who I met for the first time at the Rally Grounds. These were conducted either with groups or individuals, depending on how they were visiting. In total this comprised about 110 people.[6]

Twenty of my interviews were carried out in the Summer of 2000, before the opening of the Dokuzentrum. Of these, three were with people who had just visited the *Fascination and Terror* exhibition in the Zeppelin Building and another with a woman who was about to go and visit it. The remaining sixteen were conducted in many different parts of the main area of the Rally Grounds, my aim simply being to try to interview as broad a range of people as possible. Some of those I interviewed were sunbathing, some were walking dogs, some were playing tennis and so on. As I was approaching people 'cold' I knew little about them in advance: only the activity in which they were engaged, their gender and, roughly, their age. I could also sometimes identify tourists by cameras and guidebooks. Of these people, just under half had visited the exhibition at some point. Thirty of the thirty-eight people interviewed lived in Nuremberg or its immediate surrounding, four elsewhere in Germany, and four – of whom three were in one family – in other countries, England and France.

In the Summer of 2003 I carried out another forty interviews. Twenty of these (about forty-two people) were conducted in the Dokuzentrum, with people who had just visited the exhibition. Perhaps surprisingly, only one of these was from Nuremberg, and he was currently living elsewhere, and one other a student in the nearby town of Erlangen. Ten were from other countries – Switzerland, the USA, Australia and Namibia – and the rest from other parts of Germany, ranging from Hamburg to Karlsruhe.[7] The remaining twenty interviews were conducted, as in 2000, across the Rally Grounds and I tried to loosely match the sites where I had interviewed previously. Half of these interviewees were from Nuremberg or the immediate area, a quarter from elsewhere in Germany and a quarter from other countries. Just under a third had visited the Dokuzentrum, with two of these and one other having also visited the earlier exhibition in the Zeppelin Building; and I later met one couple again who I had interviewed earlier, before they had visited, and talked with them briefly about it.

My interviews began with a brief explanation that I was a university researcher interested in asking them about 'this place' (in German I said '*dieses Gelände*'). I began with general questions about where they had come from, where they lived, how often they came and for what reasons; and then continued with more questions about whatever activities they engaged in there, including which areas they had visited, their views on whether anything should be altered at the site and what it meant to them. I asked visitors who had visited the Dokuzentrum or earlier exhibition about these, including aspects that they especially remembered and how long they had spent there. I also asked what other similar places people had visited – a question that I purposefully left open in order to try to access the kinds of comparisons that they would make. And I asked about what they knew about the history of the site and where they had learnt about 'this history'. In addition, I gathered basic socio-demographic data – age, occupation, place of residence – and invited participants to make further comments and to ask me questions; and generally used prompts and supplementary questions to allow interviewees to take our conversation wherever they chose. The aim of this kind of qualitative research is not to try to determine frequencies of different kinds of responses but instead to indicate and explore the range and kinds of ways in which people talk about particular themes. One feature of such research is that it typically produces rich material, which is hard to do justice to without presenting extensive quotations. The longer visitor interventions that I include here (and in some earlier chapters) provide an indicative glimpse.[8]

A first interview

It is mid-morning on a warm, clear day in August. A woman is sitting on a bench, looking out over the Dutzendteich, in which the Congress Hall is reflected. I have seen her before and we've nodded and smiled. She is one of the 'regulars' at the Rally Grounds, as I have noticed in my days of walking the terrain, while I have been trying to build up the courage to interview people. Fortunately, she is amenable to being interviewed – something which I continue to be surprised is the case with almost all those I approach. During the course of our conversation I learn, among other things, that she lives nearby, on a main street, and has been coming to walk here and enjoy the air for over thirty years, and that for the last ten years, since she retired at age sixty, she has generally spent about three to four hours per day here. She knows the people and even the dogs. For her, this is a social space, a place to encounter friends and acquaintances.

Nevertheless, she – I will call her Frau Müller – is also well aware of the site's history and has previously reflected on what should be done about the buildings like the Congress Hall, which, she tells me, the 'Amis' (US forces) had wanted to blow up but it was too expensive, too large and too difficult. Her view now, she says, is that it should be left. She didn't think this previously but then a Romanian woman told her that Germans have, not culture (*Kultur*)

but 'what was it? Yes, past' (*Ja, Vergangenheit*); to which she added 'and we should not forget'.

After asking me about where I am from and why I came here, she tells me about all sorts of changes that have happened to the site over the years and about her experiences with Americans who she came to know because her brother had a car-washing business just over the back-wall from where many of them were stationed in Fürth. She then begins on a story about how one day when she was near here in her car, a 'Schwarzer', a black man, waved to her and she waved back. Then the police pulled her over and asked 'Did you wave to the Negro (*Neger*)?' She said yes and they asked if she knew him. Alerted by their use of the word 'Neger' she concocted a tale of how he had helped her with her car when it was broken down one day. They query whether this is a reason to wave to him and she retorts that if they (i.e. the policemen) had helped her she would have waved back to them likewise. They then suggest that she has been drinking – it is 11 a.m. – and she tells them that she would be happy to blow into the bag. 'What can I say?', she comments, 'they must have been racist' ('rasistisch'). She doesn't like to say this about Germans (*Deutsche*) but this is the only explanation. Her own view is that people are people ('*Menschen sind Menschen*'). I ask: 'could this have happened anywhere or was it especially likely here?' She thinks anywhere but that things are even worse since the Wall came down because lots more neo-Nazis from the East have come over. Even the parents of her nephew's wife, who is from the East, say that the Wall should have been built higher rather than pulled down.

Why people come

Not surprisingly for such a mixed site, people's motivations for being there could be very various.[9] For many, such as Frau Müller in the intervention above, they were visiting a pleasant leafy space, where they could walk, take the air, sit and meet friends. For people living in the surrounding area, the site is the only large park nearby; though many people also travel some considerable distance to use it for leisure purposes. For example, two teenage girls told me that they travel about forty minutes every other week to play tennis, and sometimes other sports, here; and a man in his late sixties told me he travels for about an hour once per week just to spend time walking in what he regards as an especially amenable green area. Among those who I interviewed who were not there to visit Nazi heritage, the most common replies to my question of why they were there were either 'relaxation' (*Entspannung*) or specific activities such as 'to sunbathe' or 'to roller-blade'*;* and to my question of 'What does this place mean to you?' the most frequent replies were 'fresh air' and 'peace and quiet'. One local woman born in 1938 told me, for example, that she comes 'to recover my nerves, against stress'; and a man who lives nearby, born 1941, said: 'I am at home here. I come to recover from everyday stress'. Moreover, many people who I met elsewhere on other occasions, including students in the university, told me that

they had visited the grounds but only to park their cars there while visiting the city's Christmas market, to go to a football match, rock concert or the fair.

Despite the fact that the great majority of visits to the site are not undertaken as part of visiting Nazi heritage, this does not mean that people are unaware of the site's history. On the contrary, every person whom I interviewed – whether lying sunbathing or having a barbecue – knew that this was the site of the Nuremberg rallies, and many spontaneously told me facts about the buildings' history. Their motivations to be there, however, were other; and the site's heritage was, in this context, irrelevant. This did not mean that it was necessarily irrelevant in all contexts: almost half of those who were there for leisure purposes had on previous occasions visited an exhibition or attended a tour about the site's history, and the majority of others said that they intended to do so at some point. I return to this below.

But what of those who were there to visit a Nazi site? Why did they choose to do so? The most common reply to my question was 'history' – an interest in history in general, and often more specifically in the history of the Third Reich or Nazi period. For those visitors for whom this was part of a more generalised historical interest, they typically replied to my question about other 'similar' places that they had been with examples of other historical sites such as castles or Nuremberg's Old Town. The latter was also part of a visiting of this site as one of the places to visit as part of a visit to Nuremberg.[10] Although my sample is too small to draw any general conclusions, there was a greater proportion of people visiting the site as part of visiting Nuremberg subsequent to the building of the Dokuzentrum than was the case beforehand, suggesting that this had put the Rally Grounds onto the Nuremberg tourist itinerary to an extent that was not the case previously. As part of this general 'visiting Nuremberg', a visit to the Rally Grounds and Dokuzentrum was typically sandwiched between activities such as visiting the castle, Dürer's house and eating *Lebkuchen* or Nuremberg sausages; and can be seen as part of a more general touristic 'doing of place' that seeks to experience a location through engagement in what are presented as the significant 'to dos' of its tourist offer.

Among people who come specifically to see the architectural remains of the site of the Nuremberg rallies, some surely do so as part of an appreciation of what they regard as the achievements of the Third Reich. However, I only met one person in the course of my interviews who was almost unequivocally appreciative: Mr Smith, who I described in an intervention in Chapter 2. Coming to this place was, for him, another realisation of his collecting of Nazi memorabilia and historical information. As he explains: 'I am absolutely fascinated. I have been studying it for years. I studied it before you were born! I probably know more than the locals … I have been reading books, I have watched videos.' Actual visiting, he maintains, goes beyond this second-hand knowledge. Here, at 'the place itself', he tells me, he can 'hear the crowds' and 'feel the energy'. He is particularly thrilled to have stood in the same place as Hitler ('it was incredible'). What he describes is a physical impulse from the place and buildings: a high level of material suggestivity that is experienced corporeally as well as intellectually. Gaining these in-site experiences is something that he has also done elsewhere: he tells me that he has also been to the Eagle's nest and 'I stood on the Führer bunker in Berlin'. Quite where the motivation for such an interest came from

in the first place is not something that I properly pursued, though his comment that 'the Luftwaffe dropped bombs on me, the buggers', when he lived in Portsmouth as a child, suggests that the place of wartime as significant in his own lifetime was partly what prompted his interest in the period.

The majority of those visiting this Nazi site as part of a historical interest share the idea that being physically present at a heritage site is significantly different from learning about it through books or other sources, even if they do not claim to experience the 'power' of it quite as forcefully as Mr Smith does. For example, a man from the East now living in Bayreuth, who describes himself as of 'the generation that did not experience it directly' (he was born in 1962), explains that 'to see it with your own eyes is more important than what you learn in school. It helps you really grasp it'. He was bringing his fourteen-year old daughter to visit partly for this reason and because he believed it important that 'young people should not forget' and because, he claimed, she learnt virtually nothing about it at school, even though 'Bayreuth was an especially brown city'. Many others also contrasted making an actual visit with book learning, saying that the embodied encounter, in the words of one of them, 'makes it more real and memorable'. This is a familiar theme in tourism research – that, as Jack Kugelmass nicely puts it, what is involved in a 'sensualiz[ation of] history', and one that is made more evocative and memorable through being embodied practice.[11] Moreover, what seems to be involved is that visitors conceptualise a scale of meaningfulness of sources, some describing how still more significant – and 'real' – for them were eye-witness accounts from their grandparents.[12]

Those who are visiting the Dokuzentrum or going on tours frame their physical encounter as part of an educational event. They are there, they say, in order to learn more about the Nazi past. This learning itself, however, is cast as what seems to be the most important motivation of many to visit. This is as a kind of moral duty to bear witness to an atrocious past; this being expressed by some simply as something that one 'should do'. As such, attendance becomes as much an act of commemoration as of education. When asked about other 'similar' places that they had visited, such visitors typically listed concentration camps or perhaps Jewish museums or the Anne Frank house in Amsterdam. And in response to a question about what should happen to the site in future, they emphasised that it should be retained and, frequently, that it should be retained as a memorial, or, more specifically, as *Gedenkstätte* – a memorial-educational complex – or a *Mahnmal* – a warning memorial.[13] Almost all such visitors, at some point during our discussions, expressed the idea that remembering the horrors of the past was especially important in order to avoid repeating it. Two Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, recall how Jehovah's Witnesses too were persecuted by the Nazis and tell me that it is important 'that it is all remembered, in order to avoid making the same mistakes again'; and a man in his late thirties tells me that an exhibition is useful 'if it is directed at young people to help prevent hate and violence'. *Nie wieder!*, *Never again!*, was the most frequently inscribed statement in the Dokuzentrum visitor books.[14]

Making visits to sites associated with atrocity is, then, for many people a means through which they can perform their own commitment to remembering and, thus, to helping to avoid bad history being repeated. It is almost a talismanic activity that

can contribute towards warding off a bad future. Many such visitors spontaneously emphasised that they thought it especially important that young people make such visits in order to avoid the past 'falling into forgottenness', as one older woman put it. Despite the fact that the Rally Grounds was a site of perpetration rather than primarily directly of suffering, it is perceived by many of those engaged in moral witnessing as one element within a network of sites connected with Nazi atrocity. This is not to say that they all necessarily think that it is quite the same kind of site as sites of suffering, neither that it should be presented or treated in quite the same way. The intervention below, which reports the discussion about it by two women, is one of several examples of visitors discussing this. Others also made contrasts between the Rally Grounds and concentration camps, saying, for example, that they found visits to places such as Dachau made more of an emotional impression upon them, some describing them as more 'authentic' than the Dokuzentrum exhibition. A German woman born in 1938 (speaking in English) put it this way: 'But another thing is to walk on the ground in a concentration camp. It is awful. The ground began to speak. But I still think here it is very good'. Nevertheless, despite its different historical role, the Rally Grounds has come to be seen by many as a place for bearing witness not just to Nazi power but also of the atrocity of Holocaust. For some visitors, as I discuss further below, this has consequences for their perception, and moral evaluation, of how the site is maintained and used.

If these are the main motivations to visit, I should also note that not all visitors were there of their own accord and that motivation should not be seen as only a matter of individual decision-making. Visiting is almost always co-visiting; and even people who attend alone may have made their decision in relation to others (e.g. a friend who advised them to come). Moreover, a significant feature of visiting heritage sites and exhibitions is that other people are also present and that this affords the possibility of viewing and judging how others also behave. This is another dimension of moral witnessing: a witnessing of others and opening of oneself up to be viewed in public. Moral witnessing is always, in some sense, accompanied witnessing (see Chapter 5). More specifically, school children, youth groups and soldiers in particular were typically attending the Dokuzentrum as part of organised tours, arranged as part of a moral education. Soldiers – members of the Bundeswehr – explained to me that their visits (which often also involved spending time undertaking activities in the study forum) were part of a wider, national, educational programme which also involved trips to other sites, such as concentration camps. Making such visits has been on the curriculum in most German schools for at least the past decade.[15]

Historical consciousness

The idea that the past can provide lessons for the present and future is, then, pervasive among those visiting this heritage site and widely socially institutionalised. In most cases, how this lesson provision might work more specifically or what kinds of precise content it might provide are not spelled out. What is involved, rather, is a more general assumption that history teaches and that knowing about it is in itself a way of making sure that there is less chance of bad events being repeated. This

talismanic-pedagogical historical consciousness is, I suggest, widespread and itself implicated in the expansion of heritage visiting. It involves a particular temporal orientation – or way of relating to history – as historical theorist Jörn Rüsen has put it.[16] More specifically, it entails an understanding of the past as to some degree separate from the present – and generally as parcelled into specific episodes – but also as open to analogical interpretation.[17] That is, it is an orientation in which we can legitimately make comparisons between 'then' and 'now'; and can think through the present via historical information. This may sometimes play out, especially in the repeated invocation of 'never again', as a 'subject[ion] of history to trauma theory which makes all presents and futures into mere repetitions'.[18] Involved here too is a democratisation: such thinking of the present through the past belongs not only in the realm of experts but is something in which lay people may also engage.

In the case of the Nazi past, its separateness and distance from the present was not uniformly conceptualised by visitors, and this in turn seemed to be related to differentials in the extent to which they made analogies between past and present. In what I have elsewhere called a 'present orientation', but that might better be discussed as 'cosmopolitan memory' in Levy and Sznaider's terms (see Chapter 6), there was much evidence of drawing on the past to comment on the present. Respondents might, for example, move spontaneously from discussing the Nazi period to talking about the war in Iraq or what they saw as a dangerous rise in neo-Nazism in Germany following reunification. Such visitors were also especially likely to identify specific features of the Nazi regime and then to generalise out from these into actions that they could see in operation in the present, engaging in a disconnection from the specific case even while beginning from it. They might talk of 'racism', the term most often used in German being *Ausländerfeindlichkeit*, literally animosity to foreigners. This could encapsulate both the anti-Semitism of the Nazi period and other kinds of racism evident in the present – exemplifying a move to a more capacious and less place-bound category in just the way suggested in arguments about cosmopolitan memory. Visitors making such links with the present were also likely to talk of the site as acting as a *Mahnmal* and to comment upon the importance of its persistence into the future as such, especially for younger generations. That is, they also expressed the future-orientation characteristic of a cosmopolitan memory formation.

Lessons for today

The following is taken from an interview with an Irish-born American, born 1935, who had just come out of *Fascination and Violence*.

> To go through it [the exhibition] and to see what happened in those years, it makes one aware that certain things like that are happening. Also, that we must be as alert today about the horror that is taking place all over the world, as we are made aware by the horror that was here. So I was very touched and moved – and challenged – by the presentation … The remark that came to me was 'Peace to All, Peace be with all of Creation' …

> We need to be reminded not just of what has happened in the past but what could happen now and in the future, when one person or a few people – whether they are charismatic or not, and obviously it's a bit more dangerous if they are charismatic – or what can happen, or what manipulation can take place, and how symbols can be used and abused for another purpose. It's happening today just as much as it was happening in the 1930s and 1940s. But we turn a blind eye to it and we don't have exhibitions in the free world to indicate today that it is not just people in the past who can abuse power. People in the present can abuse power; leaders in the present day abuse power and manipulate justice. And war and control of economies is just as real today as it was back then. It can be conditioned for life or for use. Maybe it's happening today. Because none of the world powers today will examine themselves publicly. We only examine ourselves in the past. But that's not the point.'

People younger than about twenty only infrequently mobilised such a present-oriented or cosmopolitan historical consciousness but instead were more likely to articulate the past as a relatively self-contained episode. As such, it was cast as more temporally distant from their current concerns, as an example of an atrocity of a different, perhaps even more thoroughly foreign, period. In both visitor books and interviews this kind of historical consciousness was evident in more frequent use of terms such as 'damals'/'then' and 'die Nazizeit'/'the Nazi period'.[19] Expressing this particularly strongly was the following comment about the *Fascination and Violence* exhibition in a visitor book: 'An impressive journey into an incomprehensible time'; or the comment of a teenage girl that the exhibition helped to tell you about 'how terrible things were in that time'. Also characteristic of many of these accounts was a focus on Hitler, evident, for example, in the younger visitors described below who wanted to know what had happened to Hitler, in their reference to the period as 'the Hitler time' or to the content of the exhibition or significance of the place as 'all about Hitler and so forth'. A group of younger teenage skateboarders in 2000 told me that they wouldn't mind what was in the new exhibition as long as it was interesting; and to my probe about what that might be, they replied 'stuff about Hitler'. (A thirteen year old girl also told me how the site had 'been built by Hitler'.) Such a focus on Hitler has the effect of turning the past events into a singularity, propelled primarily by an atypical individual. This is a very different way of relating to the Nazi past from one in which the past is understood primarily in terms of potentially 'transferable' lessons and concepts. Whether younger people will later in their lives come to develop a more cosmopolitan orientation to the past, or whether the Nazi past is for them more detached from the present than it is for older people, is difficult to determine. However, as university students – whose lives were also several generations removed from the direct experience of the war – were more likely to show cosmopolitan orientations than were those younger, it seems that engaging in such analogies may increase with age.

What happened to Hitler?

I interview a group of Pathfinders (*Pfadfinder* – a group rather like Scouts or Guides), aged between 13 and 17, who have just visited the exhibition. When I ask whether they have any further comments or questions, one girl pipes up 'What happened to Hitler?' It takes me a moment to realise what she is asking by which time a debate has broken out over whether he was one of the ones hanged in Nuremberg or did he escape to Russia. One of the older boys explains that he committed suicide in his bunker in Berlin, an account I confirm. 'He did die then?' she checks, it clearly being important to her to know that he did. Later, when I read through numerous comments in visitor books I notice that the question of what happened to Hitler comes up there too – not often, but now and then. It makes me realise that so much of the first part of the exhibition is focused on Hitler, especially visually. One consequence of this is that, for a sense of narrative satisfaction, visitors want to know what happened to him later – something that is not covered due to the narrative focus on Nuremberg. It also reminds me that visitors may construct narratives in ways that pick up on exhibitionary cues but not always quite as exhibition makers anticipate.

In my discussion of *Fascination and Terror* in Chapter 6 I noted that the exhibition avoids making links with the present, and that its account finishes with the Nuremberg trials. It may be that this contained account of the past helps to sustain the temporal orientation of past separateness that is exhibited by some of the younger visitors. Nevertheless, as I have described, it does not prevent many, especially older, visitors from talking analogically, often at length and with great eloquence, about the present and even future. Despite the fact that the exhibition itself can only be understood as cosmopolitan to a limited extent, such visitor accounts surely are. In Hall's terms, they are thoroughly 'negotiated' – partly taking on the 'encoding' of the exhibition but then moving on from it to range broadly across different parts of the world, referring not only to political events but also to other exhibitions or sites visited elsewhere.[20]

Not all of those visiting the Rally Grounds and making links between past and present did so, however, in approval of the Dokuzentrum or of broader attempts to educate about the Nazi past. Sitting on benches in the sunshine I met several groups of older people, all from the local area, who expressed annoyance at time and money being spent in this way. The majority of these had not visited the Dokuzentrum and one woman born in 1934 told me that she thought few of her generation would do so as they had experienced events first-hand. Such individuals argued in favour of severing past and present: typically this was expressed through the idea that a line – a *Schlussstrich* – should be drawn under the Nazi past, so that it was no longer 'for ever and ever something with which to beat us', as one local woman in her sixties put it. 'There has been', she said, 'enough stirring up [*Hetzerei*]. What is past

is past'. Likewise, the electrician quoted at more length in an intervention below argued that there was 'much too much about the Nazis. We should look to the future and not to the past'. Nevertheless, those calling for a line to be drawn under the past, themselves often also engaged in other kinds of linking of this past and the present. In a conversation between two local women in their sixties, for example, they recalled the hardship that their mothers had endured in the years during and after the war and continued on from this to talk about the lack of social assistance at that time, compared with now, when, they claimed, all kinds of undeserving people – especially from Eastern Europe – manage to trick the system to acquire money from the state. From this they went on to talk of reparations to Jews, which they felt should no longer be continued (a theme which also arose in some other interviews with older local people). Theirs was, then, a mode of relating to the past in which they recognised continuities and themselves engaged in past-present analogies but at the same time argued for the selective making of particular temporal breaks.

Expressed here was also a resentment (and awareness) of what they saw as the capacity of certain other people to make or break what counted as publicly acceptable historical linkages. This was evident in a different way in the words of the local worker below who argued that Germany was being treated differently from other nations. Other respondents too, sometimes to different effect, pointed out the selective nature of historical accounts. In one interview, a man born in 1938 became angry when I raised the topic of the Dokuzentrum, arguing that history is written by the victors and reminding me forcefully of 'your Bomber Harris who destroyed Dresden' and who would, he argued, have been seen as a war criminal had Germany won the war.[21]

These various orientations to the Nazi past exemplified by interviewees were also part of their self-positioning and reflection on others. This was not just talking *about* the past and history but, as I discuss further in the following sections, also a way of drawing on it to negotiate identities and moral standpoints.

Ascribing heritage and identity

In Chapter 1 I suggested that some heritage posed particular identity difficulties, a history of perpetration being potentially especially unsettling. As we have seen in previous chapters, this was often perceived to be the case by those involved in publicly representing Nuremberg's Nazi heritage. But to what extent is this so for visitors too? And given that heritage is typically conceptualised as property, to whom is it seen to belong? That is, of whose identity is this heritage considered to be indicative?

As the discussion above suggests, many people, especially younger ones, may avoid identification with the heritage exhibited by seeing it as the product of a thoroughly other and past social collective: the Nazis. Self is defined contra 'the Nazis' in the 'then'/'now' temporal constructions employed by such visitors. For example, one teenager explained to me that 'then, in Nazi-times, you had to join in but now you are freer to decide what to do'. Rather than casting self-identity versus contemporary others, then, what is involved here is doing so via those of the past. While especially prevalent among younger visitors such a means of negotiating self was by no means restricted to them but might be employed by others too, sometimes alongside other

kinds of differentiations and identifications. So while talking about Nuremberg, a respondent might effectively do so contra 'the Nazis'. One local man, for example, told me how 'the Nazis came to Nuremberg and made it the City of the Party Rallies'. He also talked of the 'destruction of Nuremberg' and its rebuilding postwar, and how the latter was still in process today. Nuremberg – the city and its inhabitants – was thus seen as still dealing with the aftermath of wrongs done to it.

Temporal differentiation was not only restricted to the Nazi period. Some visitors, particularly those in their forties and fifties, invoked generational differences. This was often itself reflexively expressed in terms of how their own approach to the past differed from that of the previous generation. Those who were from 'the generation of the time', explained a man in his fifties, tended to prefer to 'keep silent'. This was in contrast to what he regarded as a preferable willingness to address the past among those 'who came after'. Such 'generational talk' is common in Germany, frequently being invoked in newspapers, for example; and many people simply talk about themselves as being one of 'those born after' – the implicit reference point is the Third Reich and, thus, the potential to have been a perpetrator. An interviewee born in 1941, for example, described himself as *'quasi Nachkrieggebohren*' – 'practically born after the war'. Such comments illustrate too the embeddedness of 'the war' as a reference point in continuing self-identification.

But what of national and local identifications? Visitors from outside Germany, who were nearly always visiting the site specifically in order to see the Nazi heritage, almost invariably talked about Germany and Germans. This was German heritage and the way in which it had been treated was evidence of a German 'mentality', as one Swiss visitor put it – though he also acknowledged that it was 'part of European history'. Another Swiss visitor, when asked his impressions of the place, replied simply 'ratlose Deutsche' – meaning Germans at a loss to know what to do. Despite such references to 'Germans', however, this is not to say that 'Germans' were necessarily considered to be a homogeneous and unchanging mass. Rather, what was taken-for-granted – in the way that Michael Billig regards as typical of banal nationalism[22] – was that the Nazi heritage was German. As such, foreign visitors might talk about the neglect of parts of the site as evidence of 'Germans wanting to forget about their past', as some Canadian visitors did; or they might equally praise Germans or Germany in terms like the following by a US visitor commenting on the Dokuzentrum:

> it just struck me that this can be here in this country in which this horror grew up at the time. That's a great tribute. In America, in the US, I wish [laughs] we could do something about some of the horrors that continue to be. It's a brave thing to do. And a great thing for the present generation to have for the future.

If the heritage was self-evidently 'German' to visitors from other countries, it was only partially so to visitors from Germany. The majority from places outside Nuremberg talked about the site and how it was being treated more specifically in terms of 'Nuremberg' rather than Germany. The city was usually invoked as the taken-for-granted agent; though occasionally respondents might specify the city council or authorities, or, in relation to the Dokuzentrum, its 'makers' or 'managers'.[23] Only

infrequently did non-Nuremberg German visitors talk about the Rally Grounds as 'German' or see what was happening in Nuremberg as directly connected to their own lives. One eloquent exception was a science professor from the Rhineland, born in 1938, who told me that he had wanted to come to the Rally Grounds precisely 'because there is so much silence about it in Germany'. 'Our government believes', he explained, 'that a temptation [*Verführung*] comes out from it, like a sweet poison or something, that one is no longer allowed to show the Germans'. This, he said, was analogous to the way that 'you are also not allowed to buy *Mein Kampf* in Germany – either because it is too poisonous, or because the Germans are so immature'. The result was 'that one isn't allowed to experience anything at all'. I must not, though, take him in any way as a typical respondent, he concluded: 'I am not the majority; I am never the majority'.

Among many, though not all, visitors, then, whether German or not, the tendency was to see the difficult heritage as belonging to others. Such an attribution of ownership could exist alongside making comparisons with other cases. So, for example, two black Americans talked of how they admired how Germany was looking at its own past and contrasted this with what they saw as the much more reluctant and limited addressing of slavery in their own country – 'if only back home would take such an enlightened view on its history, *our* history. You have to admire the Germans for how they are looking at theirs so head on'. Visitors from other parts of Germany likewise, while seeing the site as particularly the product of 'Nuremberg', simultaneously talked about how in their own localities there had been similar, sometimes earlier, moves to somehow marking or commemorating the atrocities of Nazism. While they engaged in cosmopolitan analogy-making, then, they simultaneously ascribed 'ownership' – and effectively responsibility for – the Nazi Party Rally Grounds to others than themselves.

So what of those from Nuremberg? Only very few used deictic linguistic forms such as 'we' or 'our' that implied a sense of ownership or identity with this heritage.[24] Frequently, they used passive forms that avoided needing an agent. So, for example, they might talk of how it was good that there was now a documentation centre or they might refer to an event such as the renovation of the Great Road, but without mentioning who had undertaken this. It might be the case, as Michael Billig's discussion of deixis suggests, that such forms can be evidence of taking an identity category (he talks of the nation) for granted. However, given such respondents' tendency in other parts of their talk to refer to, say, the Nazis, as mentioned above, or to the city authorities, it seems more likely that these agent-less constructions are more reflective of a sense of events happening beyond respondents' control and perhaps even without their knowing who was involved.

While there is a clear tendency, then, for all of those confronted by difficult heritage to engage in a kind of identity-partitioning that results in the heritage being seen as not belonging to them, this is not to say that they do not recognise the identity problems involved in negotiating such heritage. Visitors from outside Germany discussed, often with great sensitivity and sophistication, the dilemmas for Germans of addressing this history and of whether they might end up 'always having to keep thinking about it', as a woman from Britain put it. So too did visitors

from other parts of Germany in relation to Nuremberg. And many of those from Nuremberg, even if they tended not to see themselves as in any way responsible for the developments at the Rally Grounds site, talked about questions of how the city would be seen in relation to either addressing or appearing to hide this aspect of its history. Here, with the exception of the minority which voiced the view that too much attention was given to the Nazi past, visitors agreed that it was right that this history was being acknowledged and education provided about it. Many gave descriptions of how the Nazi past had been less acknowledged in earlier years – some remarking, for example, on the fact that the earlier exhibition was only open for part of the year or that visitors often couldn't even find the site – and approved a change towards what they regarded as a greater openness on the part of Germany/Nuremberg. 'I think it is right that we should talk about these things more', said one man who had been a member of the Hitler Youth, 'and I think it is right that we should make sure that the young people know about it all. Yes, it is a good thing that there is this museum [i.e. the Dokuzentrum]'. Some talked about the shift as a consequence of generational change – 'We probably had to wait until the perpetrator generation was gone' said a doctor in his fifties; and the science professor quoted above commented that the silence which he observed 'might change now that Leni Riefenstahl has died'. Many also talked about it in terms of recognising a need to ensure that a younger generation would know about the events – that they would 'never forget' – 'even when all of the eye-witnesses have gone, as they almost have already', as the doctor noted. The shift was sometimes also characterised simply as evidence of 'a more mature approach', as a South African teacher put it. This was an approach in which the country/city was seen as having attained a more advanced identity, capable of acknowledging and reflecting upon their own dreadful heritage.

A kind of cosmopolitanism?

An electrician born in 1966 is sitting on a bench smoking a cigarette and reading the *Bild*, a tabloid newspaper, during his lunch-break from his workplace nearby. He comes very often because it is near and he likes to get a bit of peace and relaxation during his lunch-break; and he has come to know the whole area quite well, though has not visited the exhibition in the Zeppelin Building and the Dokuzentrum is not yet open. He thinks it's making a good development, he says, as it will attract tourists and bring money to the city. But he hopes that there won't be anything about Nazis in it as there is already far too much about them.

> We should look to the future instead of the past. Other countries also have bad things in their pasts. OK, Germany's was especially brutal but it is now fifty years ago. France was as bad, and England with the colonies was too in the past. People shouldn't just go on about Germany. The exhibition should be about criminal humanity and not just about criminal

> Germans. Maybe [he pauses] it should not just be about humanity but perhaps animal welfare or the environment … There is just far too much about the Nazis, it's always on TV and in the newspapers. It's all to do with the media. A few weeks ago everything was about ferocious dogs and strangely a child seemed to be being attacked every day. Now it's all about neo-Nazis. Next week perhaps it will be child-abuse or pornography. So I don't take the media too seriously.

Material suggestivity

In making moral commentaries about how history had been addressed – either by Germans or Nuremberg – visitors frequently did so through observations about the physical site itself. That is, its state and what had been done with it, were talked about as evidence of how Germans or Nuremberg had negotiated their past. Thus, the Spanish student quoted in Chapter 1 talked of the weeds growing on the Zeppelin Building as indicating a neglecting of the past. So too did other visitors. Both Mr Smith and a man in his thirties from the former East said that the neglect of the Zeppelin Building in particular showed that 'they' wanted to 'bury' this past. The buildings were thus regarded as both metaphors for, and tangible evidence of, the historical consciousness of those responsible for this heritage.[25] More vociferously, a group of Canadians in their early thirties expressed shock at the way that the Zeppelin marching ground had been grassed over and turned into football pitches – something that one of them described as 'gentrification'. One said 'This place sends a message: let's forget about it'; and another expanded, 'It's like Germany's black-mark – they want to hide this history and forget about it'. They made comparisons with the US 'where there's plaques everywhere and you have, like, the Holocaust Museum in Washington'. People playing tennis or skateboarding were described as 'just ignoring history, and Jews, who were the ones who really suffered because of all of this'. The place should instead be redeveloped as a location in which 'to learn about history' and as 'a shrine to Jews and the Holocaust'.

Other visitors, however, were less disapproving. A woman from London, born in 1946, thought for a while about the mixed uses of the place and the fact that many parts seemed to be falling into disrepair and concluded that she thought that this was 'right – there shouldn't be a special effort to look after it or treat it as special. Just leaving it to crumble gives a certain feeling. No, they shouldn't do anything differently – they should just leave it to decay'. And a couple of women from Frankfurt, taking a stroll out across the area during their lunch-break while on a work-related visit nearby, talked through arguments for and against different approaches to such heritage as they pondered the question of what should be done. Their discussion, which also ranges into other key themes, is reproduced below as an example too of the ways in which visitors may collectively negotiate complexities of the site as they jointly reflect upon it.

Negotiating a difficult site

Two women, born 1964 and 1974, who I will call Frau A and Frau B respectively, are sitting on the steps of the Zeppelin Building. They are from Frankfurt and are in Nuremberg, a city that they have never been to previously, for work reasons. It is their first day and, as they are working nearby, they have come to look around the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds during their lunch-break. The following is an excerpt from our discussion, held in September 2003.

SHARON: What do you think of this place?

FRAU A: Disappointing!

SHARON: Why?

FRAU A: Well, because it is all torn apart. I mean, I can understand it, but I had somehow thought that there would be more left. I saw a report on television and it was …, it showed around here and somehow I had the impression that it was more or less maintained as it was. But you have to really search and here you've got the rows to the right [she gesticulates to where the seating of the Zeppelin field would have been] and, there, to the left, and so you can see the boundaries. But it is all totally destroyed; and there behind, behind the stands. So in principle you could take it all away given how it now is.

FRAU B: Yes, one simply imagined it otherwise. One naturally knows it from all those Nazi films, and, yes, here it now is …

FRAU A: Even with the fences and the trees it now is …

FRAU B: But despite that I find it somehow strange, because you imagine what once happened here.

FRAU A: Only unfortunately you don't experience it fully … though you are also impressed by … even the building style, I find it so ugly. I think it is … well, does it remain impressive? Only for what it was once used. That is then another matter; but that has been lost.

SHARON: Have you seen other buildings here?

FRAU A: No. We came straight here. There are hardly any signs and it isn't easy to find. And the Nurembergers don't really know. We asked about it …

SHARON: And they didn't know where? [Agreement] What does this place mean to you?

FRAU B: Well, I have no personal feelings about it. I am too young for that.

FRAU B: It simply interested me. It interested me and it also belongs, I think, to that which one just knows about. It would also have interested me if it had all been beautiful here.

SHARON: Should anything be changed here?

FRAU B: Everything costs a lot of money to maintain. So, I think, there is surely no longer anything else like here. So it would be good if this here could be kept. But then you would need to tear it all down again and bring

it back to condition, just in order to give the impression of its enormous size, or, I don't know how to say it …

FRAU B: I think another function is … a warning-memorial [*Mahnmal*] function or some such. There are, I think, other things. There are, for example, plenty of concentration camps in Germany that have been renovated. I think those are more effective as warning-memorials than here, because if you were to renovate here, that would only result in something beautiful. That [gesticulating to Zeppelin Building] would look like a lovely, impressive grandstand but not like a warning-memorial. And so I also think that it should surely somehow be maintained … and surely they are also doing that in a way … but whether it is worth it, or what can be achieved by it … then maybe one should also call a halt.

FRAU A: That is the question. Because it would also become difficult again, if one then actually held events here, if these were offered, then … if it was actually … then it would be the question here again; well, OK, there weren't actually people killed here in that sense but despite that it is then naturally very difficult.

FRAU B: That is perhaps the reason why nothing was done here for so long.

[…]

FRAU A: If you wanted to renovate it, say, then you shouldn't, as already said, hold fun events here. Or if you have to use it for something completely different, and forget what happened here … but you can't do that either …

FRAU B: Or, on the contrary, you could now say, we'll celebrate here against the opinion of what the Nazis thought or did. You could take it as a counter-event [*Gegenveranstaltung*], which would also make it profane, without question.

FRAU A: You can interpret it in so many ways and… over the years that also gets forgotten, that's clear … Why not use it for something else? Then probably it will just get used for that. I know from old photographs that it was very impressive. So it is difficult, yes, without question.

FRAU B: I don't know for sure what should be done here, and what not. It is not so burdened as a concentration camp, certainly …

FRAU A: But it naturally presents something from a regime that one does not want anymore […] I am very ambivalent about what should be done … It is difficult.

Unusual in this interview, and partly a function of the lengthy working through of possibilities, is the idea of profaning the site through particular kinds of activities. As we have seen in earlier chapters this is an idea promoted by some of those involved in the management of the site, though generally in relation to existing casual uses for leisure activities, and for the physical neglect of the site, rather than the more active 'counter-events' that Frau B suggests here. No other visitors using the site in ways that

some of the history-workers might count as profanation used this or related language to describe their activities. Instead, they simply reported what they did or, if prompted to comment, casually remarked that they thought it acceptable that the place be used in such ways. As justification, some of them pointed out that it was a park before it was taken over by the National Socialists. They did not, however, express themselves as engaged in some kind of active profanation or countering of Nazi poison. This, I suggest, is partly because they did not load the site with such symbolic significance in the first place: it was simply a place at which a range of activities takes place, which they did not regard as incompatible with one another. A man born in 1934, playing tennis against the Zeppelin Building, put it this way: 'You get used to it. And then you don't think about it any more. It is a piece of history – nothing more'. As a 'piece of history' it should be kept, but, he laughed, it should also be resurfaced to improve its quality for tennis-playing.

As I have noted above, any one individual may engage in a range of diverse activities at the site. For example, another man (b. 1956) who I talked to in 2000 as he took a break from playing tennis up the side of the Zeppelin Building, an activity that he came to the site for about once per month, had also visited the exhibition three times with youth groups, though had stopped doing so as they found it too 'intellectual' and 'worthy', and insufficiently 'direct'. He nevertheless talked at length about how important he considered education about the Nazi past to be and of the necessity to retain this particular place 'for future generations'. Carefully differentiating what he called the 'history function' and the 'sport function' of the grounds in his replies, he argued that more could be made of the place in both respects – these not in his view being at all incompatible.

Figure 8.1 Football fans at Nazi Party Rally Grounds for World Cup 2006

People may also engage in the 'history function' and 'sport function' on a single visit. When in 2006 Germany hosted the football World Cup, numerous visitors to football matches at Nuremberg's stadium on the Rally Grounds – where some of the matches were held – also went to visit the Rally Grounds site and the Dokuzentrum exhibition. In preparation for this event, new and more extensive information panels were also set up around the grounds, meaning that in future there would also be more chance of the history and sport functions overlapping to some extent.

The fact that people do not seem troubled by the idea of using the place in various ways – that others (such as the Canadians quoted above) might think incompatible or at least in bad taste – does not mean that they do not engage in any kind of symbolic interpretation of the site's materiality. On the contrary, this was widespread among all kinds of interviewees. As I noted in the previous chapter, many people told me, often with great relish, the story of the Silbersee – the poisonous lake. That the Nazis had left behind physical poison – either directly or indirectly as war rubble – that could continue to attract but that would only result in death was a compelling allegory. Some visitors remarked on the trees growing around the site in ways that seemed to imply that the Nazi presence on the site, and by analogy in the country, was declining. 'It is good that nature is coming back', said one local woman, 'that is what we need more of'. At the same time, however, it was not only the Spanish student who saw weeds growing on the Zeppelin building as an indication of Germans or Nuremberg trying to ignore the past; and many people complained about litter, some of them attributing this to 'people today who don't show awareness' – a comment that sometimes seemed to have historical as well as environmental resonance.

How far the materiality of the site is suggestive directly to the senses or emotions, rather than being actively interpreted by visitors, is more difficult to determine. Certainly, physical qualities make practical differences to how people use it. The walls of the Zeppelin Building making for such good tennis practice, or the outer corridors of the Congress Hall providing quiet shelter in which to sleep rough, are just a couple of examples of uses of the site that were never originally intended but to which its material qualities lend themselves. But what of the intended Nazi effects? How far are the buildings and former marching grounds still able to impact and enchant in the ways that Hitler and Speer had hoped? Watching people using the place and hearing them talk about it, it seemed to me that there was little to indicate much of this. Certainly, some would stand where Hitler would have stood on the Zeppelin Building, and they might even give a Nazi salute, but this was typically accompanied by joking and parody. And, certainly, some visitors talked of the chilling nature of the site, prompting them to quiet reflection. The woman from London quoted above described the site as 'eery' and giving her 'a funny feeling'. But in all of their accounts it seemed that what was involved was not so much being directly affected by particular calculated features of the architecture as by their own pre-formed visions of it. They accounted for their senses of disquiet by, for example, knowing that this was where Hitler stood or by imagining vast fervent National Socialist crowds chanting in unison on the marching fields. The London woman explained to me that she had seen the place on newsreels and photographs; as did Frau A and B from Frankfurt. Even Mr Smith, who claimed to 'feel the power' of the buildings went on to talk – in

very specific visual detail – about how he was mapping his visual memories of Leni Riefenstahl's films onto what he could see in front of him.

The relative material ineloquence of this site, however, should not necessarily be taken to conclude that this is so for all buildings or places. On the contrary, in its original state the site would undoubtedly have been better – though never unequivocally – able to make particular affective suggestions. Now, however, broken up, grassed over, amputated, skated and cycled upon, it needs considerable assistance from other media, and from pictures held in visitors' imaginations, to do much affective work at all.

Future visions

In previous chapters we have seen how this site of difficult heritage has been negotiated primarily by history workers and others involved in its management and presentation over the years, and I have presented plans for the site to be, variously, destroyed, restored or altered. Plans, I have suggested, however apparently practical, are also indicative of other kinds of cultural assumptions and hopes.[26] In this chapter too we have seen how visitors' various ways of thinking about history and the past, and about materiality, may be reflected in their comments about what should happen in the future. As these have been discussed only partially and in passing, here I provide a brief overview of their speculations on the future of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds.

None of the visitors – even those who wanted a line to be drawn under the Nazi past – argued that any of the original buildings or grounds should be destroyed or removed. Overwhelmingly the most common response to my question about what should be done in the future was to keep what was there. This was often expanded to 'for future generations', 'as a place to learn history' or 'as a warning-memorial'. One woman, born in 1930, spoke for many when she emphatically replied: 'I think that it really must be preserved here in this place and it must for ever more be shown to people. It must never fall into forgottenness'.

On the extent to which such preservation should be accompanied by restoration, visitors were much more divided, with visitors from outside Germany generally arguing more frequently and strongly for at least some attempt to return the buildings or marching grounds to their original state. A man (b.1943) from Britain, for example, argued that 'it should be reconstructed to how it appeared in the 1930s – it was such a defining moment in German history'; and a marine engineer from Australia (b. 1968) argued not just for restoration but for completing the unfinished buildings. (He was especially keen on completing the vast glass roof planned for the Congress Hall.) That German respondents were much less likely to suggest any kind of restoration was surely related to their own greater discomfort over the idea of appearing to reconstruct anything from the Nazi period, physical reconstruction being seen as potentially a reconstruction of other Nazi qualities and agency. I have already discussed above some views on the mixed uses of the site. Several respondents also argued that it was important that the site – including the interiors of buildings such as the Congress Hall – be used for a range of purposes because this could bring a wider audience, who might then come into contact 'with the history by chance', as one

woman put it. Even though many accepted that it was used in multiple ways, however, most were against any further building developments, especially, for 'commercial purposes'. This latter was also part of a more general opposing of commerce and making money with what were envisioned as higher aims of commemoration and history pedagogy – as we have seen in previous chapters too.

While many visitors, from Germany and elsewhere, argued for the importance of preservation of the physical structures as a means of preventing forgetting, there was some variation in how a memorial function was conceived. So while Canadian visitors stated that the site 'should be a shrine for Jews and the Holocaust', a student from Hamburg (b. 1978) argued that there should not be more information panels provided as this would 'turn it into a *Mahnmal*'. For him, a historical site was 'more objective', as he put it, if not marked in this way. Many more visitors, however, called for better signposting and more information panels (both of which have now been provided) – that is, for technologies to accompany people to learn and remember as part of their moral witnessing.

* * * * *

Perhaps more than anything, what talking to people at this site of difficult heritage made evident to me was how varied and sophisticated were the ways in which they talked both directly about it and used it as a prompt for reflecting on many connected matters. These included reflections on the past, present and future; on their own biographies and families as well as on the actions of governments, leaders, nations, members of the resistance and neo-Nazis.

A good deal of this talk, even among those visiting for leisure, was morally-inflected. (Recall Frau Müller's self-positioning reminiscences of racism, described in the first intervention in this chapter.) Difficult heritage prompts such ethical reflection. And this, I have suggested, is partly what draws many people to make educational visits to such sites. It provides an opportunity not only to learn about the particular histories that such places present but also to engage in broader moral consideration and self-positioning. Many interviewees did this spontaneously, without any direct prompting from me; and some commented on how they had already been discussing such matters among themselves. While all acknowledged that there were other information sources about the same topics, they regarded coming to an actual site – 'the place where history happened' – to nevertheless be distinctive and more effective in helping them 'grasp' it. The rather physical expression so often employed here – to 'grasp' (*greifen*, or to make *greifbar*) seems significant. One feature of physically attending an actual heritage site or exhibition is that, compared with many other kinds of sources, you are more forcefully pushed into paying attention. Many visitors commented on how the exhibition 'keeps you in there', some expressing a degree of irritation about this but several commenting that they thought this somehow right.[27] Moreover, making a visit typically entails a good deal of effort, many people having travelled considerable distances, which also increases their commitment to a relatively concentrated experience.

This relatively concentrated and collective experience is a dimension of what I have called moral witnessing. Attending a site of difficult heritage is also a performance of a wider commitment to remembering atrocity and evil, and, thus, to guarding against them. Although inherent in this understanding is the idea that what happens during the time-space of a heritage visit somehow seeps out beyond it, into everyday life, visitors nevertheless simultaneously regard such attention as something that they only need to attend to sometimes, almost like periodic inoculations. The woman who I quoted in Chapter 1, who doubted whether it was a good thing to spend too much time looking back at this history, put this idea well when she explained that nevertheless she thought it good to go back to it every 'now and then'. The Swiss visitor who had spent almost six hours in the exhibition told me that he was thinking of going to the fair later in the evening. I felt bad to disappoint him by telling him that it was not open on that particular day.

NOTES

These notes use the following abbreviations:
FAZ – Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung
GfA – *Geschichte für Alle*, History for All
NN – Nürnberger Nachrichten, Nuremberg News
NAnz – Nürnberger Anzeiger, Nuremberg Reporter
NZ – Nürnberger Zeitung, Nuremberg Newspaper
StAN – StadtArchiv Nürnberg, Nuremberg City Archive
TZ – Tageszeitung, Daily Newspaper
All translations are mine unless otherwise stated.
All website listed were checked in January 2008.

1 Introduction

1 In using the term 'story' I give recognition to the fact that this is, inevitably, a selective and crafted account (Clifford 1997). It is shaped by a narrative drive to explore wider questions and tell about these, rather than to provide a full documentation. Nevertheless, I have striven for empirical accuracy and the account has been constrained by the research findings and a consideration of much more 'data' than can be presented here.
2 See, for example, Buruma 2002: 112–35; Yoshida 2006; Duffy 2001 and http://humanum.arts.cuhk.edu.hk/NanjingMassacre/NMGP.html. Note: Nanking is also sometimes spelt Nanjing.
3 The dispute over the display of the *Enola Gay* at the US National Air and Space Museum is the classical example; see Linenthal and Engelhardt 1996. See Grayling 2006 and Niven 2006a on Dresden; and on a recent dispute at the Canadian War Museum, see Dean F. Oliver, 'A Museum of History, a History of Remembrance', Canadian War Museum, 27.03.2007 at www.warmuseum.ca/cwm/media/bg_history_e.html.
4 And also individuals. Handler 1988; Macdonald 1997a; the notion of 'expressive individuation' is derived from Taylor 1989.
5 Buruma 2002: 114.
6 See, for example, Bevan 2006, which includes further examples, such as the obliteration of Turkish-Muslim heritage, especially the Bridge of Mostar, by Croats.
7 The term 'memorial entrepreneur' is from Jordan 2006.
8 Graham *et al.* 2000: 24; and also Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996: 21; the following quote is also from Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996: 21.
9 Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996: Chapter 5.
10 Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996: 21.

11 In German this distinction between 'places of perpetrators' (*Orte der Täter*) and 'places of victims' (*Orte der Opfer*) is widely used in commentary on the treatment of such sites.
12 See Law 1986 on the notion of 'action at a distance'.
13 Macdonald 2005a.
14 This is adapted from what Alpers 1991 and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 51–4 have called 'the museum effect'; see also Macdonald 2006a.
15 Porombka and Schmundt 2006 includes this and other German examples.
16 A focus on 'assemblage' entails looking at the heterogeneous elements – material and discursive – involved in constituting a particular entity. Key theorists are Latour (e.g. 2005) and Deleuze and Guattari (e.g. 1987); see also de Landa (2006), and Collier and Ong (2005), who develop the notion of 'global assemblage', which I discuss in the final chapter of this book. I have discussed assemblage theorising, including some of its limitations, in Macdonald forthcoming.
17 Key theorists include Jeismann (e.g. 1985) and Rüsen (e.g. 1990, 2001, 2005). See also Macdonald 2000, Straub 2005 and Berger 1997.
18 Olick 2003: 8. See also Crane 2004; Macdonald 2006a.
19 Bevan 2006; and on destruction and forgetting more generally see Forty 1999, Küchler 1999.
20 See, for example, Kaschuba 2002; Williams 2007 on the related development of the memorial museum; and Beck-Gernsheim 1999 and Bodemann 2002 on the turn to Jewish culture in Germany.
21 Hughes 2004.
22 Coombes 2003; Dubin 2006a; Karp *et al.* 2006.
23 See the museum's website: www.terrorhaza.hu/index3.html. Jewish groups have criticised the fact that the building's earlier use by the Nazis is played down and the fact that some of the Communist interrogators were Jewish is played up. See: www.jewishsf.com/bk020809/i42.shtml.
24 See *Sites of Conscience* website (which also lists other examples): www.sitesofconscience.org/eng/gulag.htm.
25 Arditti 1999.
26 Huyssen 2003: 102; for more information about the development see the site's official website: www.parquedelamemoria.org.ar/parque-ing/motivacion.htm.
27 Discussed further in Macdonald 2007. For the museum's official website see: www.usnationalslaverymuseum. See also Graham *et al.* 2001.
28 See the project's website at: http://nmaahc.si.edu/.
29 Novick 1999.
30 Hochschild 1998, 2005.
31 Horton and Kardux 2004.
32 The museums' official websites are, respectively: www.empiremuseum.co.uk/ and www.internationalslaverymuseum.org.uk/.
33 Dubin 2006b: 482.
34 See Zimmerer 2006; Olick 2007; Nobles 2003; Hayner 2001; Edkins 2003.
35 Cf. Huyssen 2003, Hoelscher 2006, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998.
36 Huyssen 2003: 14.
37 See Levy and Sznaider 2001, 2002.
38 Maier 1997; Dudek 1992; Weber 1990.
39 Glaeser 2000: 326.
40 Neumann 2000: 10.
41 Hoelscher 2006: 202.
42 Collins German Dictionary 1980. See Macdonald 2006a for further discussion. Interestingly, my more recent dictionary, Collins German Dictionary 1997 has a different example: that of colonialism.
43 Rosenfeld 2000: 2.

44 Koshar 1998, 2000; Lynch 1976; Lowenthal 1998; Barthel 1996; Littler and Naidoo 2005; Graham *et al.* 2000 **<?SHOULD THIS BE 2001? IF NOT PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS**]; and see Lowenthal 1985 for a discussion of changing conceptions of time and their implications for heritage. John Soane 2002 is an interesting account of differences between English and German conservation practices that, he argues, have roots in the different histories of industrialisation and urbanisation in the two countries. In Britain, he argues, industrialisation was early and fairly rapid, leading to a sense of a 'more radical break from the past' (2002: 269) than in Germany, which industrialised later and maintained more sense of historic continuity. In consequence, he argues, in Britain 'the significance of "heritage" is considered as being something quite distinct from the normal experience of the modern world' whereas in Germany to a greater extent 'the contemplation and interpretation of the built past is considered a relevant and integrated element within the contemporary lifestyle of the country' (2002: 268).
45 Lowenthal 1998: 5; Pickard 2002; see also Herzfeld 1991.
46 Pickard 2002; 'Germans were to the forefront of this worldwide [preservation] movement, and by 1975 West Germans were convinced that one of every twelve buildings had historical value', Koshar 1998: 5.
47 Boswell and Evans 1999; Littler 2005.
48 Niven 2002; Reichel 2001; Koshar 1998; Maier 1997.
49 Moeller 2001: 18.
50 Reichel 1999; Niven 2002: Chapter 1; Neumann 2000: Chapter 8.
51 Moeller 2001: 15.
52 See, for example, Moeller 2001; Gregor 2003a and forthcoming; Koshar 1998; Frei 1999; and on pre-1949, Olick 2005.
53 Moeller 2001: 18.
54 Ibid.: 19.
55 Rüsen 2005: 200.
56 Generationalist arguments also need a word of caution. First, generations are not the 'naturally occurring' phenomena that they are sometimes conceived as being in such perspectives – rather, they have to be defined in relation to some chosen 'starting point' and decisions have to be made about how to map generation onto particular time-stretches (Davis 1989; Misztal 2003: 83–91). More importantly, however, generationalist arguments tend to depict history in terms of clearly distinguishable periods, 'presuppose a determining set of experiences and values common to a specific social age group' (Carrier 2000: 45), deploy the notion of generation change itself as sufficient explanation and erase differences within a 'generation'.
57 E.g. Maier 1997.
58 E.g. Niven 2002; Thiele 1997; Macdonald 2007.
59 E.g. Carrier 2005; Young 2000 Chapter 7; Niven 2002: Chapter 8; Jeismann 1999; Brumlik *et al.* 2000.
60 Clifford 1988.
61 Geertz 1973: 448.
62 For example, Knischewski and Spittler 1997 suggest that the 1980s constitutes a distinct phase of 'conservative backlash'; this is followed by a post-unification stage. Kansteiner 2006a and b sees the period since 1990s as one of 'routinisation, professionalisation and fragmentation'.
63 E.g. König 2003.
64 Rüsen 2005: 201.
65 Assmann 2006: Chapter 7; Niven 2006b.
66 Levy and Sznaider 2001, 2002; and see Chapter six below; see also Jeismann 2001; and Kansteiner 2006a, Chapter 12, who suggests that a 'Europeanisation of … political memory' may be underway since the 1990s.
67 Levy and Sznaider 2002: 98.
68 Interview with the author in 2000.

69 In the Nuremberg metropolitan region, with a population of about 2.5 million, 18 per cent of the population is recorded as constituted by foreign nationals, which the city council website points out is higher than the average in Bavaria or Germany (www.nuernberg.de/internet/portal_e/buerger/city_portrait.html).
70 With the exception of the early months postwar when the occupying US forces imposed a temporary mayor; see Chapter 3.
71 Kosfeld 2001: 69; GfA 2002b: 246.
72 E.g. Ladd 1997; Till 2005; Rosenfeld 2000; Dietzfelbinger and Liedtke 2004; Sereny 2000; Carrier 2005. For discussion and critique see Kauders 2003 and Kansteiner 2002.
73 See Nash 1995: 93–3; Huyssen 1995 Chapter 11; Simons 1997; Saltzman 1999. I have discussed these ideas further in relation to what I call a 'multi-temporal' anthropological approach: Macdonald 2002a.
74 E.g. Macfarlane 2007.

2 Building heritage

1 Gerstenblith 2006.
2 See Gieryn 2002 on the theorisation of 'what buildings do'; see also Parker Pearson and Richards 1994; Markus 1993. For other accounts of the multiple interpretation, presentation and use of buildings see, for example, Bender 1998; Edensor 1998; Buchli 1999 and Breglia 2006.
3 Littler 2005: 13.
4 Tilley 2004: 31.
5 See also Miller 2005 for a helpful overview. Key references are Gell 1998 and work by Bruno Latour, e.g. 1993. I have discussed some of this further in relation to this material in Macdonald 2006b and forthcoming.
6 Hertz 2006. See also Needham1974; Kress and van Leeuwen 2006.
7 Speer 1995: 61.
8 Speer 1978: 8.
9 Kershaw 1998: 156; Scobie 1990.
10 Schmidt 1995.
11 Petsch 1992: 199.
12 Petsch 1992: 199; Koch 1995.
13 Benton 1999: 211; Hughes 2003.
14 Petsch 1992: 198.
15 Jaskot 2000: 50.
16 Sontag 1990: 208.
17 Sturken and Cartwright 2001: 163.
18 For an account of his arguments see Speer 1978; Jaskot 2000: Chapter 6; and also Sereny 1996 (e.g. p.153). As Grasskamp (1990) and Jaskot (2000) observe, there has been a tendency among art historians (and also in the Nuremberg trials) to separate off Speer's role as an architect from his position from 1942 as head of the Ministry of Armaments and Munitions, and to regard only the latter as political, thereby 'ignor[ing] the essential political interests served by his actions as the most powerful architect in National Socialist Germany' (Jaskot 2000: 140).
19 Speer 1978: 8.
20 He says 'property relations'. Benjamin 1992: 234.
21 Hewitt 1993: 166; cf. 'Monumental buildings mask the will to power and the arbitrariness of power beneath signs and surfaces which claim to express collective will and collective thought' Lefebvre 1991: 143.
22 Speer 1978, 1995; Burden 1967; Jaskot 2000; Doosry 2002.
23 Dietzfelbinger and Liedtke 2004: 36.
24 Gunther Kress has developed a sensitive analytical approach – 'social semiotics' – to these kinds of questions. E.g. Kress and van Leeuwen 2006, 2001.

11 The section on the conclusion of the tour also states: 'Geschichte für Alle does not want to present a "lesson" from the Rally Grounds and the dealings with them. How you conclude the tour depends on the group and individual opinions/desires/feelings' (GfA 1999: 42).
12 Schmidt 1992/3: 11.
13 In Hall's terms, what they are seeking is a 'dominant-hegemonic' reading, though as the tours might themselves be seen as counter-dominant-hegemonic (in that when the tours were first begun they were undertaken against the preference of the city and tourism authorities at that time to ignore the party Rally Grounds) the terminology seems less appropriate in this case.
14 GfA 1999: 15.
15 Fine and Speer 1984.
16 Speer 1995.
17 GfA 1999: 23.
18 GfA 1999:6.
19 Schmidt 1992/3: 12.
20 Ogan and Jahn 1996.
21 Brooker and Jermyn 2003: 127.
22 Askew 2002.

8 Visiting difficult heritage

1 E.g. Lennon and Foley 2000: 3; see also Williams 2007 on 'memorial museums'.
2 Visitor figures – Documentation Centre of the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds.
3 As Lennon and Foley note, 'there is … little research available on the significance that such visits have to those who make them' (2000: 4); though for a couple of excellent exceptions see Kugelmass on Jewish tourism to Poland 1992 and Sandell 2007 on visits to the Anne Frank house. There is, however, a considerable body of scholarship theorising tourist motivation in general, much of it developing the classic accounts of Cohen (1970) and MacCannell (1989) – both of which emphasise, to different degrees, modernist quests for authenticity and escaping of routine. Urry's notion of the 'post-tourist' (1990) is a partial critique of the centrality accorded to authenticity in these accounts. Lennon and Foley draw on this earlier work to suggest that what they call 'dark tourism' involves 'anxiety and doubt about the project of modernity' (2000: 11).
4 See Meethan 2001: 153–6.
5 In addition to extensive observational experience, staff at the Dokuzentrum have been carrying out primarily quantitative research.
6 Especially in larger groups some participants would occasionally join or leave part way through, so figures are to some extent inexact.
7 Dokuzentrum figures on this?
8 In my account below, in order not to make the text too cumbersome I do not provide details about all respondents, particularly where their comments are representative of others' too.
9 Part of John Urry's argument in *The Tourist Gaze* (1990) is that tourism is increasingly blended into other activities. In this case, however, it is the multiple identity of the site that is especially significant.
10 In research on visiting of the Science Museum in London, 'doing place' was likewise one of what I there called the 'cultural itineraries' of visiting (Macdonald 2002b: Chapter 8.
11 Kugelmass 1992: 401; his argument draws on Connerton 1989.
12 On the importance of family memorial practices see Welzer *et al.* 2002. What is also evident in the ways in which visitors talk is that a visit to an 'actual site' seems to set up a debate for them about the qualities and affect of different sources.
13 For discussion of *Mahnmal s*ee Chapter 4. Neumann writes the following about the term *Gedenkstätte:* 'The verb *gedanken* means "to commemorate" or "to remember". A

Gedenkstätte is a kind of extended *Denkmal*. The term could refer to a larger landscaped complex with several different monuments. In most cases, a *Gedenkstätte* includes the display of information, or a museum … The most prominent *Gedenkstätten* in today's Germany are those at the sites of former concentration camps' (2000: 11).

14 Macdonald 2005b.
15 Reither 1996.
16 Rüsen 2005.
17 Lowenthal 1985 traces the history of this way of thinking about the past.
18 Huyssen 2006: 182.
19 Macdonald 2005b: 130. Welzer *et al.* 2002 also provide examples of such historical partitioning – accompanied by a blurring together of different periods of history into a generalised 'past'.
20 Hall 1980; and see previous chapter.
21 The argument about victors writing the history also occurred in various comments in the Dokuzentrum visitor books: Macdonald 2005b.
22 Billig 1995.
23 There is further discussion of this in Macdonald 2005b.
24 The use of such language is discussed in Billig 1995.
25 Cf. Hughes 2003.
26 See also Abram 1998.
27 This has implications for assumptions often made in heritage management about visitors necessarily wanting freedom of choice. I also discuss this in Macdonald 2002b: Chapter 8.

9 Unsettling diffcult heritage

1 Collier and Ong 2005.
2 Tsing 2005: 'Cultures are continually co-produced in the interactions I call "friction": the awkward, unequal, unstable, and creative qualities of interconnection across difference', p. 4.
3 See Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim 1999 for insightful discussion.
4 See note 14, Chapter 1.
5 This was an argument of Hewison's *The Heritage Industry* (1987); and is part of Walter Benjamin's concern over heritage (Buck-Morss 1987: 331).
6 Collier and Ong 2005: 4.
7 Städtebaulicher Ideenwettbewerb für das ehemalige Reichsparteitagsgelände 2001 *Dokumentation*, Auslober: Stadt Nürnberg. See also Baulust 2004 *Positionen: Zum Umgang mit dem ehemaligen Reichsparteitagsgelände*, Nuremberg: Initiative für Architektur und Öffentlichkeit e.V.
8 'Fans shown the "blue card" on how to behave', *Telegraph* 16.06.2006. The Nuremberg authorities were particularly concerned about the likely behaviour of England fans. For this reason they produced a 'blue card' informing fans of the illegality of Nazi insignia among other things. In the event, there were few arrests and the authorities seem to have been relieved about the general behaviour, if not the joke Nazi helmets worn by some fans. 'Police praise England fans', *Guardian* 16.06.2006. Having a photograph in the Hitler podium on the Zeppelin Building seems to have been almost de rigeur for fans, BBC Sport World Cup 2006 blog 'The old and the new in Nuremberg' 22.06.2006.
9 Young 2000: 1–11; quote on p. 9.

REFERENCES

Abram, Simone 1998 'Introduction: anthropological perspectives on local development', in S. Abram and J. Waldren (eds) *Anthropological Perspectives on Local Development*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–17.

Adorno, Theodor 1986 'What does coming to terms with the past mean?', in Geoffrey H. Hartmann (ed.) *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 114–30.

Alpers, Svetlana 1991 'The museum as a way of seeing', in I. Karp and S.D. Lavine (eds) *Exhibiting Cultures. The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, pp. 25–32.

Arditti, Rita 1999 *Searching for Life. The Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo and the Disappeared Children of Argentina*, Berkeley: California University Press.

Askew, Kelly 2002 'Introduction', in K. Askew and R.R. Wilk (eds) *The Anthropology of Media*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–13.

Askew, Kelly and Richard R. Wilk (eds) 2002 *The Anthropology of Media*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Assmann, Aleida 2006 *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Barthel, Diane 1996 *Historic Preservation. Collective Memory and Historical Identity*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Beck, Ulrich and Edgar Grande 2007 *Cosmopolitan Europe*, Cambridge: Polity.

Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth 1999 *Juden, Deutsche und andere Erinnerungslandschaften*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Beer, Helmut, Thomas Heyden, Christian Koch, Gerd-Dieter Liedtke, Winfried Nerdinger, Alexander Schmidt 1995 *Bauen in Nürnberg 1933–1945. Architektur und Bauformen im Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag.

Beier-de Haan, Rosmarie 2005 *Erinnerte Geschichte – inszenierte Geschichte. Ausstellungen und Museen in der Zweiten Moderne*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Beier-de Haan, Rosmarie 2006 'Re-staging histories and identities', in SharonMacdonald (ed.) *Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 186–97.

Bender, B. (1998) *Stonehenge. Making Space*, Oxford: Berg.

Benjamin, Walter 1992 [1968 trans. H. Zohn] *Illuminations*, London: Fontana.

Bennett, Tony 2007 'The work of culture', *Cultural Sociology* 1(1): 33–47.

Benton, Tim 1999 'From the Arengario to the Lictor's Axe: memories of Italian Fascism', in M. Kwint, C. Breward and J. Aynsley (eds) *Material Memories. Design and Evocation*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 199–218.

Berger, Stefan 1997 *The Search for Normality. National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Germany since 1800*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Berlin, B. and P. Kay 1969 *Basic Colour Terms, their Universality and Evolution*, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bernett, H. 1992 'Albert Speers "Deutsches Stadion" war eine gigantische Fehlkonstruktion', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 205–10.

Bevan, Robert 2006 *The Destruction of Memory. Architecture at War*, London: Reaktion.

Bial, Henry 2004 'Introduction', in H. Bial (ed.) *The Performance Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–9.

Billig, Michael 1995 *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.

Bloch, Maurice 1989 [1979] *Ritual, History and Power: Selected Papers in Anthropology*, London: Athlone.

Bodemann, Y. Michal 1999 *In den Wogen der Erinnerung. Jüdische Existenz in Deutschland*, Munich: DTV.

Bodemann, Y. Michal 2005 *A Jewish Family in Germany Today. An Intimate Portrait*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Boswell, David and Jessica Evans (eds) 1999 *Representing the Nation*, London: Routledge.

Bott, Gerhard 1995 'Some thoughts when looking at Dani Karavan's "Way of Human Rights" ', in Peter Laub and Konrad Scheurmann (eds) *Straße der Menschenrechte. Dani Karavan*, Bonn: Arbeitskreis selbständiger KulturInstitute e.V., pp. 84–93.

Bott, Gerhard and Sigrid Randa (eds) 1993 *Aufbruch. Der Kartäuserbau und das Museumsforum des Germanischen Nationalmuseums 1993*, Nuremberg: Germanic National Museum.

Boyer, Dominic 2005 *Spirit and System. Media, Intellectuals, and the Dialectic in Modern German Culture*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Breglia, Lisa 2006 *Monumental Ambivalence. The Politics of Heritage*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Brooker, Will and Deborah Jermyn 2003 'The spectator and the audience. Shifts in screen theory', in W. Brooker and D. Jermyn (eds) *The Audience Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 126–31.

Bruckner, Dietmar 2002 *Was war los in Nürnberg 1950–2000*, Erfurt: Sutton Verlag.

Brumlik, Micha, Hajo Funke and Lars Rensman (eds) 2000 *Unkämpftes Vergessen. Walser Debatte, Holocaust-Mahnmal und neuere deutsche Geschichtspolitik*, Berlin: Das Arabische Buch.

Bruner, Edward M. 2005 *Culture on Tour*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Buck-Morss, Susan 1987 *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Buchli, Victor 1999 *An Archaeology of Socialism*, Oxford: Berg.

Bund Deutsche Architekten 1963 *Denkschrift*.

Bundesamt für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge (ed.) 1999 *Ein Gebäude – viele Namen. Eine Gebäudegeschichte. SS-Kaserne. Merrell-Narracks. Bundesamt*, Nuremberg: Bundesamt für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge.

Burden, H.T. 1967 *The Nuremberg Party Rallies*, London: Pall Mall Press.

Buruma, Ian 2002 [1994] *The Wages of Guilt. Memories of War in Germany and Japan*, London: Phoenix.

Butler, Shelley Ruth 2008 *Contested Representations: Revisiting 'Into the Heart of Africa'*, Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview.

Caplan, Pat 2007 ' "Never again". Genocide Memorials in Rwanda', *Anthropology Today* 23(1): 20–2.

Carrier, Peter 2000 'Places, politics and the archiving of contemporary memory in Pierre Nora's *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', in S. Radstone (ed.) *Memory and Methodology*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 37–57.

Carrier, Peter 2005 *Holocaust Monuments and National Memory. France and Germany since 1989*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Centrum Industriekultur Nürnberg 1992 *Kulissen der Gewalt. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, Nuremberg: Hugendubel.

Clendinnen, Inga 1999 *Reading the Holocaust*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clifford, James 1988 *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, James 1997 *Routes: Travel and Translation in the late Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, Erik 1970 'A phenomenology of tourist experiences', *Sociology* 13(2): 179–201.

Collier, Stephen J. and Aihwa Ong 2005 'Global assemblages, anthropological problems', in A. Ong and S.J. Collier (eds) *Global Assemblages. Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 3–21.

Connerton, Paul 1989 *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Susan E. 2004 'The politics of preservation in Rwanda', in S.E. Cook (ed.) *New Perspectives on Genocide: Cambodia and Rwanda*, New Haven: Yale Centre for International Area Studies, pp. 293–311.

Coombes, Annie E. 2003 *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Crane, Susan A. 2004 'Memory, distortion, and history in the museum', in B. Carbonell (ed.) *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 318–34.

Dahles, Heidi 2002 'The politics of tour guiding. Image management in Indonesia', *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(3): 783–800.

Davidson, M. 'A world of evil and hope amid the dark pines' *The Observer* 13.03.05.

Davis, John 1989 'The social relations of the production of history', in E.Tonkin, M.McDonald and M.Chapman (eds) *History and Ethnicity*, London: Routledge, pp. 103–20.

DeLanda, Manuel 2006 *A New Philosophy of Society*, London: Continuum.

Delanty, Gerard and Chris Rumford 2005 *Rethinking Europe. Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*, London: Routledge.

del Casino Jr, Vincent and Stephen P. Hanna 2000 'Representations and identities in tourism map spaces', *Progress in Human Geography* 24(1): 23–46.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari 1987 *A Thousand Plateaus*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dietzfelbinger, Eckart 1990 *Der Umgang der Stadt Nürnberg mit dem früheren Reichsparteitagsgelände*, Beiträge zur politischen Bildung 9, Nuremberg: Pädagogisches Institut.

Dietzfelbinger, Eckart 1994 'Reichsparteitagsgelände Nürnberg. Restaurieren – Nutzen – Vermitteln', in W. Durth and W. Nerdinger (eds) *Architektur und Städtebau der 30er/40er Jahre. Ergebnisse der Fachtagung in München 1993, des Deutschen Nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz*, Vol. 48, Bonn: Deutschen Nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz, pp. 64–73.

Dietzfelbinger, Eckart and Gerhard Liedtke 2004 *Nürnberg – Ort der Massen. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände. Vorgeschichte und schwieriges Erbe*, Berlin: Ch. Links.

Doosry, Yasmin 2002 *'Wohlauf, laßt uns eine Stadt und einen Turm bauen …'. Studien zum Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag Tübingen.

Douglas, Mary 1966 *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dubin, Steven C. 2006a *Transforming Museums. Mounting Queen Victoria in a Democratic South Africa*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dubin, Steven C. 2006b 'Incivilities in civil(-ized) places: "culture wars" in comparative perspective', in Sharon Macdonald (ed.) *Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 477–93.

Dudek, Peter 1992 ' "Vergangenheitsbewältigung" zur Problematik eines umstrittenen Begriffs', *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, no. 1–2.

Duffy, Terence M. 2001 'Museums of "human suffering" and the struggle for human rights', *Museum International* 53(1): 10–16.

du Gay, P. (ed.) 1997 *Production of Culture/Cultures of Production*, Milton Keynes: The Open University/London: Sage.

Durkheim, Émile 1965 [orig. 1915] *The Elementary forms of the Religious Life*, New York: Free Press.

Edensor, Tim 1998 *Tourists at the Taj: Performance and Meaning at a Symbolic Site*, London: Routledge.

Edkins, Jenny 2003 *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fein, Egon 2002 *Hitlers Weg nach Nürnberg*, Nuremberg: Verlag Nürnberger Press.

Fine, Elisabeth C. and Jean Haskell Speer 1985 'Tour guide performances as sight sacralization', *Annals of Tourism Research* 12: 73–95.

Fischer, Bernhard 1996 'Sanierung der Großen Straße in Nürnberg', *Bautechnik* 72(7): 443–6.

Forty, Adrian 1999 'Introduction', in Adrian Forty and Susanne Küchler (eds) *The Art of Forgetting*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 1–18.

Frei, Norbert 1999 [orig. 1996] *Vergangenheitspolitik. Die Anfänge der Bundesrepublik und die NS-Vergangenheit*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Frei, Norbert 2005 *1945 und Wir*, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Friedrich, Jörg 2002 *Der Brand. Deutschland im Bombenkrieg, 1940–1945*, Munich: Propyläen.

Fine, Gary A. 2001 *Difficult Reputations. Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept and Controversial*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Fulbrook, Mary 1999 *German National Identity after the Holocaust*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Geertz, Clifford 1983 *Local Knowledge*, New York: Basic Books.

Gell, Alfred 1998 *Art and Agency. An Anthropological Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerstenblith, Patty 2006 'Museum practice: legal issues', in S. Macdonald *Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 442–56.

Geschichte für Alle 1995 *Nürnberg-Langwasser. Geschichte eines Stadtteils*, Nuremberg: Sandberg Verlag.

Geschichte für Alle e.V. 1999 *Das ehemalige Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, 5th version, Nuremberg: Geschichte für Alle.

Geschichte für Alle 2002a *Architektur Nürnberg*, Nuremberg: Sandberg Verlag.

Geschichte für Alle 2002b *Geländebegehung. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, 2nd edition, Nuremberg: Sandberg Verlag.

Gibson, J. (1986) *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gieryn, Thomas F. 2002 'What buildings do', *Theory and Society* 31(1): 35–74.

Giesen, Bernhard 2003 'The collective identity of Europe: constitutional practice of community memory', in W. Spohn and A. Triandafyllidou (eds) *Europeanisation, National Identities and Migration: Changes in Boundary Constructions between Western and Eastern Europe*, London: Routledge, pp. 21–35.

Giordano, Ralph 1987 *Die zweite Schuld oder von der Last ein Deutscher zu sein*, Munich: Knaur.

Glaeser, Andreas 2000 *Divided in Unity. Identity, Germany, and the Berlin Police*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glaser, Hermann 1989 'Rumpelkammern im deutschen Kolosseum', *Rheinischer Merkur*, 16.06.1989.

Glaser, Hermann 1992 'Nürnberg: eine Stadt wie jede andere? Die Last, als Symbol des Nationalsozialismus zu gelten', in Bernd Ogan and Wolfgang Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: W. Tümmels Verlag, pp. 39–40.

Goldhagen, D. (1996) *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, London: Little, Brown and Company.

Graham, Brian, Greg Ashworth and John Tunbridge 2000 *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*, London: Hodder.

Graham, M., S. Dann and A.V. Seaton (eds) 2001 *Slavery, Contested Heritage and Thanatourism*, New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press.

Grass, Günther 2004 [orig. 2002] *Im Krebsgang. Eine Novelle*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Grasskamp, Walter 1990 'The de-nazification of Nazi art: Arno Breker and Albert Speer today', in B. Taylor and W. van der Will (eds) *The Nazification of Art. Art, Design, Music, Architecture and Film in the Third Reich*, Winchester: The Winchester Press, pp. 231–48.

Grayling, A.C. 2006 *Among the Dead Cities. Was the Allied Bombing of Civilians in WWII a Necessity or a Crime?*, London: Bloomsbury.

Gregor, Neil 2003a '"Is he alive, or long since dead?": loss, absence and remembrance in Nuremberg, 1945–1956', *German History*, 21(2): 183–203.

Gregor, Neil 2003b '"The illusion of remembrance": the Karl Diehl affair and the memory of national socialism in Nuremberg, 1945–1999', *The Journal of Modern History* 75(3): 590–633.

Gudehus, Christian 2006 *Dem Gedächtnis Zuhören: Erzählungen über NS-Verbrechen und ihre Representation in deutschen Gedenkstätten*, Essen: Klartext.

Hall, Stuart 1980 'Encoding/decoding', in Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis (eds) *Culture, Media and Language*, London: Hutchinson, pp. 128–38.

Hallam, Elizabeth and Jenny Hockey 2001 *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, Oxford: Berg.

Hambrecht, Rainer 1976 *Der Aufstieg der NSDAP in Mittel- und Oberfranken, 1925–1933*, Nuremberg: Nürnberger Werkstücke zur Stadt- und Landesgeschichte.

Handelman, Don 1998 [orig.1990] *Models and Mirrors. Towards an Anthropology of Public Events*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Handler, Richard 1988 *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*, Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Handler, Richard and Eric Gable 1997 *The New History in an Old Museum*, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Harvey, David 2003 'The city as body politic', in Jane Schneider and Ida Susser (eds) *Wounded Cities. Destruction and Reconstruction in a Globalized World*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 25–44.

Hayner, Priscilla 2001 *Unspeakable Truths. Confronting State Terror and Atrocity*, London: Routledge.

Heigl, Peter 2003 *Die US-Armee in Nürnberg auf Hitlers "Reichsparteitagsgelände"/The U.S. Army in Nuremberg on Hitler's Nazi Party Rally Grounds*, Nuremberg: Documentation Centre of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds.

Hertz, Robert 2006 [1960] *Death and the Right Hand*, London: Routledge.
Herzfeld, Michael 1991 *A Place in History. Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*, Cambridge, Mass.: Princeton University Press.
Hewison, Robert 1987 *The Heritage Industry*, London: Methuen.
Hewitt, Andrew 1993 *Fascist Modernism. Aesthetics, Politics and the Avant-Garde*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Heyden, T. 1995 'Ludwig Ruff (1878–1934): "Des Führers zweiter Baumeister"', in H. Beer *et al*. pp. 180–203.
Heynen, H. 1999 *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique*, Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.
Hochschild, Adam 1998 *King Leopold's Ghost. A Story of Greed, Terror and Heroism in Colonial Africa*, New York: Mifflin.
Hochschild, Adam 2005 'A monument to denial', *Los Angeles Times*, 2.3.2005.
Hoelscher, Steven 2006 'Heritage', in S. Macdonald *Companion to Museum Studies*, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, pp. 198–218.
Horton, James Oliver and Johanna C. Kardux 2004 'Slavery and the contest for national heritage in the United States and the Netherlands', *American Studies International*, 42.
Hughes, Rachel 2003 'The abject artefacts of memory: photographs from Cambodia's genocide', *Media, Culture and Society* 21(1): 23–44.
Hughes, Rachel 2004 'Memory and sovereignty in post-1979 Cambodia: Choeung Ek and local genocide memorials', in S.E. Cook (ed.) *New Perspectives on Genocide: Cambodia and Rwanda*, New Haven: Yale Centre for International Area Studies, pp. 269–92.
Hughes, Robert 2003 'Albert Speer: size matters', *Visions of Space* [television documentary] BBC2.
Huyssen, Andreas 1995 *Twighlight Memories. Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*, London: Routledge.
Huyssen, Andreas 2003 *Present Pasts. Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Huyssen, Andreas 2006 'Air war legacies: from Dresden to Baghdad', in Bill Niven (ed.) *Germans as Victims*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 181–93.
Jaskot, Paul B. 2000 *The Architecture of Oppression. The SS, Forced Labor and the Nazi Monumental Building Economy*, London and New York: Routledge.
Jeismann, Karl-Ernst 1985 *Geschichte als Horizont der Gegenwart. Über den Zusammenhang von Vergangenheitsdeutung, Gegenwartsverständnis und Zukunftsperspektive*, Paderborn: F. Schörnagh. **[?PLEASE CHECK WITH NEXT ENTRY: ARE THEY THE SAME, DIFFERENT EDITION?]**
Jeismann, Karl-Ernst 1995 *Geschichte als Horizont der Gegenwart. Über dem Zusammenhang von Vergangenheitsdeutung, Gegenwartsverständnis und Zukunftsperspektive*, Paderborn: F. Schörnagh. **[?PLEASE CHECK WITH PREVIOUS ENTRY: ARE THEY THE SAME, DIFFERENT EDITION?]**
Jeismann, Michael (ed.) 1999 *Mahnmal Mitte. Eine Kontroverse*, Cologne: DuMont.
Jordan, Jennifer A. 2006 *Structures of Memory. Understanding Urban Change in Berlin and Beyond*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Kansteiner, Wulf 2002 'Finding meaning in memory: a methodological critique of collective memory studies', *History and Theory* 41(May): 179–97.
Kansteiner, Wulf 2006a *In Pursuit of German Memory. History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz*, Athens: Ohio University Press.
Kansteiner, Wulf 2006b 'Losing the war, winning the memory battle. The legacy of Nazism, World War II, and the Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany', in R.N. Lewbow,

W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds) *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 102–46.

Kaplan, Flora E.S. 2006 'Making and remaking national identities', in Sharon Macdonald (ed.) *Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 152–69.

Karp, Ivan, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (eds) 2006 *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Kaschuba, Wolfgang 2002 'Scars as tattoos', unpublished paper presented in New York.

Katriel, Tamar 1997 *Performing the Past. A Study of Israeli Settlement Museums*, Mahwah, New Jersey and London: Lawrence Erlaum Associates.

Katz, Shaul 1985 'The Israeli teacher-guide: the emergence and perpetuation of a role', *Annals of Tourism Research* 12: 49–72.

Kauders, Anthony D. 2003 'History as censure. "Repression" and "philo-Semitism" in postwar Germany', *History and Memory* 15(1): 97–122.

Kershaw, I. 1998 *Hitler. 1889–1936*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kettenacker, Lothar 1997 *Germany since 1945*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

King, Alex 1999 'Remembering and forgetting in the public memorials of the Great War', in A. Forty and S. Küchler (eds) *The Art of Forgetting*, pp. 147–69.

Kirshenblatt Gimblett, Barbara 1998 *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums, Heritage*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Knischewski, Gerd and Ulla Spittler 1997 'Memories of the Second World War and national identity in Germany', in M. Evans and K. Lunn (eds) *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 239–54.

Koch, C. (1995) 'Bauen in Nürnberg 1933–45', in H. Beer *et al.*, pp. 14–113.

König, Helmut 2003 *Die Zukunft der Vergangenheit. Der Nationalsozialismus im politischen Bewußtsein der Bundesrepublik*, Frankfurt: Fischer.

Köppen, Manuel and Klaus R. Scherpe (eds) 1997 *Bilder des Holocaust. Literatur – Film – Bildende Kunst*, Cologne: Böhlau.

Korrek, Norbert, Justus H. Ulbrecht and Christiane Wolf 2001 *Das Gauforum in Weimar. Ein Erbe des Dritten Reiches*, Weimar: Bauhaus University of Weimar University Press.

Koselleck, Reinhart 1999 'Stellen uns die Toten eine Termin?', in M. Jeismann (ed.) *Mahnmal Mitte. Eine Kontroverse*, Cologne: DuMont, pp. 44–53.

Kosfeld, Anne G. 2001 'Nürnberg', in E. François and H. Schulze (eds) *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte I*, Munich: C.H. Beck Verlag, pp. 68–85.

Koshar, Rudy 1998 *Germany's Transient Pasts. Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Koshar, Rudy 2000 *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870–1990*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kress, Günther and Theo van Leeuwen 2001 *Multimodal Discourse. The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*, London: Arnold.

Kress, Günther and Theo van Leeuwen 2006 *Reading Images. The Grammar of Visual Design*, 2nd edition, London: Routledge.

Küchler, Susanne 1999 'The place of memory', in A. Forty and S. Küchler (eds) *The Art of Forgetting*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 53–72.

Kugelmass, Jack 1992 'The rites of the tribe: American Jewish tourism in Poland', in Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer and Steven D. Lavine (eds) *Museums and Communities. The Politics of Public Culture*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 382–427.

Ladd, Brian 1997 *The Ghosts of Berlin. Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Landsberg, Alison 2004 *Prosthetic Memory. The Transformation of American Memory in the Age of Mass Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Lang, Berel 1999 *The Future of the Holocaust. Between History and Memory*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Latour, Bruno 1993 *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. C. Porter, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Latour, Bruno 2005 *Reassembling the Social*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laub, Peter and Konrad Scheurmann (eds) 1995 *Straße der Menschenrechte. Dani Karavan*, Bonn: Arbeitskreis selbständiger KulturInstitute e.V.

Law, John 1986 'On the methods of long distance control: vessels, navigation and the Portuguese route to India', in J. Law (ed.) *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lefebvre, Henri 1991 *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lennon, John and Malcolm Foley 2000 *Dark Tourism. The Attraction of Death and Disaster*, London: Thomson.

Levy, Daniel 2004 'The cosmopolitan figuration: historicizing reflexive modernization', in A. Pferl and N. Sznaider (eds) *Ulrich Beck's Kosmopolitisches Projekt*, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. 177–87.

Levy, Daniel and Nathan Sznaider 2001, *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: der Holocaust*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Levy, Daniel and Nathan Sznaider 2002 'Memory unbound. The Holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory', *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1): 87–106.

Levy, Daniel and Nathan Sznaider 2004 'The institutionalization of cosmopolitan morality: the Holocaust and human rights', *Journal of Human Rights* 3(2): 143–57.

Linenthal, Edward and Tom Engelhardt (eds) 1996 *History Wars. The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*, New York: Metropolitan.

Liss, Andrea 1998 *Trespassing through Shadows. Memory, Photography and the Holocaust*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Littler, Jo 2005 'Introduction: British heritage and the legacies of "race"', in J. Littler and R. Naidoo (eds) *The Politics of Heritage. The Legacies of Race*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–19.

Littler, Jo and Roshi Naidoo (eds) 2005 *The Politics of Heritage. The Legacies of Race*, London: Routledge**.**

Lloyd, David W. 1998 *Battlefield Tourism. Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia and Canada, 1919–1939*, Oxford: Berg.

Lowenthal, David 1985 *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, David 1998 [orig. 1996]*Possessed by the Past: the Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, New York: The Free Press.

Lübbeke, Wolfram 1987 'Denkmäler des Übertreffens. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg als Denkmal und Gedenkstätte', *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Denkmalpflege* 41: 210–22.

Lynch, Kevin 1976 *What Time is this Place?*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

MacCannell, Dean 1989 [1976] *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, 2nd edition, New York: Schocken Books.

Macdonald, Sharon 1997a *Reimagining Culture. Histories, Identities and the Gaelic Renaissance*, Oxford: Berg.

Macdonald, Sharon 1997b 'A people's story? Heritage, identity and authenticity', in C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds) *Touring Cultures. Transformations of Travel and Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 155–75.

Macdonald, Sharon (ed.) 2000 *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness. Reflections and Provocations*, Hamburg: Körber.

Macdonald, Sharon 2002a 'Trafficking in history: multitemporal perspectives', in 'Shifting Grounds: Experiements in doing Ethnography', special issue of *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures*, 11: 93–116.

Macdonald, Sharon 2002b *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum*, Oxford: Berg.

Macdonald, Sharon 2002c 'Museums and identities: materializing German culture', in A. Phipps (ed.) *Contemporary German Cultural Studies*, London: Arnold, pp. 117–31.

Macdonald, Sharon 2005a 'Enchantment and its dilemmas: the museum as a ritual site', in M. Bouquet and N. Porto (eds) *Science, Magic and Religion. The Ritual Processes of Museum Magic*, Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 209–27.

Macdonald, Sharon 2005b 'Accessing audiences: visiting visitor books', *Museum and Society* 3(3): 119–36.

Macdonald, Sharon 2005c 'Commemorating the Holocaust: the ethics of national identity in the twenty-first century', in J. Littler and R. Naidoo (eds) *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of Race*, London: Routledge, pp. 49–68.

Macdonald, Sharon 2006a 'Undersirable heritage: Fascist material culture and historical consciousness in Nuremberg', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(1): 9–28.

Macdonald, Sharon 2006b 'Mediating heritage: tour guides at the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds, Nuremberg', *Tourist Studies* 6(2): 119–38.

Macdonald, Sharon 2006c 'Words in stone? Agency and identity in a Nazi Landscape', *Journal of Material Culture* 11(1/2): 105–26.

Macdonald, Sharon 2007 'Schwierige Geschichte – Umstrittene Austellungen', *Museumskunde* 72(1–07): 75–84.

Macdonald, Sharon forthcoming 'Assembling Nuremberg', *Culture and Economy*.

MacFarlane, Alan 2007 *Japan through the Looking Glass*, London: Profile.

Maier, Charles S. 1997 [orig. 1988] *The Unmasterable Past. History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Marcuse, Harald 2001 *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933–2001*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Markus, Thomas A. 1993 *Buildings and Power. Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*, London: Routledge.

Meethan, Kevin 2001 *Tourism in Global Society. Place, Culture, Consumption*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Michman, Dan (ed.) 2002 *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany, 1945–2000*, New York: Peter Lang.

Miller, Daniel (ed.) 1998 *Material Cultures*, London: University College London Press.

Miller, Daniel 2005 'Materiality: an introduction', in D. Miller (ed.) *Materiality*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 1–50.

Mistzal, Barbara A. 2003 *Theories of Social Remembering*, Maidenhead: Open University Press/ McGraw-Hill Education.

Mitscherlich, Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich 1967 *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern. Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens*, Munich: Piper.

Moeller, Robert G. 2001 *War Stories. The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Museen der Stadt Nürnberg 1999 *Projekt: Dokumentationszentrum Reichsparteitagsgelände*, Nuremberg: Museen der Stadt Nürnberg.

Museen der Stadt Nürnberg 2000 *Die Zukunft der Vergangenheit. Dokumentationszentrum Reichsparteitagsgelände*, Nuremberg: Museen der Stadt Nürnberg.

Nash, Douglas 1995 *The Politics of Space*, New York: Peter Lang.

Needham, Rodney (ed.) 1974 *Right and Left. Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nerdinger, Winfried 1995 'Bauen im Nationalsozialismus', in *Bauen in Nürnberg 1933–1945. Architektur und Bauformen im Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 10–13.

Neumann, Klaus 2000 *Shifting Memories. The Nazi Past in the New Germany*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Niethammer, Lutz 1982 *Die Mitläuferfabrik: Die Entnazifizierung am Beispiel Bayerns*, Berlin and Bonn:.

Niven, Bill 2002 *Facing the Nazi Past. United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich*, London: Routledge.

Niven, Bill 2006a 'The GDR and memory of the bombing of Dresden', in Bill Niven (ed.) *Germans as Victims*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 109–29.

Niven, Bill (ed.) 2006b *Germans as Victims*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nobles, Melissa 2003 'Official apologies and their effects on political membership in democracies', paper presented at American Political Science Association Meeting, Philadelphia.

Novick, Peter 1999 *The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience*, London: Bloomsbury.

Ogan, Bernd 1992 'Faszination und Gewalt – ein Überblick', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 11–36.

Ogan, Bernd and Carlo Jahn 1996 *'Aber Hitler hat doch …'. Sieben Legenden über das Dritte Reich*, Nuremberg: Pädagogisches Institut.

Ogan, Bernd and Wolfgang W. Weiss (eds) 1992 *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag.

Olick, Jeffrey K. 2003 'Introduction', in J.K. Olick (ed.) *States of memory. Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection*, Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1–16.

Olick, Jeffrey K. 2005 *In the House of the Hangman. The Agonies of German Defeat, 1943–1949*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Olick, Jeffrey K. 2007 *The Politics of Regret. On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*, London: Routledge.

Parker Pearson, M. and C. Richards (1994) 'Ordering the world: perceptions of architecture, space and time', in M. Parker Pearson and C. Richards (eds) *Architecture and Order. Approaches to Social Space*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–37.

Peters, Ursula 2000 'Dani Karavan: Weg der Menschenrechte', in U. Peters with A. Legde (eds) *Moderne Zeiten. Die Sammlungen zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Nuremberg: Germanic National Museum, pp. 275–80.

Petsch, Joachim 1992 'Architektur als Weltanschauung. Die Staats- und Parteiarchitektur im Nationalsozialismus', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 197–204.

Pickard, Robert 2002 'A comparative review of policy for the protection of the architectural heritage of Europe', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 8(4): 349–63.

Porombka, Stephan and Hilmar Schmundt (eds) 2006 *Böse Orte. Stätten nationalsozialistischer Selbstdarstellung – heute*, Berlin: List.

Puvogel, Ulrike and Martin Stanjowski, with Ursula Graf 1995 *Gedenkstätten für die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation*, volume 1, 2nd edition, Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Quinn, Malcolm (1994) *The Swastika. Constructing the Symbol*, London: Routledge.

Reichel, Peter 1992 '"Volksgemeinschaft" und Führer-Mythos', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 137–50.

Reichel, Peter 1999 [1995] *Politik mit der Erinnerung. Gedächtnisorte im Streit um die nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit*, Frankfurt: Fischer Verlag.

Reichel, Peter 2001 *Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland. Die Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Diktatur von 1945 bis heute*, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Reither, Ingmar 1996 'Das ehemalige Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg als Excursionsziel: Methodische Ansätze einer schulklassenspezifischen Vermittlungstätigkeit', unpublished first state examination thesis, Friedrich-Alexander University, Erlangen-Nürnberg.

Reither, Ingmar 2000 *'Worte aus Stein' und die Sprache der Dichter. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände als poetische Landschaft*, Nuremberg: Sandberg Verlag.

Rittnar, Carol and John K. Roth 1991 *Memory Offended. The Auschwitz Convent Controversy*, New York: Greenwood.

Robertson, Roland 1995 'Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity', in Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (eds) *Global Modernities*, London: Sage, pp. 25–44.

Roche, Maurice 2000 *Mega-Events and Modernity. Olympics and Expos in the growth of Global Culture*, London: Routledge.

Rosenfeld, Gavriel D. 2000 *Munich and Memory. Architecture, Monuments, and the Legacy of the Third Reich*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rowlands, Michael 1999 'Remembering to forget: sublimation as sacrifice in war memorials', in A. Forty and S. Küchler (eds) *The Art of Forgetting*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 129–45.

Rüsen, Jörn 1990 *Zeit und Sinn. Strategien historischen Denkens*, Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer.

Rüsen, Jörn 2001 *Geschichtsbewusstseins*, Vienna: Böhlau.

Rüsen, Jörn (ed.) 2002 *Western Historical Thinking. An Intercultural Debate*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Rüsen, Jörn 2005 *History. Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Saltzman, Lisa 1999 *Anselm Kiefer and Art after Auschwitz*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sandell, Richard 2007 *Museums, Prejudice and the Reframing of Difference*, London: Routledge.

Schieber, Martin 2000 *Nürnberg. Eine illustrierte Geschichte der Stadt*, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Schlesinger, P. and F. Foret 2006 'Political roof and sacred canopy? Religion and the EU constitution', *European Journal of Social Theory* 9(1): 59–81.

Schmidt, Alexander 2002 '"Sind Sie der Führer?" Nationalsozialismus als Thema von Stadtrundgängen (zum Beispiel in Nürnberg)', in Siegfried Grillmeyer and Zeno Ackermann (eds) *Erinnern für die Zukunft. Die nationalsozialistische Vergangenheit als Lernfeld der politischen Jugendbildung*, Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag.

Schmidt, Alexander 1995 'Saubere Altstadt', in H. Beer *et al.*, pp. 130–51.

Schneider, Ulrich 1993 'Mit dem Herzen sehen: Dani Karavans "Straße der Menschenrechte"', in Bott, Gehard and Sigrid Randa (eds) *Aufbruch. Der Kartäuserbau und das Museumsforum*

des Germanischen Nationalmuseums 1993, Nuremberg: Germanic National Museum, pp. 90–111.

Schöllgen, Gregor 2002 *Diehl. Ein Familienunternehmen in Deutschland, 1902–2002*, Berlin: Propyläen.

Schramm, Georg W. 1988 *Bomben auf Nürnberg. Luftangriffe 1940–1945*, Munich: Hugendubel.

Schramm, Georg W. 1993 'Nürnberg im Fadenkreuz. Bombardierung und Vernichtung', in *Centrum Industriekultur Unterm Hakenkreuz. Alltag in Nürnberg 1933–1945*, Munich: Hugendubel, pp. 194–205.

Scobie, Alex 1990 *Hitler's State Architecture. The Impact of Classical Antiquity*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Sebald, W.G. 2003 [orig. German 1999] *On the Natural History of Destruction*, trans. A.Bell, London: Hamish Hamilton.

Sereny, Gitta 1996 [orig. 1995] *Albert Speer: His Battle with Truth*, London: Picador.

Sereny, Gitta 2000 *The German Trauma. Experiences and Reflections 1938–2000*, London: Allen Lane.

Simons, Oliver 1997 'Gedächtnislandschaften, Erinnerungsbilder, Spurensicherung – Nachbilder des Holocaust', in M. Köppen and K.R. Scherpe (eds) *Bilder des Holocaust*, Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, pp. 191–213.

Soane, John V.N. 2002 'Agreeing to differ? English and German conservation practices as alternative models for European notions of the built past', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 8(3): 267–81.

Sonnenberger, Franz 1998 'Organized diversity: the Nuremberg municipal museums', *Museum International* 50(2): 55–9.

Sontag, Susan 1979 [orig. 1973] *On Photography*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sontag, Susan 1990 [orig. 1974] 'Fascinating fascism', in B. Taylor and W. van der Will (eds) *The Nazification of Art. Art, Design, Music, Architecture and Film in the Third Reich*, Winchester: The Winchester Press, pp. 204–18.

Speer, Albert 1978 *Architektur*, Frankfurt, Berlin, Vienna: Verlag Ullstein GmbH.

Speer, Albert 1995 [1970 trans.] *Inside the Third Reich*, translated by R. and C. Winston, London: Phoenix.

Straub, Jürgen (ed.) 2005 *Narration, Identity and Historical Consciousness*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Sturken, Marita 1997 *Tangled Memories*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sturken, Marita and Lisa Cartwright 2001 *Practices of Looking. An Introduction to Visual Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Charles 1989 *Sources of the Self. The Making of the Modern Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thiele, Hans-Günther (ed.) 1997 *Die Wehrmachtaustellung. Dokumentations einer Kontroverse*, Bremen: Edition Temmen.

Till, Karen E. 1999 'Staging the past: landscape design, cultural identity, and *Erinnerungspolitik* at Berlin's *Neue Wache*', *Ecumene* 6: 251–83.

Till, Karen E. 2005 *The New Berlin. Memory, Politics, Place*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tilley, C. (2004) *The Materiality of Stone. Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*, Oxford: Berg.

Tsing, Anna H. 2005 *Friction. An Ethnography of Global Connection*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tunbridge, J.E. and G.J. Ashworth 1996 *Dissonant Heritage. The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Turner, V. (1967) *The Forest of Symbols. Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Urry, John 1990 *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, London: Sage.

van Alphen, Ernst 1997 *Caught by History. Holocaust Effects in Contemporary Art, Literature and Theory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Virilio, Paul 1989 *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception*, trans. P. Camiller, London: Verso.

Wachter, Clemens 1999 *Kultur in Nürnberg 1945–1950. Kulturpolitik, kulturelles Leben und Bild der Stadt zwischen dem Ende der NS-Diktatur und der Prosperität der fünfziger Jahre*, Nuremberg: Stadtarchiv Nürnberg.

Weber, Jürgen 1990 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung', in Wolfgang Benz (ed.) *Legenden, Lügen, Vorurteile: Ein Lexicon zur Zeitgeschichte*, Munich: Saur K.G. Verlag, pp. 180–3.

Weiss, W.W. 1992 '"Ruinen-Werte" Das Nürnberger Reichsparteitagsgelände nach 1945', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 225–40.

Welzer, Harald, Sabine Moller and Karoline Tschugnall 2002 *'Opa war kein Nazi' Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Whyte, Iain Boyd 1998 'Modern German architecture', in E. Kolinsky and W. van der Will (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Modern German Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 282–301.

Williams, Paul 2007 *Memorial Museums. The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities*, Oxford: Berg.

Winckler, Lutz 1992 '"Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg". Eine Exilzeitung berichtet über die Nürnberger Parteitage', in B. Ogan and W.W. Weiss (eds) *Faszination und Gewalt. Zur politischen Ästhetik des Nationalsozialismus*, Nuremberg: Tümmels Verlag, pp. 127–34.

Winter, Jay 1995 *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning. The Great War in European Cultural History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winter, Jay and Emmanuel Sivan 2000 [1999] 'Setting the framework', in J. Winter and E. Sivan (eds) *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 6–39.

Wood, Nancy 1999 *Vectors of Memory. Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*, Oxford: Berg.

Wunder, Thomas 1984 *Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg. Entstehung, Kennzeichen, Wirkung*, Nuremberg: German National Museum.

Yoshida, Takashi 2006 *The Making of 'The Rape of Nanking': History and Memory in Japan, China and the United States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, James E. 1993 *The Texture of Memory. Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Young, James E. 2000 *At Memory's Edge. After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zeller, Joachim 1996 '"Deutschlands grösste Afrikaner" – Zur Geschichte der Denkmäler für Hermann von Wissmann', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 12: 1089–111.

Zelnhefer, Siegfried 1992 'Rituale und Bekenntnisse', in Centrum Industriekultur *Kulissen der Gewalt. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, Munich: Hugendubel, pp. 89–98.

Zelnhefer, Siegfried 2002 *Die Reichsparteitage der NSDAP in Nürnberg*, Nuremberg: Verlag Nürnberger Press.

Zimmerer, Jürgen 2006 'Tony Blairs letzter Coup', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 November, p. 40.