Berlin's Architectural Citations: Reconstruction, Simulation, and the Problem of Historical Authenticity

ROLF J. GOEBEL

In memory of my father: architect, city planner, and Berlin connoisseur

I

SINCE BERLIN WAS ELECTED AS REUNITED GERMANY'S NEW capital, in 1991, the city has been exploring its future through a complex investigation of its past while vigorously asserting its cosmopolitan newness.[1] Nowhere is this process more visible than in the city's characteristic, perhaps even unique, fascination with a ubiquitous practice I term "architectural citation." I refer to a specific type of eclectic building design, most notably the Reichstag's late-nineteenth-century facade combined with its postmodern glass dome and new interior; the plans for a partial rebuilding of the Stadtschloß; the Sony Center at Potsdamer Platz, framing remnants of the Grand Hotel Esplanade; the replicated facade of the new Hotel Adlon near the Brandenburg Gate; and the FriedrichstadtPassagen, evoking the Kaisergalerie, a premier symbol of Berlin's status as the capital of the German empire after 1873. When read in the context of present and past cultural discourses (newspaper articles, Web pages, advertisement pamphlets, literary responses, critical theory), these designs variously inscribe contemporary architectural styles with allusive reinventions of previous cultural manifestations and discourses, incorporate actual remnants of older edifices, or use partial reconstruction for new social purposes.

Architectural citation, I should emphasize, is different from projects such as the Museum Island, the Berlin Cathedral, and even the front sections of the New Synagogue on Oranienburger Straße, victims of World War II destruction or of neglect by the German Democratic Republic that have now benefited from relatively conventional principles of restoration

ROLF J. GOEBEL, professor of German at the University of Alabama, Huntsville, is the author of *Kritik und Revision: Kafkas Rezeption mythologischer, biblischer und historischer Traditionen* (Lang, 1986), *Constructing China: Kafka's Orientalist Discourse* (Camden, 1997), and *Benjamin heute: Großstadtdiskurs, Postkolonialität und Flanerie zwischen den Kulturen* (Iudicium, 2001). His previous essay in *PMLA* is "Constructing Chinese History: Kafka's and Dittmar's Orientalist Discourse" (108.1 [1993]).

© 2003 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and preservation intent on repairing a damaged original in its essential shape, even if details had to be sacrificed. By contrast, citational projects problematize this desire by revealing an unresolved but productive tension between past and present, between the metaphysics of authenticity and the media-directed politics of simulation, between genuinely nostalgic evocations of bygone glories and the sometimes cynical manipulation of historical memory. To be sure, this type of architecture is not entirely new in Berlin: the former GDR Staatsratsgebäude incorporates a portal of the demolished Stadtschloß, as a tribute to the fact that from its balcony Karl Liebknecht proclaimed the Socialist Republic on 9 November 1918; the Kronprinzenpalais on Unter den Linden features a restaurant containing a portal from Karl Friedrich Schinkel's destroyed Bauakademie; and, perhaps most famously, the Gedächtniskirche at Kurfürstendamm frames the World War II ruin of the neo-Romanesque spire with a modernist tower and sanctuary built in 1963. After reunification, however, the citational approach unfolded fully, signifying Berlin's renegotiation of its identity as the new-old capital by recycling half-obliterated and yet irrepressible traces of urban history within the parameters of international capitalism, Europe-directed national politics, and the rampant tourist industry.[2]

Although the architecture of the new Berlin defies easy categorization and uniform theoretical frameworks, one might associate the city's citational projects with the historicist eclecticism that Fredric Jameson diagnosed as a central component of the postmodernist "cultural logic of late capitalism." He defines this type of historicism as the "random cannibalization of all the styles of the past, the play of random stylistic allusion, and in general . . . the increasing primacy of the 'neo'" (18). For Jameson, the danger of this arbitrary pastiche of fragmentized traditions lies in the effacement of genuine memory and the disappearance of the traces of authentic history in the self-referential labyrinth of (inter)textuality, stereotypes, and aesthetic image series. Combining the flamboyant celebration of the radically new and chic with the seemingly arbitrary citation of an inauthenticated past, much of the new Berlin's spectacular architecture seems to confirm Jameson's worst fears.

Yet, as I will show, the capital's self-representation differs from Jameson's analysis in that Berlin's use of urban history is by no means random or without discernible reference to concrete origins. Like Jean Baudrillard, Jameson regards the postmodern as a style and a period reigned over by the simulacrum—the "identical copy for which no original has ever existed" (18). By contrast, the new Berlin's historicism, for all its eclecticism and recontextualization, continually reaches out to clearly identifiable origins, even if these have survived only as ruins, fragments, or mere images haunting the popular imagination and planning strategies of city developers. The city's rebuilding efforts especially seek to evoke the densely structured prewar ensemble of churches, museums, theaters, department stores, and popular entertainment venues in the vicinity of Unter den Linden, Friedrichstraße, and Potsdamer Platz, the districts that contributed much to Berlin's continuing aura as a vital metropolis since the late nineteenth century. Lending a putative center to the new Berlin's rebuilding plans, this topographic legacy helps distinguish the citational projects from the empty and arbitrary pastiche of various styles that Jameson associates with postmodernism.

Still, as we will see, the capital's architectural endeavors that I discuss here seem to lack a sophisticated use of "parody as repetition with critical distance that allows ironic signalling of difference at the very heart of similarity," as Linda Hutcheon, in her critique of Jameson, has defined the central strategy of postmodernism in architecture and other arts (26). While stressing the element of repetition, Berlin's examples of architectural citation tend to shy away from the complex parodic irony that identifies the ideological, social, and aesthetic breaks in the gleeful

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assertions of continuity between bygone model and reconstruction. Although many designs in the new capital pay considerable attention to the postmodern insight that the past, while undeniably real, can never be re-presented authentically in its original meaning but needs to be recognized as a mediated, discursive construct (Hutcheon 141–57), they adhere to a version of what Hutcheon identifies as "realist reference" by upholding classical notions of mimesis (146).

With the disappearance of the wall and the reunification of the two part cities, pressing issues of political guilt and memory have come again to the fore of Germany's reflection on national identity and historical origins. This is the context in which architectural planning initiatives decipher the capital's fragmentized and discontinuous history in the hidden text of its rebuilt streets (Hartung 15). Daniel Libeskind's museum for the history of Jews in Berlin and the controversial plans for a monumental Holocaust memorial near the Brandenburg Gate are the most conspicuous marks of Berlin's interrogation of the connection between its status as the capital of reunited Germany and the specters of National Socialism. But the new Berlin's architectural self-invention also reaches out to other chapters of its history—among them the Hohenzollern dynasty, the capitalist entrepreneurial optimism of the *Gründerzeit*, and the cultural liberalism of the Weimar Republic—that are being rediscovered as viable cultural models for present needs. This wide-ranging evocation, however, raises questions about the ideological underpinnings of using (or misusing) the urban past.

In his landmark essay of 1997, "The Voids of Berlin," Andreas Huyssen constructs a thought-provoking antagonism between two architectural attempts, after reunification, to fill the voids left by World War II and by the destructive effects of the East-West division. On the one hand is the "critical reconstruction" espoused by the former city building director Hans Stimmann, among others. This plan called for a recovery of such elements as the pre–World War I neighborhood divisions and city block system, traditional stone masonry facades, and a uniform building height of twenty-two meters from the ground floor to the roof gutters (Huyssen, "Voids" 67–68; Ladd 228–35). Ostensibly, critical reconstruction sought to undo or counteract the ahistorical fervor of the modernist rebuilding projects in postwar East and West Berlin, which launched a large-scale demolition of ruined streets that could have been salvaged (Ladd 231). But, as Huyssen points out, the secret target of critical reconstruction's traditionalism was mainly the modernist vision of the Weimar Republic and its embrace of American-style technological innovation, functionalism, and democratic mass culture (69).

On the other hand, Huyssen continues, is the boom of "contemporary high-tech global architecture," whose hypermodern visions and computer-generated designs seem to disregard history and cultural memory altogether (67–68). Yet despite the clash between reconstructionist local nostalgia and the futurism of international capitalist self-representation, both sides are equally engaged in image-driven designs in the service of corporate profit and political power. Thus, as Huyssen puts it, Berlin is thrown into an unimaginative debate positing "banal images of a national past against equally banal images of a global future," while displacing the notion of the city as a "multiply coded text to be filled with life by its dwellers and its readers" (68–69). By contrast, Huyssen contends, only Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum attempts to "articulate memory and our relationship to it in its very spatial organization" (75), because its radically self-conscious design of contorted shapes and broken lines and its abysmal voids signify the necessity of a reflexive reconsideration of German Jewish history. Libeskind's building neither harmonizes this history "along the discredited models of symbiosis or assimilation" nor posits the Holocaust as the "inevitable telos of German history." Instead, the museum becomes a "script" that "writes the discontinuous narrative that is

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Berlin." Opposing a spatial emphasis on historical ruptures to the reconstructionist's ideology of seamless continuity, it asserts an "architecture of memory" against the "postnationalism of global corporate architecture à la Potsdamer Platz and Leipziger Platz" (80–81).

I agree with Huyssen's discussion of Berlin's attempt to fill its physical and emotional voids with image-driven designs of competing ideological persuasions. But while the centrality of Libeskind's neo-avant-gardist museum design is beyond doubt, this does not imply that other forms of architectural (re)construction in Berlin neglect, counteract, or undermine a genuinely critical reflection on cultural memory and historical (dis)continuities. The striking examples of architectural citation that one observes frequently in the capital—be they affiliated with critical reconstruction, with corporate global modernism, or otherwise—do not necessarily distract us from the issues of remembrance and historical awareness. Rather, they force us to rethink critically the complex relation between lost originals and architectural copies, between past models and their allusive citations in the present, between the capital's desire for a new identity and its interrogation of disrupted traditions. In other words, I seek to shift the emphasis away from Huyssen's suggestion that only a radically self-conscious, quasihermetic style like that of Libeskind's museum, by refusing to lend itself to easy understanding and popular consumption, can promote genuine historical awareness, whereas other architectural designs supposedly lapse into either facile nostalgia or ahistorical futurism.

In fact, this dualistic categorization may no longer apply to the complex situation of the capital. In his recent essay "After the War: Berlin as Palimpsest," Huyssen points out that the conflict between critical reconstruction and postmodern high-tech designs has become more open to mutual accommodation and compromise (3), while as a result of the (re)building frenzy, the notion of the voids of Berlin gives way to the "more intriguing notion of Berlin as palimpsest, a disparate city-text that is being rewritten while earlier texts are preserved, traces restored, erasures documented—all of this producing a complex web of historical markers that point to the continuing heterogeneous life of a vital city ambivalent about both its built past and its urban future" (4). The citational mode that I identify as a crucial strategy of Berlin's architecture operates within this palimpsest structure, whose juxtaposition of "voids, illegibilities, and erasures" as well as "richness of traces and memories" Huyssen considers a unique feature of the German capital (5).[3]

[II]

One of the most spectacular examples of citational architecture is the refurbished Reichstag (fig. 1).[4] Designed by the British star architect Norman Foster, its hypermodern glass dome, according to Lutz Koepnick's intriguing reading, is a complex symbolic site raising important questions about the interconnections among auratic experience, historical memory, and the staging of urban space as a spectacle of distraction and simulacra in contemporary global cyberculture ("Redeeming," esp. 304–05). In the late nineteenth century, the new cupola's original, a sign of modern metal construction, shifted symbolic power from the imperial Hohenzollern Palace to Germany's parliamentary institutions (306; Hartung 17). But while the new dome seems to cite its precursor's representation of cutting-edge architecture and political power, it also signals historical discontinuity and stylistic dissonance. Perhaps proclaiming, according to optimistic public consensus, the openness and democratic transparency of reunified Germany, it also highlights, through a carefully staged shock encounter of dissimilar styles, the renovated but strangely fossilized Wilhelminian facade below (Huyssen, "After the War" 3).

In fact, the Reichstag appears less a historic edifice equipped with a new interior and dome

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 1
The Reichstag in 2002. Landesarchiv Berlin / Barbara Esch-Marowski.

than a contemporary building that has turned its semipreserved facade into a citation of a seemingly remote past. The exterior's original neo–Italian Renaissance design is barely discernible after the damage inflicted by arson (presumably committed by the Dutch anarchist Marinus van der Lubbe) in 1933, by shell fire during World War II, and by the removal of decorative elements during the facade's first postwar restoration. Since this facade is virtually the only physical remainder (and tenuous reminder) of the original edifice, whose interior has been entirely constructed anew to fit the needs of a modern parliamentary technology, its symbolic function is ambiguous. Does it still represent, as its builders originally intended, nineteenth-century Germany's national history and parliamentary aspirations? Or has it come to symbolize the terrible disruptions and reversals of Germany's subsequent history? Perhaps the facade, because its authenticity seems so isolated and decontextualized vis-à-vis the coolly elegant modernism of the new dome and interior, can best be understood as an allegorical icon of the new Berlin's collagelike assemblages of heterogeneous styles, reflecting the capital's necessarily fragmentized quest for a past that is divided into promises and failures, hopes and catastrophes.[5]

[III]

Historical citation takes on even more controversial aspects in the proposed reconstruction of the Stadtschloß (City Palace), the baroque city residence of the Hohenzollern dynasty (fig. 2).[6] It was heavily damaged during the war, and the socialist government under Walter Ulbricht detonated it in 1950 to make space for a large square for military parades. In 1976 the German Democratic Republic built its Palast der Re-

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 2
The Stadtschloß in 1913. Landesarchiv Berlin / Waldemar Titzenthaler.

publik (Palace of the Republic) on roughly the same site. This multipurpose showcase of socialist public life housed, among other things, the Volkskammer (the parliament that, after free elections, voted itself out of existence to allow the merger with the Federal Republic in 1990), a theater, a bowling alley, and several restaurants. At present the vast building, which has undergone radical asbestos abatement and is mocked widely as a terrible eyesore, is threatened with demolition.[7] Among special-interest groups emerged a polemical public debate typical of Berlin's continuing tensions between East and West, which no official postreunification enthusiasm can ease. Some fear that with the demise of the GDR regime, aspects of its cultural and architectural history that ought to be preserved are threatened with oblivion or marginalization through the wholesale political annexation of the "new" *Länder* by the hegemonic West. For others, the collapse of the German Democratic Republic and Berlin's reunification have opened up possibilities for a recovery of the pre–World War II cultural heritage, partly neglected or forgotten during the cold war and the East-West division. This ideological divide is neatly mirrored by two partial reconstruction plans that privilege either the *Schloß* or the *Palast* according to the competing parties' political preconceptions and architectural preferences. Any kind of reconstruction thus immediately poses the question of what larger social purpose a newly designed edifice might fulfill beyond aesthetic self-referentiality.

The Verein zur Erhaltung des Palastes der Republic (Association for the Preservation of the Palace of the Republic) proposed to combine the renovated GDR building with a re-creation

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the western part of the *Schloß*, envisioning a multipurpose people's forum analogous to the Centre Pompidou in Paris (see Verein). By contrast, the Förderverein Berliner Stadtschloß (Berlin City Palace Sponsoring Association) argues that the lost Hohenzollern residence's aesthetic splendor, inexcusable destruction, and function as a visual anchor of Berlin Mitte (Berlin Center) give its partial reconstruction a case of architectural and national urgency. The new Stadtschloß advocated by the Förderverein would include a fairly accurate rebuilding of the historic baroque facades at the Lustgarten, the Schloßfreiheit, and the Schloßplatz, as well as a reconstruction of the dome and the famous courtyard by Andreas Schlüter, albeit now protected by a modern glass roof. Facing the river Spree, there may even be a modern wing, to match a later redesign of the Marx-Engels-Forum. The interior is supposed to comprise a combination of elegant, historically inspired rooms and modern, functionalist ones (*Berliner Extrablatt*, 14th ed., 18–19). The integrated complex is to house public assembly rooms, spaces for the non-European art holdings of the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin-Dahlem, the Humboldt University's scientific collections, and other cultural facilities (16–17).

Thus, whereas the advocates of the Palast der Republik center their design on the landmark of their own history while incorporating a partial reconstruction of its historical predecessor and ideological other, any such compromise is explicitly rejected by the *Schloß* defenders. They argue that the modern, functionalist facade of the *Palast* would presumably clash with the intricately historicist *Schloß* exterior (17) and that any continued use of the architecturally isolated *Palast* would only finalize the deformation and fragmentation of the city center, thus perpetuating the vacuum left behind by the *Schloß* destruction (21–22). The *Schloß* planners are not only firm in their rejection of East Berlin heritage and sensibilities, they are also opposed to arguments (which they dutifully list) that our time can only represent itself in its own architectural language and that a *Schloß* copy surrounded by the aura of bygone times may not be suitable for hosting many contemporary democratic events (22). Such considerations, the Förderverein suggests, are less valid than the UNESCO Charta view that historic edifices have a material age and an immaterial significance. This time-transcendent quality justifies reconstruction that preserves a vital part of urban identity and historical memory, provided sufficient documentation for a "wirklich authentische Kopie" 'truly authentic copy' exists (as it presumably does for the *Schloß*). The oxymoron points to a nostalgic desire to downplay the ontological gap between the obviously imitational character of the partial reconstruction and the illusion of being able to recapture a politically victimized past. This rhetoric of mimetic verisimilitude vigorously inserts considerations of architectural metaphysics into a broader politics of cosmopolitan pragmatism. Only the new *Schloß*, the Förderverein claims, would be able to restore the ensemble effect of the surrounding edifices and their original artistic value for Berlin's historic Mitte district. The reconstructed city's productive tension between old and new would act as a "Langzeit-Besuchermagnet" 'long-term visitor's magnet' in central Europe because here magnificent European culture would uniquely interweave with the American way of life and the proverbial "Berliner Pep" 'Berlin vitality' (22).

This debate highlights the fact that conflicts about preservation and reconstruction do not exist in a political and social vacuum but attain their meaning only with reference to competing ideological positions. Thus, in a quasi-Wagnerian vein, the Förderverein advocates a restored "Gesamtkunstwerk Berlin" in the city's central district, where the reconstructed *Schloß* would offer a unifying focus for the putative restoration of the legendary "Spreeathen" 'Athens on the river Spree' aura, which is lauded as an exciting counter to the overwhelming effect of ubiquitous modern buildings (*Berliner Extrablatt*, 14th ed., 22).

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In contrast to this aestheticist fervor, another proponent of the *Schloß* reconstruction, Joachim Fest, has argued that the destruction of the *Schloß* was meant to symbolize the victory of the socialist idea of power; hence the edifice's reconstruction would be an appropriate reminder of the failure of communist politics (qtd. in Schreiber 182). However, opponents like the art historian Tilmann Buddensieg have contended that reconstructions produce only simplistic replicas and "gruselige Fälschungen für Touristen, die nicht genau hinschauen" 'eerie falsifications for tourists who won't look too closely' (qtd. in Schreiber 183).

This polemical triad of historical aestheticism, postsocialist triumphalism, and the purist rejection of cheap falsification, however, fails to address the complex dialectic of authenticity and imitation. More convincingly, the architectural historian Wolf Jobst Siedler, pointing to Schinkel's Neue Wache, Johann Heinrich Strack's Kronprinzenpalais, and Georg Wenzeslaus von Knobelsdorff's Opera House, reads these outstanding examples of urban reconstruction as signs, though often overlooked, that Berlin's architectural history, like all Europe's, is little more than "eine Geschichte von Falsifikaten" 'a history of falsifications' (128). Hence, the dogmatic adherence to authenticity is, in Siedler's opinion, misdirected when it comes to rebuilding the Stadtschloß. It will be a copy, he argues, but one indispensable for accomplishing what modern architecture could never achieve—recovery of the city's coherent and integral assemblage of streets and buildings. For this reason, Siedler concludes, "wird man nicht triumphierend, sondern resignierend das Verlorene mit Abschiedsschmerz wiederherstellen müssen" 'one will have to restore what has been lost with valedictory pain—not triumphantly but resignedly' (132). Contrary to nostalgic proponents of authenticity, here reconstruction is not meant to produce the illusion of undoing the ravages of history. The function of a partly rebuilt *Schloß*, in Siedler's sense, is not to re-present the sheer physicality and political aura of the lost original but rather to serve as a paradoxical site of symbolic articulation. In his reading, the replica would be a territorial and allegorical center of the ravaged city through its function as a sign of irretrievable loss, displaying itself as a belated copy that self-consciously foregrounds its own failure to restore authentic origins while nonetheless seeking to fill some of the territorial voids in Berlin's center left by postwar and postdivision rampages.

Whatever the outcome of the debate,[8] it may be that imitated facades, partial reconstructions, or isolated citations of older architecture in modern buildings are more suitable than complete, presumably authentic replicas for transporting historical memory and the meanings of the lost human aspirations. The obvious artificiality of partially historic and partially modern spaces, by virtue of their collagelike incongruity and continual surprise effect, deliberately draws attention to the work of interrogating the past. These visualities constantly remind the spectator of the need for reflection about history's uses and abuses, its original meaning and different significance for the present. Partial replicas and simulations evoke allegorical images of the past that may prove at least as meaningful as surviving monuments, which, as naturalized objects, one tends to get used to or overlook altogether.[9]

[IV]

If the Reichstag and the Stadtschloß reflect the conjunction of "monumental" architectural reconstruction and national politics, other examples of Berlin's new building boom attest to the more obviously commercial and popular, but equally meaningful, aspects of architectural citation. The panoramic view from the Reichstag dome includes the spectacular revival of the war-ravaged Potsdamer Platz, which combines the old and the new in a strikingly paradoxical manner.[10] The site features the powerful iconicity of global capitalism (the Sony Center; the Daimler-Chrysler headquarters), of consumerism (the

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Arcaden shopping mall), and of the entertainment industry (Cinemaxx, the venue of the Berlin film festival; the Stella musical theater on Marlene-Dietrich-Platz). But the new Potsdamer Platz also re-presents visual remnants of the past, if in a thoroughly dispersed manner. The prewar square, its mixture of rapid-transportation technology, commerce, and vibrant cultural life providing a premier locus of Weimar Republic modernity, was a visually open, star-shaped meeting point of major avenues. By contrast, the new assembly of dizzying skyscrapers is a somewhat claustrophobic and decentered design that at first glance seems ahistorical and hypermodern. But soon the visitor discovers that the new buildings incorporate uncanny remainders of Berlin's prewar era: the miraculously preserved Weinhaus Huth (a famous 1912 restaurant and wine store), as well as a remnant of the exterior facade and other parts of the Grand Hotel Esplanade (1911), destroyed in World War II. The hotel's Frühstückssaal (Breakfast Room), its fragments reassembled on the ground floor of Helmut Jahn's Sony Center, has been designated to house the bar of the revived Café Josty, a legendary prewar meeting spot for artists, writers, and politicians. The recontextualizing impetus of architectural citation has led the Esplanade's Kaisersaal (Emperor's Hall) to be hydraulically relocated from its original location to fit the new design, where it finds itself crammed into a stainless steel and glass framework like a precious museum piece in a vitrine (fig. 3). With their gilded neobaroque and rococo stucco, typical of the Wilhelminian empire, the Esplanade remnants have taken on a surrealistic and sadly anachronistic aura. Is the design to be applauded as a thought-provoking way of preserving endangered remnants of the past for new public use? Or have the Esplanade fragments been reduced to little more than decorative elements in Sony's spectacle of dazzling corporate self-celebration, visually overpowered as they seem to be by the enormous plaza and towering height of the total assembly?

For the novelist and essayist Martin Mosebach, the Esplanade remains have been archaeologically preserved like a dinosaur skeleton, a curiously touching, helpless fossil that seems almost crushed by the gigantic girders carrying the modern luxury apartments above. In his opinion, the most adequate term for this stylistic collage may be not "Denkmalsschutz" 'preservation of monuments' but "Denkmalsverwertung" 'exploitation of monuments.' After Jahn's concept was prevented from eradicating the hotel's ruins, Mosebach suggests, they survive as a farewell gesture to a time whose building style, while often denounced as pompous, still appears to have been commensurate with human proportions. For Mosebach, Hans Kollhoff's neighboring Mercedes Tower, with its architectural diversity and quasiorganic appearance, is preferable to Jahn's coldly monumental building assembly. In the writer's eyes, Kollhoff's project contains echoes of 1920s industrial brick architecture but also of Manhattan skyscrapers and Italian neoclassicist designs. Furthermore, its sharply angled facade creates a dramatic visual distortion that seems to cite simultaneously the perspectival dynamics of early German expressionist film sets and of Andrea Palladio's Teatro Olimpico in Vicenza (54–55). Mosebach's interpretation may be the projection of a nostalgic connoisseur of subtle stylistic allusions rather than a verifiable identification of historical origins, but it reflects a serious need for cultural recognition and understandable references that Jahn's collage may ultimately leave unanswered, even though it incorporates actual elements of an architectural original. It seems to me, though, that Mosebach underestimates the extent to which the Esplanade citations (and the Weinhaus Huth facade) contribute to an architectural language that expresses the problem with—instead of facilely satisfying—the desire to capture echoes of Berlin's imperial era. In other words, the unresolved tension in Jahn's decontextualized *Verwertung*—between the aura of authenticity attached to remnants of the past

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 3
Potsdamer Platz in 2000: the Sony Center with the Grand Hotel Esplanade's Frühstückssaal and Kaisersaal in the foreground. Landesarchiv Berlin / Stefane Jacob.

and their manipulative estrangement by global corporate power—is of considerable cultural significance for the redesigned Potsdamer Platz.

[V]

If the Potsdamer Platz allows bits and pieces of the physical past to survive, the new Hotel Adlon exemplifies Berlin's fascination with architectural surface simulation at a most prominent location (fig. 4). Opened on 23 August 1997, the Adlon, located on Unter den Linden near the refurbished Brandenburg Gate, displays a facade that imitates the neoclassicist style of its world-famous predecessor in considerable detail without being an accurate replica. Most notably, the new venue has one more floor than the original, while its interior combines modern hotel technology with an eclectic mix of styles. Paradoxically, the immaculate sheen of the new Adlon's historical trompe l'oeil facade only underscores the building's lack of historical authenticity, its appearance as a pleasingly theatrical simulacrum. Nonetheless, the Adlon draws much of its promotional image not from the temporal distance, the inevitable breaks and

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 4
The Hotel Adlon in 2002. Photograph by the author.

differences, between the original building and its recent copy but from their idealized, presumably seamless continuity.

The hotel's Web site provides a detailed historical survey of the old hotel, which opened on 23 October 1907 under the auspices of Kaiser Wilhelm II (fig. 5). Loved by the emperor but avoided by Adolf Hitler, it served as a premier luxury hotel and diplomatic convention site during the 1930s. At the end of World War II, it was used as a military hospital until it sustained heavy damage by fire in 1945. Converted into a dormitory for apprentices, its remains suffered final demolition in 1984 ("History"). Despite these disastrous disruptions, a promotional brochure claims that with the new Adlon, the past literally returns in the present: "Neun Jahrzehnte nach der Ersteröffnung kehrte . . . eines der berühmtesten Hotels der Welt an seinen historischen Platz zurück" 'Nine decades after it first opened, . . . one of the most famous hotels in the world has returned to its historic site' (*Hotel Adlon Berlin*). The pamphlet also offers a long list of guests who stayed in the Adlon since 1907 (Thomas Mann, Henry Ford, Marlene Dietrich, Aristide Briand, Lawrence of Arabia, and Edgar Wallace, among others), as if the present venue were the original. At least (or so the pamphlet claims, in an amplification typical of the hotel's inflated rhetoric), the new Adlon's atmosphere and ambience "atmen den Geist des legendären Vorgängers" 'breathe the spirit of the legendary precursor.' In this way, the present building seeks to re-create the bygone aura of the old Adlon in the interest of selling itself as an exclusive center of cosmopolitanism in the heart of Berlin and the future Europe.

The new Adlon recycles its tradition, constructing a cyclic narrative where the transient political horrors of the past are faithfully evoked only to be overcome by the repetition or return of seemingly time-transcendent material values

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 5
The Hotel Adlon in 1909. Landesarchiv Berlin / Waldemar Titzenthaler.

such as urbane luxury, architectural splendor, and social exclusivity. And yet, even though there is little that is strictly authentic in the new Hotel Adlon, its carefully designed retrostyle manages to recapture some aspects of the sensuous experience that, according to Walter Benjamin and other urban modernists, derived from the classical flâneur's immediate, visual and tactile immersion in the city's surface phenomena and their half-hidden historical traces (*Passagen-Werk* 524–69; *Arcades* 416–55). Thus, the hotel seems designed to attract a new kind of flâneur, one who could not care less about possible conflicts between authenticity and simulation or one who seeks to transcend these conflicts ironically, enjoying the cultivation of contemporary corporate luxury in the auratic restaging of the fleeting pleasures of bygone metropolitan life.

[VI]

Such appeals by the capital's citations of previous architectural models to postmodern forms of flânerie can also be found in the new FriedrichstadtPassagen on the rebuilt Friedrichstraße in Berlin Mitte, the city's old and new center (figs. 6 and 7).[11] These shopping arcades, which opened in 1996, comprise three buildings connected by an underground passage. Quartier 205 houses low-end stores and restaurants, Quartier 206 forms the luxurious centerpiece of the complex, and Quartier 207 sports a branch of the French department store Galéries Lafayette. These arcades self-consciously link present-time shopping pleasure with the Berlin urban legacy since the nineteenth century. The project contradictorily seeks recourse to historical

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 6
The Friedrichstadt-Passagen exterior in 2002. Photograph by the author.

authenticity only to submit it to a selective manipulation of cultural facts.

In the nineteenth century, shopping arcades were sites of technological innovation, public self-display, and capitalist commodification, features that Benjamin considered typical of urban modernity. Paradoxically, these preferred haunts of the flâneur soon became anachronistic victims of modernity's acceleration. In the mid-1800s the arcades declined rapidly because of widened pedestrian sidewalks, electric light, the ban on prostitution, the cultivation of open-air activities, and other urban changes (*Passagen-Werk* 140; *Arcades* 88). The majority of the Paris arcades, as Benjamin points out, were built in the decade and a half after 1822. The new iron technology these venues used served a mode of cultural citation that anticipates the allusive reinvention of the FriedrichstadtPassagen. The French empire, Benjamin argues, saw in iron construction "einen Beitrag zur Erneuerung der Baukunst im altgriechischen Sinne" 'a contribution to the revival of architecture in the classical Greek sense.' The designers at the time misunderstood the functional purpose of iron construction, advocating an unpragmatic use of iron for aesthetic rather than technical reasons. As Benjamin writes, "Diese Baumeister bilden Träger der pompejanischen Säule, Fabriken den Wohnhäusern nach, wie später die ersten Bahnhöfe an Chalets sich anlehnen" 'These architects design supports resembling Pompeian columns, and factories that imitate residential houses, just as later the first railroad stations will be modeled on chalets' (*Passagen-Werk* 45–46; *Arcades* 3–4). For Benjamin, such seemingly anachronistic projects correspond to dialectical "Wunschbilder" 'wish images' in the collective unconscious, in which "das Neue sich mit dem Alten durchdringt" 'the old and the new interpenetrate.' These dream images express society's dissatisfaction with problems in contemporary

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 7
The Friedrichstadt-Passagen interior in 2002. Photograph by the author.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

social production and its desire to overcome the outdatedness of its most recent past. Also, in these dream images, the epoch's conception of its successor period is joined with collective remembrances of "Urgeschichte" 'elements of primal history,' which Benjamin's historical materialism associates with the Marxist notion of a classless society (*Passagen-Werk* 46–47; *Arcades* 4; see also Schaper 17–41).

The ideals of a classless society seem fairly anachronistic in the context of the collapse of the German Democratic Republic and Berlin's embrace of international corporate capitalism. Indeed, it is questionable whether the FriedrichstadtPassagen use cultural citations to express any kind of utopian desire beyond the materialist yearnings of consumer culture. Nonetheless, the formal implications of Benjamin's theory reach from the Paris arcades to their Berlin successor. For if the iron construction of the Paris arcades evokes classical antiquity, the FriedrichstadtPassagen cite the prewar Friedrichstraße, together with its famous shopping arcade, the Kaisergalerie, to celebrate themselves as a luxurious symbol of the reunited capital's political power, cosmopolitan culture, and international competitiveness. The new arcades, like Benjamin's icons of nineteenth-century iron construction, reflect a collective wish to overcome the recent past and return to a supposedly more glorious chapter of history. During World War II the Friedrichstraße was destroyed almost completely. Because of its vicinity to the Berlin Wall, it was turned into a half-neglected wasteland, although the GDR government sought to recapture some of its old importance by constructing there the International Trade Center (1978); the Friedrichstadtpalast, a huge modern variety theater (1984); and the Grand Hotel (1987). The government even decided to build its own version of the FriedrichstadtPassagen, but the half-completed project was demolished after the fall of the regime—another example of the new Berlin's tendency to erase possibly salvageable aspects of its GDR past. After the city's reunification, the new arcades were visibly designed to signal the city's desire to fill the voids of this recent history and to connect to older, more vibrant cultural periods, most notably the *Gründerzeit* and the Weimar Republic, two periods endowed with a quasimythic legacy for the present.

The joyful self-mystification of the FriedrichstadtPassagen and their manipulative reinvention of origins were visible on a (now defunct) Web site of Quartier 206. A historical survey, pastichelike in its eclectic and abbreviated (and occasionally misspelled) allusions, evoked the (stereo)typical tropes of prewar Berlin's high and popular culture in this area. Titled "The Myth of the Centre," the cybertext celebrated the Friedrichstraße as "Berlin's old luxury promenade, the glamour boulevard of Prussia's royal residence." The "famous" Kaisergalerie was singled out, together with "the history of Germany's first class department stores" that started here. The Friedrichstraße was celebrated as providing subjects for "painters and poets, writers, dandys and connaisseurs" since the nineteenth century, such as Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Bertolt Brecht, Franz Hessel, Alfred Döblin, and Walter Benjamin. Heinrich Heine was quoted as saying that in watching the Friedrichstraße closely, "one finds the idea of endlessness illustrated here." Sheer endlessness also characterized the Web site's mythmaking: "Quartier 206 starts off with the claim to continue the Friedrichstraße's old flair and image, to revive the special, fastidious atmosphere of this legendary place." Claim, image, legend—the arcade, where "the past is being linked to the future" (almost a parody of Benjamin's philosophy of history) is a site of free-floating cultural signifiers that reconfigure the realities of the Weimar Republic and reunified Berlin into a dizzying melange of name-dropping. The description reads like a postmodern montage of geographic allusions and aesthetic styles. "The modern architecture finds a subtle integration into the historic environment"; Quartier 206, the firm Pei Cobb Freed and Partners' latest

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

showcase, after the glass pyramid at the Louvre and Hancock Tower in Boston, displays "modern steel- and glass-prisms, a Mediterr[an]ean atrium and Venetian mosaics. The façade's broad lightbelts containing classicist and Art Déco elements are a tribute to the 'Golden Twenties.'"

The historical reality of the area during the Golden Twenties, though, was rather different. For Benjamin's friend Franz Hessel, the Friedrichstraße, at least the area north of the old Kaisergalerie and Unter den Linden, offered a mixture of false glamour and real social misery that even in Hessel's lifetime seemed old-fashioned (243). This past includes the Kaisergalerie, which was located south of Unter den Linden, at the corner of Friedrichstraße and Behrenstraße (fig. 8).[12] Its construction in 1873, after the Prussian victory over France, the unification of the German lands, and Berlin's ascension as the capital of the Empire, had ideological purposes, not merely commercial ones. At the beginning of the *Gründerzeit*, the arcade was to celebrate Berlin's new metropolitan status. It was named after Emperor Wilhelm I, who, together with other members of the court, attended the splendid opening ceremony. As the *Vossische Zeitung* reports, the venue was expected to prosper through good times, bringing in high rents and profits on the stock market (qtd. in Geist 40). But the fortune of the Kaisergalerie, which at different times contained all kinds of specialty shops, a Viennese café, a panopticon, a variety theater, an anatomical museum, and other attractions, declined steadily. In 1930–31 it was renovated in a modernist style, whose functionalism seems cold and uninviting when compared with the ornamental excess of the original design. Having sustained heavy damage from the firebombs of the first air raid on Berlin, on 1 March 1943, the facility was finally demolished in 1957 by the GDR (Geist 51–59).

Replete with arched windows, spires, and columns, the old arcade's grandiose design cannot directly be traced to authentic historical styles, such as the Italian Renaissance or French palatial architecture. Nevertheless, it vaguely recalls a variety of possible inspirations, including the Antwerp city hall, the terracotta techniques of northern Italy and Lübeck, and Venetian palace facades (Geist 64–67). Thus, the Kaisergalerie, much like the older Paris arcades and the FriedrichstadtPassagen today, was a site of stylistic citation and historicist eclecticism. This architectural nostalgia corresponds with the edifice's strangely anachronistic character, which Hessel called "historic" in 1929 (245) and which the Kaisergalerie shared with its French counterparts. Benjamin describes the arcades of Paris as buildings and passages that, like a dream, have no outside (*Passagen-Werk* 1006; *Arcades* 839). With their obscure trades and old-fashioned shops, they exemplify what Benjamin identifies as "raumgewordene Vergangenheit" 'a past become space,' while the merchandise on display seems unintelligible or ambiguous in meaning (*Passagen-Werk* 1041; *Arcades* 871).

More than half a century after its opening, the Kaisergalerie, too, exudes for Hessel an inescapable aura of uncanny strangeness, claustrophobia, and decay (245–48). As he admits, not entirely ironically, he cannot enter it without experiencing a "leisen Moderschauer" 'silent dread of rottenness' and "Traumangst" 'dream fright,' worrying that he will not be able to find the arcade's exit (245). He abhors the building's outdated "Bierhaus-Renaissance" 'beerhall renaissance' appearance, with its high vaults, its brownish contours, and its windows obscured by dust (246). In the midst of the shop windows displaying cheap imitation art, travel souvenirs, pearls, thermometers, rubber wares, and other slightly discomforting or obscure products, Hessel is overcome by a horror of false reflecting lights, fleeting shadows, and the vacuity in the building's center. Haunted by specters of the dense human crowds of bygone days, he is glad to reach the outside: "Straße, Freiheit, Gegenwart!" 'the street, freedom, the present!' (248).

Like Hessel, Siegfried Kracauer regards the Kaisergalerie—or Lindenpassage, as he calls

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press



FIG. 8

Friedrichstraße in 1898: the arcade and the panopticon. Landesarchiv Berlin / N. N.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it—as the spatial symbol of a bygone era. As he notes in December 1930, the cold, smooth marble walls and the new glass roof of its recent modernization have almost totally replaced the original renaissance decor, which, in spite of its imitative pomp, seemed preferable to the new design's bland functionalism. Kracauer, too, approaches the Kaisergalerie with a mixture of fascination and horror, seeing it as an uncanny space in which obsolete, marginal, or suppressed matter of urban modernity is preserved. He takes the meaning of the arcade (*Passage*) literally, as an interior in which to walk, and figuratively, as a spatial-temporal configuration, a passage(way) through the bourgeois life thriving outside. The arcade offers exile to everything that has been rejected by the bourgeois mentality because it was not "repräsentationsfähig" (24). The term is characteristically ambiguous, referring to things that are not respectable or that cannot be represented—that is, described, conceptualized, and governed discursively. Venues like the anatomical museum, the bookshop peddling soft pornography, sellers of travel souvenirs, and the world panorama represent desires, illusions, and geographic transgressions that cannot be tolerated by more established public institutions. In analogy to Freud's theory of the return of the repressed, Kracauer reads the Kaisergalerie as a refuge for revengeful forces crowding together in its cavernous space. Here the obscure commodities and trades muster energy for a conspiracy or rebellion against the "Fassadenkultur" 'facade culture' outside, unmasking the pretentions of bourgeois idealism as aesthetic kitsch. In sum, Kracauer argues, the Kaisergalerie, especially in its modernized shape, reveals the evanescence and mortification of its time period; its meaningless, mute objects crowd behind a vacuous architecture anticipating "vielleicht den Fascismus oder auch gar nichts" 'perhaps fascism or nothing at all.' In this sense, the arcade, as an ambiguous passage through a deceptively neutral modernism, represents the unsettling transitoriness of the early 1930s, whose imminent horrors Kracauer sensed only too well: "Was sollte noch eine Passage in einer Gesellschaft, die selber nur eine Passage ist?" 'What is an arcade supposed to do in a society that itself is but a passage?' (28–29).

I have reviewed two important chapters of the Kaisergalerie's literary fortune in some detail because they illuminate the hidden prehistory of the FriedrichstadtPassagen's self-image.[13] Understanding this archaeology is helpful because in terms of architectural style, physical location, and ideological self-legitimation, the present venue bears only the faintest resemblance to the older arcade. That facility's original site was taken up by the GDR-built Grand Hotel, which cites the nineteenth-century structure's diagonal front and curved entrance portal on the corner of Friedrichstraße and Behrenstraße. Thus, the hotel, rather than the shopping arcades, preserves some of the exterior shape of the Kaisergalerie. The new FriedrichstadtPassagen are located across the street, one to three blocks to the southeast. Neither the modernist geometry of their facade nor the elegant curves and rhythmic patterns of art deco revival inside Quartier 206 recall the massive ornamental classicism of the Kaisergalerie's *Gründerzeit* historicism or its 1930s modernist functionalism. This difference in physical appearance underscores the significant shift in the ideological function and cultural meaning of the two venues.

"Some opportunities occur only once in a lifetime," announces *Quartier 206: FriedrichstadtPassagen*, a large-format promotional publication opulently bound in burgundy cloth and featuring detailed blueprints, floor maps, and individually pasted-in color photos. "FriedrichstadtPassagen represents the rebirth of a legend," the book exhorts, "[a] new beginning in a new city centre that is fast developing into a national centre of finance, commerce and government. A European gateway to the East and a centre for tourism and entertainment" (9). The international readers (investors, tourists, flâneurs) are reminded of the arcades' proximity to

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Berlin's historic landmarks, international hotels, and government and corporate offices. The intellectual climate, artistic vitality, and luxurious ambience of the Weimar Republic Friedrichstraße are evoked together with the opening of the Kaisergalerie, which, erroneously, figures as "Europe's first retail arcade" (11), even though it was modeled on earlier arcades in Paris, Milan, and Brussels (Geist 10).

The false claim about the Kaisergalerie's originality goes hand in hand with the disregard for its seedy legacy. This is understandable considering that the promotional discourse links Quartier 206 with "premier retail addresses" in Paris, London, Milan, and other world capitals (*Quartier* 13). Nonetheless, the idealization of the Kaisergalerie as a showcase of the old Friedrichstraße grandeur squarely contradicts the bygone facility's reputation as a site of social marginality and the transiencies of capitalist consumer phantasmagoria. Indeed, the brevity of Quartier 206's reference to its putative precursor is significant. For instead of providing anything close to a faithful reconstruction of the Kaisergalerie's variegated history, the new arcade bypasses that building's dubious image since the late 1920s to evoke only the lost splendors and promises of its initial phases during the 1870s. Thus, in seeming continuity with the Kaisergalerie's representation of *Gründerzeit* economic self-confidence and national pride, Quartier 206 is lauded as a "pioneering example of a new modern form of concentrated and centralised luxury mile, symbolic of the new, reunited, visionary Berlin" (31).[14] It would be naive to assume that this advertising is interested in truth and historical authenticity rather than in projecting invented images for the stimulation of consumer desires and financial investments. Yet the promotional language needs to be taken seriously and warrants analysis because the advertisement's illusions, subterfuges, and misleading statements reveal aspects of the new Berlin's public self-representation in the mirror of its own elusive and manipulated history.

As Uwe Rada suggests in 1996, the FriedrichstadtPassagen are part of a euphemistic urban discourse that idealizes anemic squares as piazzas and mundane shopping malls as fancy-sounding arcades. He reminds his readers that other arcades in Berlin, along Kurfürstendamm, failed commercially. The reason, he believes, is that the idea of the arcade seems to have outlived its historical moment. Following Benjamin, he points out that in the early nineteenth century, the luxurious Parisian arcades were characterized by architectural innovation (the use of iron and glass as structural elements) and the discovery of consumerism by the emerging urban middle class. However, postmodern venues like the FriedrichstadtPassagen, notwithstanding inflated suggestions of an individualized shopping experience and despite simulated urbane decorations, merely contribute to the rampant homogenizing culture of international franchising and brand-name stores, which the consumer finds in every other arcade. Referring to the ill-fated Kaisergalerie and the Passagenkaufhaus of 1908–09, on Oranienburgerstraße, whose ruins now house the alternative arts center Tacheles, Rada reminds his readers that arcades in Berlin have traditionally been disappointing financial investments. Whereas in the United States shopping malls responded to the middle-class desire for security and for secluded consumption away from increasingly criminal downtowns, arcades in Berlin are likely to be unsuccessful because they are seen as a threat to the lively diversity and social integration of urban space (Rada). Yet some residual aspects of the old arcades have survived in the new one, including the pleasures of flânerie, although redefined in postmodern terms as an activity matching the pastiche of the FriedrichstadtPassagen. According to another observer, Quartier 206 exudes, not genuine greatness, but merely *grandezza*, a flamboyant and somewhat pretentious aestheticism amalgamating eclectically "[d]as Beste aller Epochen" 'the best of all periods.' Still, the FriedrichstadtPassagen satisfy a widespread desire for a large "Zerstreuungslabyrinth"

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'labyrinth of diversion' attracting those who crave to experience the new Berlin through the phantasmagoric lens of contemporary consumer culture's ready-made reproductions of Golden Twenties flair, the Parisian arcades, and other such aspects of classical urban history (Braun).

[VII]

The problems facing Berlin's negotiation of the past are rooted not only in the intricacies of postmodernist uses and abuses of historical origins. More profoundly, they go back to the material ravages wreaked by wartime bombings and to an ongoing crisis of historical consciousness that combines visionary ideologies of utopian city planning with a ruthless disrespect for the historical Berlin. For Siedler, "Geschichtsvergessenheit" 'historical forgetfulness' characterizes the city's treatment of house facades as well as its renaming of streets. He refers especially to a frightful continuity between two otherwise different architectural projects: Albert Speer's architectural vision of future Nazi glory and Hans Scharoun's brutally modernist "Stadtlandschaft' 'city landscape' after the war. Siedler goes so far as to speculate whether Berlin's only faithfulness to itself lies in continually destroying the remainders of its past (58–59).

In fact, the postwar demolition of entire streets and squares whose ruins could have been repaired is part of a modernist tabula rasa ideology. It sought to use radically new beginnings and ahistorical styles for the redemptive absolution of the German people from the political disasters before 1945, even if such a tactic was never able to eradicate all historical districts (Hartung 14). In this context, the postreunification return to the half-obliterated traces of Berlin Mitte, despite its often unreflective use of simulacra and citations, can be seen as an attempt to undo or counteract the historical self-suppression committed in the name of modernist city planning after World War II. Even the manipulative recourse to the contested category of authenticity may signal more than complacent self-promotion or a naive resort to a metaphysics of presence that is refuted by the actual voids and palimpsests of Berlin. It may well express a desire that Benjamin already detected in nineteenth-century Paris, where in "seinem narkotischen Historismus, seiner Maskensucht" 'its narcotic historicism, its passion for masks' nonetheless lurks "ein Signal von wahrer historischer Existenz" 'a signal of true historical existence' (*Passagen-Werk* 493; *Arcades* 391).

For this reason, I believe, the building projects that I have discussed imply much more than playful pastiche or indulgence in simulacra; they are not simply, as *Der Spiegel* has called the proposed Stadtschloß reconstruction, "ein schöner, verrückter Traum, eine begeisternde Illusion, eine Fata Morgana" 'a beautiful, crazy dream, an enticing illusion, a mirage.' Rather, as the article also notes, the *Schloß* proposal (like many other projects, I would add) is a reminder of the problems with assuming, in accordance with Hegelian notions of the dialectical progression of world history, that each style is singularly connected to the historical period it is supposed to represent. On the contrary, although originating in particular contexts, styles can be legitimately revived, reinvented, and copied, even if zeitgeist purists criticize such procedures as anachronistic (Schreiber 185). Seen from this angle, the self-conscious assemblage of stylistically incongruous but historically inseparable facades and interiors in the new Berlin are a fitting allegory of the capital's reunification, offering a stage where the linearity of history is interrupted for the citation of moments of past life, which, for all its glory and failures, can only be inscribed in the present as fragments, echoes, and images.

It is important to acknowledge that this process does not merely include high-cultural edifices such as the Reichstag and the proposed Stadtschloß (or Libeskind's Jewish Museum) but also comprises purely commercial venues like the FriedrichstadtPassagen or the Hotel

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Adlon, as well as icons of corporate power like the Sony-Esplanade complex. These examples show that even the most blatant celebrations of capitalist enterprise and consumerist materialism can open up physical and cultural spaces that allow for reflection on the possibilities and limitations of remembering half-forgotten or destroyed attainments of the past, even though these controversial spaces leave many questions unanswered. If German national identity after reunification is notoriously inseparable from intricate connections among the postindustrial economy, political power, and cultural memory, then the new Berlin's architecture of citation and allusive reconstruction can be an important hermeneutic vehicle for adding to our understanding of these issues. Perhaps, then, returning to the synchronicity of the (seemingly) nonsynchronous is the most appropriate mode of historical self-reflection in the new Berlin.

Notes

Parts of this essay were presented as "Berlin Reinvented: Urban Memory as Architectural Citation" on 5 October 2001 at the twenty-fifth-anniversary conference of the German Studies Association, in Washington. I thank the participants, as well as Janet Ward and Lutz Koepnick, for their valuable suggestions.

[1] For essays on these changes in Berlin's theater, film, and art scenes and on its new ethnic populations, religious formations, sport culture, etc., see Krüger.

[2] By talking about Berlin in this way and similar ones, I do not attribute a singular subjectivity to the city but use the name to denominate a multiplicity of discourses and ideological positions shaping the capital's identity. For a detailed account of the conflicts among the city's competing agencies—e.g., investors, local residents, architectural experts, and public sector actors—leading to a fragmented and unstable planning policy that prevents a coherent governing regime of collaboration between the public and private sectors, see Strom. For the historical context of Berlin's visual surface culture in the Germany of the 1920s, see Ward.

[3] Architectural citation and the urban palimpsest resonate with the psychoanalytic vocabulary sometimes used in recent theories of art and architecture. Thus, Jencks mentions parody, nostalgia, and pastiche as the "lesser genres with which Post-Modernism is equated by its detractors," but he also associates it with the more positive act of anamnesis: "In a Post-Freudian age the unconscious is often invoked as the source of anamnesis, and it works characteristically with the juxtaposition of related and opposed fragments," which in the viewer's eyes form an "enigmatic allegory" that "makes use of dissociated and partial memories and, at best, creates a simulacrum of meaning where the overtones combine and harmonise" (338). Such a selective recollecting of history through the assembly of heterogeneous fragments in simulated meaning is also at work in Berlin's citational architecture, although it seems to me that conscious city planning and the willful appropriation or manipulation of the past are at least as important to this architecture as unconscious anamnesis. Vidler talks of the empty spaces of urbanism and the tabula rasa of modernist utopias, voids to be filled by "architecture, which is forced, in the absence of a lived past, to search for posthistorical grounds on which to base an 'authentic' home for society." He goes on to argue that "architecture finds itself 'repeating' history, whether in traditional or avant-garde guise, in a way that itself gives rise to an uncanny sense of déjà vu that parallels Freud's own description of the uncanny as linked to the 'compulsion to repeat'" (13). When Berlin seeks obsessively to fill its postreunification voids by repeating its history through reconstruction, simulacra, and other referential means, it can be understood in such psychoanalytic terms as attempting to cope with the traumas of World War II, the German division, and the uncertainties created by the fall of the wall. For further theoretical insights into the connection between psychoanalysis and architecture, see the essays in Leach.

[4] For relevant historical accounts of the Reichstag, see Siedler 186–99 and Ladd 84–96.

[5] See also Koepnick's discussion of the new significance of visuality and the spectacle for present Germany's political identity in the context of Christo's 1995 avant-garde project *Wrapped Reichstag* ("Rethinking").

[6] Here and throughout, undocumented translations are mine.

[7] For a detailed account of the history of the two buildings, see Ladd 47–70.

[8] While I have discussed some representative early positions in this debate, I have made no attempt to cover this ongoing process it in its entirety. On 17 April 2002 an international commission of experts delivered its decision in favor of implementing reconstruction plans involving three baroque facades and the Schlüterhof. While the Palast der Republik is to be demolished, the details of the reconstruction and the politics of financing the project remain undecided, even though, in July 2002, the Bundestag overwhelmingly voted in support of the commission's recommendations.

[9] A playfully ironic perspective on the issue of authenticity and simulation was offered for a while by a life-size plastic canvas simulation of the *Schloß* facade, installed on the approximate site of the original in 1993–94. In a more serious vein, the architect Meinhard von Gerkan proposed

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an alternative to the reconstruction of the edifice: a modern glass cube that incorporates a virtual image of the historical Schloß facade, suggesting remembrance and loss alike. His design was rejected by the Förderverein, as was Axel Schultes's proposal to construct a modern three-wing ensemble that does not restore Schlüter's original courtyard but only incorporates architectural citations of it (*Berliner Extrablatt*, 17th ed., 22).

[10] For the history of Potsdamer Platz and the politics of its rebuilding, see Ladd 115–25 and Strom 186–200.

[11] For an account of the politics of rebuilding the Friedrichstraße area, see Strom 200–06.

[12] For a detailed account of the Kaisergalerie's architecture, history, and cultural significance, see Geist.

[13] Further discussion of the Kaisergalerie's literary fortune can be found in Schaper 205–21. For excerpts from Hessel, Kracauer, and other literary commentaries on the Kaisergalerie, preserving the history of the arcade's "nicht rekonstruierbare Erfahrung der Milieus, des Alltags" 'experience of the milieus, of quotidian life' from the mid-1870s to the early 1940s, see Geist 118–31.

[14] For Huyssen, the critical reconstructionists (who have been particularly active in the Friedrichstraße) have fantasized about postreunification as a "second *Gründerzeit* analogous to the founding years of the Second Reich after the Franco-Prussian war" ("Voids" 69).

Works Cited

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge: Belknap-Harvard UP, 1999.

———. *Das Passagen-Werk*. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. 2 vols. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982. Vol. 5 of *Gesammelte Schriften*.

Berliner Extrablatt, 14th ed. Bargteheide: Förderverein Berliner Stadtschloß e.V., June 2001.

Berliner Extrablatt, 17th ed. Bargteheide: Förderverein Berliner Stadtschloß e.V., Feb. 2002.

Braun, Christoph. "Über den Bereich Home in die Abteilung Men." *Tageszeitung Berlin lokal* 31 Oct. 2000: 22. 14 May 2001 <http://www.taz.de/tpl/2000/10/31.nf/textdruck?Tname=a0184&list=TAZB_ku&idx=1>.

Geist, Johann Friedrich. *Die Kaisergalerie: Biographie der Berliner Passage*. München: Prestel, 1997.

Hartung, Klaus. "Doppelgesicht: Über die Paradoxien Berlins." *Berlin. Metropole*. Spec. issue of *Kursbuch* 137 (Sept. 1999): 7–36.

Hessel, Franz. *Ein Flaneur in Berlin*. Berlin: Arsenal, 1984. Rpt. of *Spazieren in Berlin*. 1929.

"History." *Hotel Adlon Kempinski Berlin*. 7 July 2003 <http://www.hotel-adlon.de/en/hotel/geschichte/index.htm>.

Hotel Adlon Berlin. Berlin: Hotel Adlon, n.d.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Huyssen, Andreas. "After the War: Berlin as Palimpsest." *Harvard Design Magazine* 10 (2000): 1–5.

———. "The Voids of Berlin." *Critical Inquiry* 24 (1997): 57–81.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism; or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

Jencks, Charles. *Post-modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1987.

Koepnick, Lutz P. "Redeeming History? Foster's Dome and the Political Aesthetic of the Berlin Republic." *German Studies Review* 24 (2001): 303–23.

———. "Rethinking the Spectacle: History, Visual Culture, and German Unification." *Wendezeiten, Zeitenwenden: Positionsbestimmungen zur deutschsprachigen Literatur 1945–1995*. Ed. Robert Weniger and Brigitte Rossbacher. Tübingen: Stauffenberg, 1997. 151–70.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Abschied von der Lindenpassage." *Straßen in Berlin und anderswo*. Berlin: Arsenal, 1987. 24–29.

Krüger, Thomas, ed. *Die bewegte Stadt: Berlin am Ende der Neunziger*. Berlin: FAB, n.d.

Ladd, Brian. *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting Urban History in the Urban Landscape*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.

Leach, Neil, ed. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Mosebach, Martin. "Spaziergang durch das neue Berlin." *Deutschland* Oct.-Nov. 1999: 50–55.

"The Myth of the Centre." *History of Quartier 206*. 7 Apr. 2001 <http://www.quartier206.de/historie/body_e.html>.

Quartier 206: FriedrichstadtPassagen. Berlin: Jagdfeld FriedrichstadtPassagen Quartier 206 Vermögensverwaltung KG, 1994.

Rada, Uwe. "Der Trend zu Passagen hält an." *Tageszeitung-Berlin* 2 Aug. 1996: 24. *Squat.net*. 14 May 2001 <http://squat.net/de/berlin/stadtbau/radataz3.html>.

Schaper, Rainer Michael. *Der gläserne Himmel: Die Passagen des 19. Jahrhunderts als Sujet der Literatur*. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1988.

Schreiber, Mathias. "Das verrückte Traumbild." *Der Spiegel* 15 Jan. 2001: 182–85.

Siedler, Wolf Jobst. *Phoenix im Sand: Glanz und Elend der Hauptstadt*. Berlin: Propyläen, 1998.

Strom, Elizabeth A. *Building the New Berlin: The Politics of Urban Development in Germany's Capital City*. Lanham: Lexington, 2001.

Verein zur Erhaltung des Palastes der Republik e.V. Home page. 22 Apr. 2003. 11 June 2003 <http://www.pdr.kultur-netz.de/verein.htm>.

Vidler, Anthony. *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays in the Modern Unhomely*. Cambridge: MIT P, 1992.

Ward, Janet. *Weimar Surfaces: Urban Visual Culture in 1920s Germany*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2001.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081203X68009 Published online by Cambridge University Press