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This thesis addresses the German government’s proposed reconstruction of Berlin’s city palace, the Stadtschloss, from a critical perspective. The exact replication of the old façades attempts to recreate a lost relationship in the city’s geographical and cultural center. An exploration of the layering of historical events and memories on the palace’s site show how they may be revealed and recalled. By analyzing case studies of reconstructed historic districts in Dresden and Warsaw, along with theories of preservation and memorialization, this thesis proposes an alternative to the artificial façade reconstruction. Through the coupling of museum program with a landscape garden, ‘found’ ancient monuments and artifacts from the city of Berlin are used to evoke the individual and collective memories of the multi-layered, intertwined histories of the reunified German capital.
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In 2002, the German Bundestag voted to reconstruct the Berliner Stadtschloss, the eighteenth-century seat of the Hohenzollern monarchy. This building had been damaged by Allied bombing during World War II and subsequently dynamited by the East German government in a highly symbolic and politically motivated gesture (Fig. 2). The program for the reconstruction of the Schloss called for 40,000 m\(^2\) of usable space (about 430,500 ft\(^2\)) containing the National Museum, the Humboldt University archives, two of the largest libraries in Germany, and an “agora” of shops and restaurants. Franco Stella won the design competition in 2008.

The project for the reconstruction of the Stadtschloss is part of a number of reconstruction projects that, since German reunification, are aimed at reclaiming this country’s history. This memorial exercise is hardly neutral. Mark Jarzombek, in his discussion of the reconstruction of Dresden’s historical center, has shown how an interpretation of an idealized historic eighteenth-century city was privileged. Jarzombek notes that some important monuments in Dresden, notably its nineteenth-century synagogue designed by Gottfried Semper, have been purposefully eliminated from this initiative.

This thesis wishes to address critically the role
Fig. 1 Berliner Schloss in the 1920’s.

Fig. 2 Demolition of the Stadtschloss in 1950.
played by architecture in the shaping of the collective memory of citizens. Reacting to the program prescribed in the competition, it proposes to house the collections of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum, the museum of the city of Berlin, which are scattered in various historic locations around the city (including in the 13th century Nikolaikirche), and unite it on the Schlossplatz site. This new City Museum will comprise a landscape garden which will also contribute to the memorialization of the site and its history. I intend for this project to be an alternative to nostalgic reconstructions exemplified by the post-war rebuilding of central Warsaw, the post-Communist reconstruction of Dresden, or in America, the recreation (or even invention) of pre-revolutionary Williamsburg. This project will also eschew the gestural “signature” buildings of internationally acclaimed architects that often disregard the multi-layered complexities of historic centers.
Contention

I contend that architecture can play a crucial role in the construction of a collective historical memory despite the decline of public space in contemporary western societies.

Method of Testing

By looking at how contemporary artists and architects have addressed memorialization critically, I wish to reinstate the Schlossplatz as an important locus of memory for Berliners. The exploration will begin with mapping and archaeological exercises.
Fig. 3 View of the Stadtschloss in 1891 facing its east façade, known as the Hofapotheke, or Court Pharmacy.
Fig. 4 Map of the two adjacent settlements of Berlin and Cölln in 1237.
Site History

The modern day city of Berlin was formed by the union of the two historic settlements Berlin and Cölln. A 1237 map (Fig. 4) shows the island of Cölln in the Spree River, the location for the first construction of the city castle in 1443 (Fig. 5). To the south of the settlement was Tempelhof castle and to the west was Spandow castle.

As the two settlements of Berlin united, the city greatly expanded outward. Like most medieval European cities, Berlin was fortified and had to rebuild its walls as the city grew. A 1723 map shows how the city expanded outward in relation to the centerpoint on the island of Cölln, which is the Stadtschloss (Fig 12).

Over the course of its long history, the Berliner Schloss, or Zwing Cölln as it was colloquially known in the 1400’s, underwent many additions and redesigns. In 1538-40, the newly constructed Renaissance palace was completed by the architect Caspar Theiß (Fig. 7).

In 1702, Friedrich I appointed Andreas Schlüter to transform the palace (Fig. 8). Schlüter’s overall
Fig. 6 Medieval form of the Zwing Cólln in the 1400’s.

Fig. 7 Painting of the Renaissance palace designed by Caspar Theiß for Joachim II of Brandenburg.
Fig. 8 Andreas Schlüter’s drawing for the new Stadtschloss in 1702.

Fig. 9 Johann Friedrich Eoasander von Göthe’s drawing for the extension of the Stadtschloss wings and creation of a second courtyard.
The redesign of the palace was never completed. The Elector fired his architect after he built the Münzturm (or Mint Tower) in the palace’s court, which had an unstable foundation and threatened to collapse.

Johnann Friedrich Eosander von Göthe replaced Schlüter in 1707. He radically altered the palace, doubling its size with an extension to the west and a large courtyard (Fig. 9). Eosander is also known for the gate he designed for the enlargement, conceived to carry a 100 meter tall dome (Fig. 10).

Throughout the nineteenth century, most of the work on the Berliner Stadtschloss takes place on the interiors. Erdmannsdorff, von Gontard, Langhans, and Schinkel are the main architects of the interior renovations. In 1845, Friedrich August Stüler built the dome on top of Eosander’s Gate at a smaller scale (Fig. 11).
Fig. 12 Map of Berlin in 1723.
Fig. 13 Timeline depicting the evolution of the Schloss and the events on its site.

1443 Foundations for castle, Zwing Cölln, for Friedrich II of Brandenburg laid in swampy wasteland north of Cölln.

1538 Joachim II of Brandenburg demolishes the castle and has master builder Caspar Theiss build newer and grander palace in Italian Renaissance style.

1648 Friedrich Wilhelm of Brandenburg embellishes the palace.

1699 More alterations on palace made under rule of Friedrich I of Prussia by new court architect Martin Grünberg. He also designed the German Cathedral.

1702 Andreas Schlüter appointed as court architect under Friedrich I of Prussia. Drafted plans to rebuild palace in Protestant Baroque style.

1845 Under Friedrich August von Schloen court architect. Under Friedrich Eosander von Gontard, expansion of palace with balcony and...
A Prussian Symbol

The Berliner Stadtschloss is closely linked with the identity of Prussia. During the Holy Roman Empire, the castle in Cölln was the seat of the Electorate of Brandenburg. Once the Kingdom of Prussia was established in 1701, the Stadtschloss became the seat of King Friedrich I of Prussia. By 1871, Kaiser Wilhelm I unified the German states under the German Empire. In 1918, after the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II, the focus of political power in Berlin shifted from the Stadtschloss and Emperor to the Reichstag and German Chancellor. Although it had lost its original function, the building remained a symbol for the development of the Prussian nation and even the kingdom’s military power.

The architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781–1841) played a key role in providing architectural expression to the Prussian Kingdom. While working for the state, he designed many buildings in the city center as well as buildings in the greater Berlin area and in Potsdam, the suburban residence of the Hohenzollerns (Fig. 21). He strived to create a national style and thereby a new identity for the Prussian elite.¹ In the heart of Berlin, Schinkel designed the Schauspielhaus (Fig. 17) and the Neue

Fig. 14 Schinkel’s drawing looking down Unter den Linden at the cultural center of Berlin, comprising of the Altes Museum, the Berliner Dom, the Stadtschloss, and the Schlossbrücke.
Fig. 15 The Hall of Stars, designed by Schinkel for the Stadtschloss.
Fig. 16 The 1785 view of the Stadtschloss depicts the unrealized dome by Eosander von Göthe.
Fig. 17 Perspective drawn by Schinkel for his Schauspielhaus.

Fig. 18 View from inside Altes Museum "stoa" portico back toward the Lustgarten and Stadtschloss.
Wache in 1818, the Schlossbrücke in 1819, the Friedrichswerdersche Kirche and the Altes Museum in 1824 (Fig. 18), the Tea Salon, Hall of Stars (Fig. 15), Drawing Room, and Study of the Stadtschloss in 1824 to 1826, the Bauakademie in 1831 (Fig. 19), and the Palais Redern in 1833. He also renovated the Berliner Dom and was involved in redesigning the interior of the Stadtschloss.²

Schinkel’s buildings created a Prussian forum around the Stadtschloss. For instance, the Schauspielhaus had a view to the Stadtschloss from its upper storey. The Altes Museum had also an elevated framed view back to the Stadtschloss (Fig. 12). The addition of the museum completed the square of the Lustgarten in front of it, defining it as a public space and the museum as an equal to the schloss.³ Schinkel’s work on the Museum Island is especially closely related because he built the relationship between the king (Schloss), the divine (Dom), and the arts (Museum). Schinkel designed the Schlossbrücke at an angle to the northwest facade of the Schloss, enhancing its urban presence (Fig. 13).⁴ This axis down the main boulevard Unter den Linden connects many of his other projects to the island. After the bombings of WWII and reunification, these buildings’ relationships were largely restored,

² Bergdoll, 31.
³ ibid., 72-3.
⁴ ibid., 31.
except for the Stadtschloss.

The government of the city of Berlin is currently considering a rebuilding of Karl Friedrich Schinkel’s Bauakademie. A scaffolded facade, similarly to the one erected for the Stadtschloss, stands on the building’s site (Fig. 20). The Bauakademie was damaged during World War II and, despite calls for its restoration, finally taken down in 1962 to make room for the GDR’s Foreign Ministry Office. Itself demolished after reunification in 1996, the question of reconstructing the Bauakademie was once again raised. This reconstruction is an essential component of the current plan to bring back the center of Berlin to its post-Schinkel aspect.
Fig. 19 Painting of the scaffolding erected over the Bauakademie in 1835.

Fig. 20 Scaffolding constructed to simulate how the reconstructed Bauakademie would appear with the Friedrichswerdersche Kirche behind it.
Fig. 21 Photocollage of Schinkel's engraving of the Bauakademie with the scaffolding erected to promote its reconstruction. This photocollage emphasizes the will of the current government to return to an idealized version of Schinkel's Berlin through reconstruction projects like this one.
Fig. 22 Photocollage of Schinkel's engraving of the Packhof with Chipperfield's rendering of the James Simon Gallery. This photocollage highlights the old context with the new building.
Fig. 23
1867 Map of Berlin

1. Palais Redern, 1833
2. Schauspielhaus, 1818
3. Neue Wache, 1818
4. Friedrichswerdersche Kirche, 1824
5. Bauakademie, 1831
6. Schlossbrücke, 1819
7. Altes Museum, 1824
8. Berliner Dom, 1817-1822
9. Stadtschloss (Interior), 1824-1826
World War II and Its Aftermath

The Berliner Schloss was, like many buildings in Berlin in 1945, badly damaged by the Allied bombings and the resulting fire (Fig. 22). The palace was still intact enough to be used as an exhibition space in 1946.

The German Democratic Republic (GDR), backed by the Soviet Union, increasingly grew in favor of removing the schloss. The Communist Party leader, Walter Ulbricht, argued that the high costs of restoration demanded its demolition in 1950. In its place, a large parade square was left for the newly formed Communist government’s demonstrations. Many former West Germans maintain that East Germany’s destruction of the palace was motivated by a desire of the Communist government to distance itself from Prussian imperialism.
Fig. 24 Aerial view of the badly damaged Stadtschloss and Dom in 1945.
Fig. 25 Map of Museum Island highlighting the former locations on the Schlossplatz of the Stadtschloss and Palace of the Republic.

Fig. 26 Palace of the Republic in the 1980’s.
Palace of the Republic

The Palace of the Republic was constructed in 1976 on the vacated Stadtschloss site as the GDR’s culture house and parliament building (Fig. 23). It housed a number of recreational and cultural functions, such as a bowling alley, restaurants, theaters, and auditoria. The architects Heinz Graffunder and Karl-Ernst Swora designed it as a place for leisure in the often oppressive regime. The most prominent feature of the architecture was its bronze mirror curtain wall, which provided extensive panoramic views of Berlin from the inside (Fig. 24). After reunification, many West Berliners called for the removal of the building in favor of a reconstruction of the castle that it replaced, complaining about the Palace’s “ugliness” and apparent disregard for its site and its historical context.

However, in 2004, opponents of the demolition organized events in the palace in an effort to save it. After the Palace of the Republic was closed down and the asbestos was removed, the empty skeleton of the building was used as an art and culture exhibition space and renamed the “Volkspalast” (Fig. 25). The venue was largely successful and attracted many tourists and visitors. The building’s “ruinous” form
made it usable for the temporary art exhibition. It gave the Palast der Republik preservation supporters a sense of opportunity that they could bring new ideas to the debate about the future of this site.\(^5\) In the end, the palace was deconstructed from 2006 until 2008, leaving a void in the center of the city (Fig. 26). The demolition exemplifies the aesthetic and ideological issues at play in historic preservation.\(^6\)


Fig. 27
Raumlabors “Der Berg” installation inside the abandoned Palace of the Republic.

Fig. 28 View from the Schlossbrücke to the site of the demolition of the Palace of the Republic.
Fig. 29 Palimpsest map of Berlin Mitte separating buildings by time period.
Berlin Today: Mapping Studies

The city of Berlin reconstructed or restored many of the buildings destroyed by the Allied bombings. The biggest exception was the Stadtschloss (Fig. 27). Its replacement with the Palace of the Republic was unique in Berlin Mitte.

The maps show the district called Berlin Mitte, the overall city center of Berlin (Fig. 28). The U-Bahn and S-Bahn circle around the museum island and have various stops just south of the island. The other maps show the parks and green spaces, the locations of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum collections, which are scattered throughout the city, and the most heavily travelled streets in Berlin (Fig. 29-32).

Palimpsest Map of Berlin Mitte

Early Prussian Buildings, 1600-1871
- St. Hedwig’s Cathedral, 1773
- Berlin State Opera, 1742
- Neue Wache, 1818
- Zeughaus (Armory), 1695-1730
- German Historical Museum (addition), 2004
- Friedrichswerdersche Kirche (church), 1824
- Bauakademie (school), 1831

Late Prussian Buildings, 1871-1919

Communist Era Buildings, 1949-1990

Post-Reunification Buildings, 1990-present

- Schlossbrücke (palace bridge), 1819
- Stadtschloss (city palace), 1702-1706, 1845
- Palace of the Republic, 1976
- Berliner Dom (cathedral), 1894-1905
- Map of Museum Island, 1840
- Altes Museum, 1824
- Neues Museum, 1855
- James Simon Gallery, 2012 (planned)
- Alte Nationalgalerie, 1861
- Pergamon Museum, 1910
- Bode Museum, 1904
Fig. 31 U-Bahn and S-Bahn Stop Locations

Fig. 32 Parks and Green Spaces

Fig. 33 Locations of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum

Fig. 34 Major Streets: Highlighted in red are Unter den Linden, Leipziger Straße, and Karl-Marx-Allee


Stadtschloss Reconstruction Competition

The German government voted in 2002 to redevelop the center of the Museum Island which involved the reconstruction of the former Berliner Stadtschloss. The reconstruction includes the north, west, and south facades and the Schlüter courtyard, while the interior spaces and the east facade were left to the participants to design.

Competition Programming

The program of the building includes museums, libraries, and an archive for the Humboldt University. The museums include The European Collections of The National Museums at Berlin and the German Historical Museum. Additionally, the building will house the Central and Regional Libraries of Berlin, the National Library in Berlin, and the State Opera (Fig. 33). The Humboldt Forum will also showcase for the first time non-European collections of art and scientific artifacts. The Central Library will be the largest library in Germany and together with the university and museum collections will recreate the cultural and educational microcosm in the castle in central Berlin as envisioned by the Humboldt brothers.
The first prize was awarded to Italian architect Franco Stella. Of all the entries which were awarded prizes, Stella’s design is one of the most conservative. He proposed to reconstruct the three exterior facades and most of the courtyard facades. In 2009, the eligibility of Stella’s participation in the competition was called into question. His contract was later declared null and void. In addition to the first prize winner, there were four third prize winners. They included Kleihues + Kleihues, Hans Kollhoff, Christoph Mäckler, and Eccheli + Campagnola. These designs, for the most part, were slightly more evocative and departed more from the strict competition brief. In addition, the jury awarded two honorable mentions (Reimar Herbst + Angelika Kunkler and NPS Tchoban Voss) and one special prize awarded to the firm Kuehn Malvezzi. In March 2010, Franco Stella received a new undisputed legal contract and the planning and fundraising for the reconstruction is going forward.

---

10 The Federal Cartel Office released a report stating “the minimum requirement for participation was either a minimum annual turnover of €300,000 during the period 2004 to 2006 or alternatively an office comprising a minimum of four persons...” Stella’s office did not meet the required annual turnover and, from the beginning of the competition, did not meet the minimum staff requirement. (Bundeskartellamt)  
11 Case Study: Reconstruction of Berlin Stadtschloss, Bundeskartellamt (Düsseldorf Higher Regional Court, 11 Mar 2010), 1.  
12 ibid., 2.
Theories of Preservation

As defined by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior, the four main areas of historic preservation are preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Preservation is defined as sustaining the current form of an existing building. Rehabilitation is the repair, alteration, or addition of the building to allow for a compatible use. Restoration is defined as replacing the features of time on a building by reconstructing old features and removing more recent ones. And finally, reconstruction is new construction of a building to depict a previous time period. The Stadtschloss project, as made clear in the competition brief, is designated as a reconstruction because much of the building (i.e. the facades and footprint) are being recreated to depict the former palace in the early 1900’s before its destruction.

The Venice Charter, drafted in 1964 by the International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments is the foundational document for modern theories of historic preservation. It provides strict guidelines for conservation; monuments should be used in a socially purposeful way, but without altering the layout or decoration of...
the building. “Wherever the traditional setting exists, it must be kept. No new construction, demolition or modification which would alter the relations of mass and color must be allowed.”\textsuperscript{14} In terms of restoration, it must stop at the point where conjecture begins. Any additional work must be made distinct from the original composition and “bear a contemporary stamp.” However, modern construction techniques may be used to conserve ancient monuments. Article 11 of the charter addresses issues linked to the deconstruction of the Stadtschloss. The charter states that “the valid contributions of all periods to the building of a monument must be respected, since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration. When a building includes the superimposed work of different periods, the revealing of the underlying state can only be justified in exceptional circumstances...”\textsuperscript{15}

Post-reunification reconstructions in Germany have largely eschewed the principles outlined in the Venice Charter. The recent reconstruction of the center of Dresden, for instance, has favored a selective return to the city in its eighteenth-century state, removing traces of the Nazi- and Socialist-era past in favor of reconstructing baroque facades.

\textsuperscript{15} ibid.
Camouflage

Camouflage is most effective through repetition and time. Over time, any space will become familiar. Likewise, through repetition, mundane acts become part of daily life.¹⁶ These repetitive rituals, which may camouflage into the everyday, are what create a sense of belonging and identification with a particular place. They form a familiarization with the place that leads to its assimilation with its environment.¹⁷ Over the course of time, buildings that were at one point unique will tend to blend into the “background” of the city and thus people’s daily lives. In Berlin, much of the reconstructed buildings tend to achieve this quicker without creating a strong sense of place. This notion that time allows for camouflage could work with the concept of buildings developing into monuments over time. A camouflaged building in the urban fabric has the potential to be a very subtle and evocative monument. As the building becomes less alienated and more familiar, its value as a collective monument is strengthened.

Façadism

Façadism is defined as “the practice of preserving historic facades or creating replicas, and the
construction of essentially new buildings behind.”

The practice has received a lot of criticism. It can be interpreted under Ruskin’s ‘Lamp of Truth’ as being dishonest and distasteful because it creates buildings where the facade has very little relationship to the rest of the building in terms of style, proportion, and structure. As a result of retaining only the facade, there is a distinct separation between the interior and exterior spaces. It also results in the loss of historical information that was behind the facade as well as falsely suggests what the building’s function is. In certain instances, such as in Glasgow City Centre, the retention of the facade can be an interpretive process. Here, the later added mansard roof is excluded, thus returning the facade to its idealized 1872 form. In the case of a facade which is structurally unstable, facadism calls for the deconstruction and exact reconstruction of the original facade or even an evocation of one with a similar style. However, facadism is often used as a compromise between historic preservation and new construction for modern use. This compromise allows people to see their place in time, alongside relics from the past, which provide reassurance, and new construction, which maintains the values of the present day.
Fig. 37 Map highlighting the reconstructed buildings and the excluded ones in the Neumarkt restoration plan.
Building Nostalgia: Dresden

During World War II, Allied fire bombing destroyed most of Dresden. The Dresden Church of our Lady, or Frauenkirche, stood as a landmark in the center of the city and was an icon of the state of Saxony. After the war and the Frauenkirche’s destruction, the East German government left the building in ruins for some 45 years, prompting locals to save pieces of the rubble (Fig. 36).

In 2004, the Frauenkirche was rebuilt using spared building materials, although the exact location of each stone was not known (Fig. 37). The “critical restoration,” as it is known, became a nostalgic and memorializing symbol for post-Communist new city.23 The destruction and subsequent rebuilding of the city is the driving force of memory in Dresden.

Dresden is defined by an overlapping of historical elements pertaining to its Nazi past, former Jewish community, and more recently, its Socialist legacy.24 One example of these components is the famous synagogue designed by Gottfried Semper. It was destroyed, but while so many historically important buildings were reconstructed, the synagogue was

Fig. 38 The Frauenkirche was destroyed in the Allied bombing of Dresden in 1945.

Fig. 39 The reconstructed Frauenkirche (2005) using pieces of collected rubble to invoke nostalgia.
designed anew and removed from the restored skyline (Fig. 35). The Socialist period that followed brought reconstruction efforts of some key buildings including the Zwinger Palace, the Semper Opera House, and Brühlsche Terrasse. The restoration of these important civic buildings help to retrieve the collective memories of the citizens of Dresden. This is also achieved, for instance, by the building of statues in the city’s public spaces. However, in certain cases, the Jewish persecution and Nazi atrocities are overlooked in favor of remembering Allied cruelty.

As Mark Jarzombek points out, the old Semper synagogue was an important component in the city’s urban silhouette. The skyline represented the identity of the city with prominent religious and civic buildings. After the complete destruction of the city in World War II, the remains of the synagogue were cleared away by the communist East German government along with most of the city’s rubble (the important exception being the Frauenkirche). This was done in an initiative, as Jarzombek writes, to create a *tabula rasa* on which the new ideal socialist city would be constructed.

With the runification came a new initiative brought on by the West German plans. By 1989, much of

25 Jarzombek, "Distinguished Visibilities,” 60-1.
26 ibid., 71.
27 ibid., 58.
the socialist style architecture made way for the exact reconstruction of the pre-war old city. The most prominent example that was excluded is the Kulturpalast, which was a symbol of leisure for the citizens of the socialist regime (Fig. 38).²⁹

Dresden’s Jewish community was celebrated by the Saxons with such a prominent house of worship because of their complete integration into Saxon society. As a result of the choice to design the synagogue anew, the Jewish community is now alienated and left with a memorializing building instead of a celebratory representation of their former influence in society (Fig. 39).³⁰
Fig. 40
Kulturpalast, a Modernist Socialist era building in its medieval context. It is planned to be torn down in 2012, like the Palast der Republik in Berlin.

Fig. 41 The New Synagogue was excluded from the idealized reconstruction plan and built in a contemporary style.
When the Nazis took control of Warsaw, Hitler ordered the complete destruction of the city, specifically the royal castle because of its significance. The Nazis then significantly reduced the size and population of the once extremely dense city. After the war, the master plan called for widely distributed green spaces in the newly reconstructed city center of mostly public buildings. In the reconstruction plan, an important aspect is the reorganization of different groups of buildings into a “comprehensive civic design so that one will obtain a continually changing, but always composed, town picture.” The skyline of the city was also to be altered. A proposed group of skyscrapers was distributed throughout the city center to give dramatic changes in heights. The only pre-war skyscraper, the Prudential Building, was repaired and four additional stories were added in order to follow the skyline reconstruction plan.

The reconstruction of the Prudential Building is a point of contention in the post-war socialist period (Fig. 40). It was originally constructed in 1931 in the art deco style and was the tallest building in Warsaw. The building was not completely demolished, but was

---

32 ibid., 216-7.
34 ibid., 278.
Fig. 42 The Prudential Building, Warsaw’s first skyscraper, was bombed heavily during World War II, but was reconstructed after the war in the Socialist-Realist style. The building is currently undergoing a renovation to return it to its original art deco style.
severely destroyed after being hit with hundreds of bombs. The skyscraper was rebuilt in the socialist-realist style after the communist regime took over. This politically-motivated interpreted reconstruction was part of an agenda to make the city a more idealized communist city.\textsuperscript{35}

The Royal Castle in Warsaw underwent a series of reconstructions over the course of its history. It was originally completed in 1619, but was destroyed on numerous occasions by enemies in war. In 1944, during World War II, the Germans dynamited the building (Fig. 41).

The Royal Castle was rebuilt and completed in 1984 (Fig. 42). It is today used as a museum and is a major tourist attraction for the city. The reconstructed landmark in the heart of Warsaw is seen as an icon of memory and historical significance. The building represents the story of its continuous reconstruction, as well as representing the history of the city and nation.

The city was also interpretively reconstructed according to the 1760’s to 1770’s vedutes painted by Italian artist Bellotto. These paintings were thought to have captured the essence of the city and were

Fig. 43 Rubble of the royal castle in Warsaw following the demolition by the Germans in 1944.

Fig. 44 Reconstructed Warsaw royal castle, completed in 1984.
thus used as a model for its post-war reconstruction. As Michał Murawski points out, Bellotto’s paintings were known to have used significant artistic license, but were still preferred in the remodelling of the city over early twentieth-century photographs. Much of the ‘Old City’ is actually reconstructed buildings as seen in Bellotto’s vedutes. One example is John’s House in the Old Town Square (Fig. 43). Much of the detailing and ornamental aspects are recreated from the paintings and ignored in the photographs.36
Fig. 45 John’s House, a building in the Old Town Square, was reconstructed as it appeared in the Bellotto paintings of Warsaw. This idealized view in the painting of the city was privleged over the pre-destruction photograph of the building.
Fig. 46 Map of Colonial Williamsburg from 1782.

Fig. 47 Map of Colonial Williamsburg as reconstructed in 1952.
Faux Replication: Williamsburg

Colonial Williamsburg is a Georgian-Revivalist reconstructed community representing the colonial life and culture of the 18th century village. The project was founded by John D. Rockefeller and W.A.R. Goodwin, who stated that it would represent the “core values of American society.” In addition, by keeping the memory of the settlement alive, it allows the American people to hold onto a vestige of their history.37 Rockefeller and Goodwin were very much concerned with creating a seemingly accurate representation of the early settlement (Fig. 46-49), but using modernized elements like sewers. However, the overall site plan is almost exactly recreated (Fig. 44 & 45). The buildings are used as tools for historical education instead of attempting to rejuvenate an old building or town’s appearance in an effort to make it relevant to modern society. Through its historical re-creation, the buildings create a sense of patriotism.38 The simulation is more associated with recreation and leisure than the restored European cities are.

38 ibid., 40.
Fig. 48 Original sketch of the Governor’s Palace in 1782.

Fig. 49 The Governor’s Palace at Colonial Williamsburg, reconstructed as Christopher Wren’s design.
Fig. 50 Original sketch of the Capitol Building in 1782.

Fig. 51 Reconstructed Capitol Building of Colonial Williamsburg.
Reconstructing Issues

The proposal for the reconstruction of the Berliner Stadtschloss brings to light many questions about “authenticity” in architecture. A reconstructed building may superficially look like the original, but much of its aura will inevitably differ.\(^3\) This superficiality is evident in the temporary scaffolding-supported façades simulation (Fig. 50 & 51).

In the case of the Berliner Stadtschloss, the building’s place does not serve anymore its original function. The culture, which once identified itself with its monarchy, has changed. However, this site remains an important example in the debate between history and memory as it has undergone numerous demolitions and rebuildings.

The inherent imperial form of the baroque Schloss was adapted to the royalty who inhabited it, but is not an appropriate landmark to represent the democratic society of today. The reconstruction of a 17th century palace is only backward looking and is an historical recreation that is intended for suspect reasons. Programmatically, the palatial building type does not so readily accommodate a museum as proposed, therefore the interior of the castle is planned to be

---

Fig. 52 The facade illusion set up in 1993 to 1994 complete with an enormous mirror to reflect the continuous facade.
Fig. 53 Close-up of facade reconstruction simulation painted on canvas.
completely new, which further complicates the issue. The reconstruction only applies to the facade, which is problematic because it falsely represents the building’s identity, creating a disconnect between interior and exterior. In the case of the Stadtschloss, the content and meaning are subordinate to form.

This relationship between interior and exterior is important in terms of historic preservation. The reconstruction of only the façades creates a monument which superficially portrays an empty meaning. If the building were not destroyed and the façades remained, their preservation would be vital to the cultural identity and collective memory of the German people. However, the proposed reconstruction of these façades merely make a stage set which do not recall any memories, but attempt to relive a history.
Fig. 54 Photocollage of the Schlossplatz taken from three different stages. On the right is the destroyed building after World War II, in the center is the pre-war 1918 palace, and on the left is the East German’s Palace of the Republic.
Fig. 55 Photocollage of the proposed newly constructed palace with a photograph of the original palace’s demolition.
Memory in Architecture

The city is a primary locus of memory. As Adrian Forty writes, “the memory is not individual, but social and collective...its architecture is one of the means by which a nation constitutes its identity through shared memories.” Architecture, however, is only one component in triggering collective memory. As Michel de Certeau wrote, “memory is a sort of anti-museum: it is not localizable.” This notion of collective memory is socially significant, but unattainable through architectural means. Instead, it shifts the focus from objects to activities, making the ritual a primary concern and the building a secondary one. “It is through ceremonies, rituals, codes of behaviour, and repetition” that societies remember and therefore “may become attached to particular places.” The remembrance of these events is particularly important in this location in Berlin because of the overlaying of historical events that have occurred on this site and the subsequent attempts at removing or hiding parts of it. Thus, there is an important tension created between memory and forgetfulness.

Furthermore, there is a divide in the memories of the collective and that of the individual. The power

41 ibid., 215-7.
42 ibid., 219.
43 ibid., 212.
of memory however, comes from its ability to be shaped. Maurice Halbwachs wrote that the individual is free to choose and ignore certain memories of the past. However, in terms of the collective, “the mind reconstructs its memories under the pressure of society.” He goes on to write that society obliges us to revise our memories to “give them a prestige that reality did not possess.”44 This can be seen in the rituals which take place at war memorials, which are most resistant to forgetfulness.45 The observant is brought into the ceremony of remembrance, regardless of whether or not they actually were witness to it.

Berlin is a city plagued with ghosts. Karen Till defines ghosts as “social figures through which something lost can be made to appear.”46 They can be evoked when elements of the past are revisited such as identifying artifacts or ruins as culturally significant or establishing museums or memorials. Therefore, it is safe to say that the reconstruction of the Stadtschloss does not evoke the latent ghosts, but rather creates more of them. However, place making is a way of marking these “haunted” sites. These places of memory tell the story of national pasts, in the case of Berlin, a complex, multi-layered one. Till writes that archaeological metaphors are

common to use in referring to this layering. For example, Walter Benjamin characterized memory as being “the self-reflexive act of contextualizing and continuously digging for the past through place.” These analogies with archaeology relate memory recall to the ground plane.

**Memory and Landscape**

Collective memory is manifested in the relationship between human nature and landscape. Simon Schama writes that nature and human perception are indivisible. “Before it can ever be a repose for the senses, landscape is the work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock.” Schama goes on to write that the social memory of landscapes, along with the myths associated with them, are not always pastoral ‘places of delight’, but may represent a public tragedy. Thus the collective memorialization can be influenced by the type of landscape associated with it. This perspective of landscape’s memorializing potential of ‘public tragedy’ is particularly relevant to the layering of events that have occurred in Berlin over its history.

Landscape, and nature in general, finds its
associations with memory through its relationship with human nature and function. Jan Birkstead mentions that landscape increases the awareness of how memory is ‘seen’. Vision is closely connected to the act of remembrance. This relationship is capable of generating narrative visions and has temporal implications. It has the capability of:

- transporting the past into the present,
- blurring past and present, recreating the present as past. Vision of landscape has a temporal dimension and thus brings the temporal dimension into the spatial dimension. The landscape perspective foregrounds time.⁵⁰

Birkstead here explains landscape’s ability to transcend time by ‘blurring the past and present’ and thus affect one’s perception of memory and history.

Collective memory is manifested in the relationship between monuments and landscape. Hannah Lewi discusses an example of this phenomena in Kings Park in Perth, Australia. She explains the association of collective remembering with history by the placement of monuments, follies, and historical statuary in the landscape while sculpting the landscape (Fig. 52). Kings Park consisted mainly of monuments commemorating

---


---

Fig. 56 War memorial in Kings Park in Perth, Australia.
Imperial British figures, so the addition of artifacts of local history “recalling ‘authentic’ events and a distant home...in which ‘home’ is a memory and an ideal.”

Kings Park also creates an important relationship between nation and nature. An obelisk and a tree avenue, called the Avenue of Honour, memorializes the fallen soldiers of World Wars I and II. Similarly, the use of the park as a memorial is further developed in the presence of a landscape cemetery. Lewi goes on to connect the nostalgia of remembering the dead in the cemetery to the collective memorialization in the Avenue of Honour and the use of the native bush (wooded areas), which, in Australia has associations with melancholy. The native flora was used as architectural detailing, monument, and as a component in the garden. Its use serves to represent a growing sentiment of nationalism in Australia. The bush’s wildness qualities invoke the memory of the “found” Aboriginal state.

Recently, there has been a push away from the military memorial aspects of Kings Park in favor of a privledge for the environmental and spatial memories. While there is no longer a concern for the

52 Ibid., 21-3.
idea of the found place and its transformation into familiar place, there is now a shift to the strategies of picturesque place-making and the capturing of easily recognizable views and stories.\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{Le Musée des Monuments Français}

Le Musée des Monuments Français is France’s original national museum of sculpture, architecture, and monuments. The musée serves the education of the public in the post-aristocratic society and is an example of a new museum typology: the \textit{narrative} history museum. The musée also addresses landscape and architectural theory in its landscape garden.\textsuperscript{54} Ancient French artifacts were displayed in the garden which serve to add a dimension of memorialization in the observer’s experience (Fig. 53). The monuments in the museum are presented in an historical and educational fashion, while the relics in the landscape attempt to recall the memory of the past.

\textbf{Theory and Precedents of Memory}

Anne-Catrin Schultz writes that “human memory draws references to places and pulls images from the past, facilitating predictions about the future,”
Fig. 57 Painting of the Elyseum in the Musée des Monuments Français depicting monuments and artifacts in the landscape garden.
which can be incorporated in built objects. Schultz also defines two different types of memory: direct, which refers to a building’s shape or style; and indirect, a narrative component of historic places. Historic and preserved buildings can evoke direct memories, while indirect memories are formed by representations of historic building fragments and forms. Architects such as Venturi and Rauch and Peter Eisenman in the Wexner Center achieve the evocation of indirect memory (Fig. 54). Buildings are representatives of the architectural tastes of their time periods; thereby they can be understood as also being ‘materialised memories’. Schultz characterizes the life of a building in three phases: searching for a future style, acceptance and integration into daily life, and finally becoming a memorial, monument or landmark. This notion that over time, a building may become a memorial counters the idea of designing a building to function or appear as a ruin or memorial. In the Wexner Center, the tower forms evoke a sense of monumentality, but fall short of recalling memory because of its lack of specificity in its references.

Aldo Rossi developed his ‘analogous design process,’ which is used to provide typologies that connect past with present by integrating fragments and personal histories in new buildings. The analogies allow for associations that refer back to

56 ibid., 50.
Fig. 59 Diagram showing different memorial typologies and their changes relative to time.
different times and places. These associations have memories embedded in them and are paralleled with the building’s ageing.\textsuperscript{57}

Italian architect Carlo Scarpa also addresses history and ageing and its relationship to memory. In Venice, where, similarly to Berlin, a multi-layered history appears, Scarpa uses historic forms, differently than Rossi’s abstract forms, to evoke memory by relating the past to the present. In the Fondazione Querini, for example, Scarpa invites water into the building in order to leave marks on the stucco and represent the periodic flooding of Venice. This, along with other references to ancient Venetian artifacts, evokes the indirect memory of the city’s formation. In the Castelvecchio in Verona, Scarpa emphasizes the building’s experiences and its movement through time by retaining and recreating meaningful historic elements. His separation of the facade from the original building also serves to reinstate direct memory of the building and its evolution (Fig. 56). This emphasis on layering facades is a continually relevant strategy for the uncovering of history and memory.\textsuperscript{58} The specific references made by Scarpa, as in the Fondazione Querini’s water features, associates the architecture with the memory of a particular historical event.

\textsuperscript{57} Schultz, 51-3.
\textsuperscript{58} ibid., 50-1, 53-9.

Fig. 60 In the Castelvecchio by Carlo Scarpa, the separation of the facade from the building emphasizes a layering of spaces aimed at evoking memory.
Aldo Rossi relates this notion of memory in architecture at the urban scale while emphasizing the importance of studying the history of the city. Rossi mentions that the archaeological viewpoint conveys important information and documentation about the complex layering of histories, relating the city to an historical text. Refering to memory, Rossi writes that “one can say that the city itself is the collective memory of its people, and like memory it is associated with objects and places. The city is the locus of the collective memory.” Because the city is so inextricably linked to the collective memory, the artifacts or monuments placed in the city used to recall memory become extremely vital in the shaping the collective rememberance. Rossi also relates the city to the individual memory. “Thus the union between the past and the future exists in the very idea of the city that it flows through in the same way that memory flows through the life of a person...” In this respect, monuments in the urban public realm take on the task of recalling both personal and collective memories for the purpose of remembering the past and shaping the future of the city.

Closer in proximity to the Schlossplatz site in Berlin, David Chipperfield incorporates the idea of memory in the form of the palimpsest in his redesign.
of the Neues Museum (Fig. 57). His design requires some details of the building to be rebuilt as it looked before its destruction, while also intervening in ways that are very respectful of the old building. Chipperfield’s renovation of the museum comes after previous plans by Karl Friedrich Schinkel and Friedrich August Stüler. The museum was imagined to relate art and history together as an idealized image of culture on the Museum Island as a manifestation of the complex historical layering of the site. Kenneth Frampton illustrates this point by writing that:

the Neues Museum is still, and in some sense always was, a kind of palimpsest in which the past and the present mutually reflect one another at different scales through an unending series of ricochets, which include, among other conjunctions, the exhibition of 3,500-year-old Egyptian relics against a backdrop of Stüler’s didactic scenography.

He goes on to mention that in almost every room of Chipperfield’s museum, the transformation of time on the building is made apparent.61

Pierre Nora makes the case that there is a constant struggle between history and memory.

Memory connects more on the personal level and has the power to alleviate and heal by dwelling on experiences, while history is merely concerned with progress. In contrast to Stüler’s Neues Museum, Chipperfield has created “a temple of memory... out of what was once the temple of a progressive faith in history.” The rebuilding achieves this not only by exhibiting artifacts of history, but by also leaving marks of history on the building. Peter-Klaus Schuster writes that the Neues Museum’s architectural vocabulary of forms and its design visualise for each and every visitor, forcefully and pointedly, the impact of history no less than the actual museum exhibits, fostering our collective memory and insight into the power and powerlessness of humans in the face of history.

Memory, however, is an interpretive process. “Things seem more beautiful when we remember them,” said Paul Klee; by remembering, we create beauty and elevate fact into the mythical. The historic and archaeological collections of the museum certainly help to make this association with the mythical.

Georgio Grassi addresses the issue of memory in his design for the reconstruction of the Prinz Albrecht Palais in Berlin. The building was to have different...
program than the palais; it accommodates a children’s German history museum, including a section on the daily life during the Third Reich, coupled with an English garden designed by Lenné. Grassi discusses the garden as a ‘Gedenkstatt’, or memorial, retaining the ruins of the destroyed Nazi regime’s building where a theater once stood in an effort to evoke reflection. In this project, the monument is the most important aspect. As ruins, the elements of the old are transformed anew by repurposing them as memorializing artifacts. The ruins are partly authentic and partly reconstructed, making the monument a ‘stage set’ for the act of remembrance (Fig. 58). The approach to the garden also contains important elements. For instance, there is an empty space alongside the ruins, which symbolizes the “first natural reaction of collective memory, which is to...forget.” Reconstructed columns, mouldings, and decorations serve to recall the memory of the destroyed building. Additionally, small monuments on the site will serve to retain the memory of the dead.  

In these previous examples, the architecture is treated in a very subtle and sympathetic way in relation to the ancient structure. The Berliner Stadtschloss would benefit in a similar treatment as a ruin and a tool by which the layers of history can be revealed and the collective memory evoked.

Fig. 62 Drawings of the Prinz Albrecht Palais by Giorgio Grassi showing monuments in the garden which are used to recall memory.
British sculptor Rachel Whiteread was commissioned to design a Holocaust monument in Judenplatz in Vienna. As distinguished by Bartomeu Marí, a ‘memorial’ is a “constant impulse to remembrance” while a ‘monument’ is a manifestation of the remembrance. For the monument, Whiteread cast the interior of a library and placed it in a modestly sized square in the city (Fig. 59). The choice to cast a library comes from the idea that the library is ‘the materialisation of knowledge’, containing the histories and experiences condensed into books. Marí writes that “every library is both a monument and a memorial.” The books are cast inside out in order to have them appear as anonymous and also reflect the countless Holocaust victims. Ritualistic aspects connect the observers with the memorial by placing candles on the base (Fig. 60).

The abstraction of the monument as a reversal of the space of a library creates an iconic center piece for this plaza, but it does not evoke the collective memory. The rituals help the visitor to interact with the memorial, but the library’s association with the memory it is trying to recall in its viewers is not immediately clear.
Fig. 63 The Judenplatz memorial is an abstract monument that aims to recall the memory of the dead.

Fig. 64 The ritual associated with visiting the memorial involves leaving candles as an interactive form of remembrance.
The Märkisches Museum is the main location of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum collection for the city of Berlin. The building was badly damaged during World War II, but rebuilt in stages. Today, it houses artifacts of Berlin’s history and cultural development over a period of 10,000 years. The Pre- and Early History Department displays objects, such as arrowheads, a primeval hunter’s hut, jewelry, etc., from the first human settlement in the area. A 160 ft² model of “Berlin around 1750” is also exhibited along with tools and models of ships and steam engines from the early nineteenth century. The largest department, however, displays art and skilled crafts such as iron castings, porcelain from the Royal Porcelain Manufactory, paintings, textiles, etc (Fig. 61 & 62). Attached to the museum is the Cölln Park with a lapidarium and a bear pit (as the bear is the icon of the city).
Fig. 65 Scaled representation of a selection of various items on display in the Märkisches Museum.

Fig. 66 Examples of items in the collections of the Märkisches Museum, which is proposed to be moved to the Schlossplatz site.
Fig. 67 Program diagram laid out in scale on the site. The total area of the site is about 1,115,000 ft².
Proposed Museum Program

Galleries.........................................................................................28,000 SF  
Permanent galleries......................................................(21,000 SF)  
Special Exhibition gallery...............................................(7,000 SF)

Lecture Hall and Meeting Rooms........................................5,000 SF  
Lecture Hall for 225 people.........................................(4,000 SF)  
Four multi-purpose meeting rooms.........................(1,000 SF)

Theater.....................................................................................3,000 SF

Bookstore...............................................................................1,500 SF

Cafe.........................................................................................1,000 SF

Offices and Support...........................................................7,500 SF

Net Area.............................................................................46,000 SF

Circulation, Mechanical, & Storage (50%)........... app 23,000 SF

Gross Area..............................................................................69,000 SF

Fig. 68 Program distribution diagram showing the museum inside the landscape garden. The gross area of the proposed museum program is 69,000 ft².

Fig. 69 (next page) Pre-war aerial view of the Stadtschloss and Berliner Dom on the Museum Island.

67 Museum Program taken from the 2010 Rotch Scholarship Design Competition: Boston History Museum in City Hall.
Appendix I

Competition Finalists

1 Written evaluation by the jury:
This design manages the urban integration of the reconstructed Schloss as the Humboldt Forum in a self-evident manner: to the south and the west with the reclamation of the historic Schlossplatz and the Schlossfreiheit, to the eastern side with the creation of further green spaces along the Spree with pathways for pedestrians and cyclists. With the creation of loggias and a terrace in the so-called Belvedere an additional public open space is created, oriented towards the Spree.
- The competition specifications for the reconstruction of the historic stereometry are fulfilled. With a high degree of self-evidence, this work manages to reconstruct the Schlüter façades, as well as the cupola, without compromises. All façades, including the non-reconstructed inner façades of the Eosanderhof, are Solidly reconstructed with a depth of one metre. The building is well accessible from almost all sides, with some restrictions on the eastern side. Of the six portals, three portals (II, III and IV) are to be structurally reconstructed as spaces. The three other portals (I, V and VI) are represented on the façade. - Critically, the Schlüterhof is not publicly accessible through portals I and V as might be expected, but only indirectly through portals II and IV via a narrow passageway. - With the idea of a ‘Schloss forum’, as the author calls it, a new urban space is created, aligned along a north-south direction. The jury praises this creation of space as an independent quality in addition to the Schlüterhof. Portal III is represented as being the convincing main entrance and main access to the agora in the Humboldt Forum. - The jury controversially discussed the new eastern end of the building, identified as the Belvedere in its function as housing loggias and stairwells. It is to be acknowledged that the façade in its discourse with the Spree pleasantly draws back to the advantage of the historic Schlüter façade. It was

Francesco Stella

First Prize

“The virtue is in the seam’ Karl Friedrich Schinkel
The ‘reconstructed’ and ‘newly constructed’ parts of the building form a composition of architectural elements spanning from three hundred years ago up to the present, with the identity of each element clearly recognisable.”

1
discussed whether the elevation, a façade which appears to the distance of the Marx-Engels-Forum, has enough architectural expression and whether in this part of the building spatial and amenity can be successfully created on such a narrow floor space. - Through the composition of new structures, which are similar in the interior allocation of floors to the reconstructions, the necessary space above all in the covered Eosanderhof is created. - The relation of the new components to the principles of historical architecture, to their dialectic of ‘wall’ and ‘column’ is received positively. The new components are to be constructed of prefabricated exposed concrete, using white cement and a ‘surface made of light-yellow sandstone.’ Its planning and realisation must be carried out to the highest level of quality. - A not insignificant reorganisation of the circulation paths and thereby reinterpretation of the historic ground plan is somewhat opposed to the clarity and functionality of the suggested ground plans and the courtyard spaces.
(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)
North Facade, 1:200
West Facade, 1:200
Written evaluation by the jury:
The designers suggest a design full of references within the specified framework: the parts which did not originally belong to the building, such as the citation of the brick exteriors walls of Schinkel’s Neue Wache or the design by Mies van der Rohe for the Reichsbank, as well as the reconstruction of components not required by the project sponsors, such as the Erasmus Chapel, the House of the Duchess and the Braunschweig’sche Galerie are all intelligently cited. However, the design does not disintegrate into randomly reconstructed or cited individual sections; the organising principle of the building is, by means of voluminous brick walls, to accentuate the seams between the different components. The three different parts (Eosander- and Schlüterhof and the renaissance buildings) are held together through the surrounding exhibition halls. - The portals I, V and VI plus their stairwells are to be reconstructed. However, the isolation of portals II and IV in a type of artificial ruin, a part of the Spree wing (Braunschweig’sche Galerie) and the reflection of portal VI in the Schlüterhof, which is merely superimposed on the façade instead of the old lateral building, all appear problematic. The cupola also appears as if it had just been destroyed and refers to the inner cupola of Berliner Dom under the skeleton of the exterior cupola, which was exposed after 1944. In this way the destruction of the Schloss and its belated reconstruction may be perceptible by the observer. - The eastern façade appears annoyingly monumental through its three ‘Mies-style beams’, at this point the work is archeologically constructed and the Spree promenade is blocked without reason. The retention of the historic monuments on the ground under the west wing was evaluated positively. - Admittedly, the references in the design come with considerable functional problems: a proper agora is missing; in its place there is a narrow passage in front of the monumental first brick wall. The library is divided up among small, all too narrow rooms, joined by even narrower corridors. - The way round the exhibition rooms interrupts the ‘ruin shafts’ of portals II and IV, the way through is complicated and unclear. - Altogether this is an intelligent and associative design. Unfortunately it is not successful in developing the functionality to a similarly high level.

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)
Written evaluation by the jury:
The work is convincing primarily through a high coherence of room layouts, room proportions and the reconstruction of the Schlüter façade. The interplay of new usage, the appropriate façades and the former room layouts has largely been achieved. - The reconstruction of some stairways and numerous historic interiors including the Kunstkammer in its original place is to be highlighted in particular. The work even goes a step further: the former Spree wing which was divided up into rather small sections and in part had a mediaeval structure also finds its structural equivalent in the use of rather small sections for administration and secondary operations, which are to be housed there. - This so-called following of the historical trail is, however, paid for by drastic deficiencies. As large-scale uses can hardly be integrated into the structure of the former Schloss, the exhibition spaces as well as the library are displaced to the basement. Although such a solution is not unthinkable, the completely insufficient illumination of the library has to be criticised. - Guiding of museum visitors is not possible in this way. The entrance is in the Eosanderhof via the central wing of the basement into the large halls, which almost end as cul-de-sacs, and continue the way round via side stairs and a lift to the upper floors. The lighting of these rooms via flat skylights in the Eosanderhof appears to be impractical. - However, the reconstruction of the Eosander- and Schlüterhof as both public and accessible spaces, which closely link the Humboldt Forum to the urban space, is acknowledged. The agora is easily accessible from the Eosanderhof, but unfortunately is spread across other spaces in the basement. - Architecturally, the design is also close to the historical language in its non-reconstructed façades. In the Schlüterhof this further development is not convincing and seems too schematic. The slit-like perforation of the façades in the Eosanderhof and the Apothekenflügel were not received particularly well. The highly animated and small-structured interpretation of the Spree wing was controversially discussed by the jury and can hardly meet the needs of the new urban situation. - Altogether, this is a work which looks for a high degree of agreement from the usage and the structure of the former Schloss, but which threatens to fail in this task through its functional and interior sequences. (Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)

Christoph Mäckler
Frankfurt am Main
Third Prize
“The central idea behind the design is to combine the reconstructed Schloss and the Humboldt Forum to form a new entity, both aesthetically and in content. The idea is not to create a contrast with the reconstructed baroque architecture, but rather to continue in the style of Schlüter but with modern means.”
Written evaluation by the jury:
The design is developed on the historic ground plan of the Schloss. The required thoroughfare in a north-south direction is present as is the west-east circulation via portal III and on the Spree side. Portals II and IV act as the main entrance. - The re-erection of the required three baroque façades is envisaged, however as a double-layered construction, first with an interim façade made from fibre cement. The envisaged cupola was controversially discussed by the jury with regard to the heightened drum and the modern design and was looked upon as being rather inappropriate. - The eastern façade is designed with windows, with size of the openings being out of scale with the historic façades. The design of the eastern façade of the central wing of the Schlüterhof stands out as being over-dimensional. - The agora is conveniently housed in the ground and basement floors, but in its form, which is divided into small sections and heavily dissected, neither ensures a clear thoroughfare nor the desired generous and welcoming gesture. Access is on the basement floor room from the Spree side and from portal III via steps to the basement. The circulation concept is remarkable for its many stairs and escalators and does not appear to be truly stringent. Furthermore, there is no consistent barrier-free access. The light wells for the basement of the agora clearly restrict movement in the Schlüterhof and will hardly be able to fulfil their purpose as ‘gardens of the continents.’ - The space allocation plan has been quantitatively fulfilled; however, qualitative criteria such as room heights and room structures must be critically evaluated. The exhibition spaces in part receive too little daylight and are too narrow. - The library is primarily housed on one floor in the Spree wing and with sections in the Apothekenflügel. The tunnel connection required by the library to the royal stables is envisaged.

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)

Kleihues + Kleihues
Berlin
Third Prize
“The Schloss building was and will be a defining solitaire jewel in the centre of the city.”
Written evaluation by the jury:
The idea behind this work is the careful reconstruction of the portals and the Schlüterhof with adjoining rooms on the one hand and the free design of the agora and the exhibition rooms on the other hand. Both areas are covered by the reconstructed Schloss façade to make an exterior unity, but are of highly different spatial qualities.
- The careful reconstruction of the Schlüterhof and the adjoining rooms has been acknowledged by the jury. Here, the ‘festive urban space’ envisaged by the designer can be generated. - In contrast, the agora rather gives the impression of a cinema. The quality expected in the brief of a ‘centre for numerous cultural experiences’ and a ‘place of education and for communicating knowledge’ can hardly be combined with this appearance. The uniting quality of the agora has been disregarded in this design: the auditorium can only be reached by a separate entrance from the Schlüterhof or via long basement corridors. The exhibition rooms above the agora are in conflict with the different climatic requirements of the exhibitions. The adjoining areas are missing special qualities. The library is also divided in its use by stairwells and exhibition spaces. The Lapidarium is isolated and housed in a new tower building to the north east of the Schloss. - Some of the functional deficiencies are the consequence of the reconstruction of room sequences in the area of the Schlüterhof. However, other areas lack careful treatment in a comparable manner. - The concept ensures urban reconstruction and design of the urban spaces in all areas. The Schlossplatz receives its historic design. The Spree promenade remains open, with limited use only via narrow steps in part. The Schlossgarten is regained between the Schlossplatz and the Spree. Altogether the project shows high quality in the careful reconstruction and severe deficiencies in the functions and room sequences. However, a coherent overall concept is missing.

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)

Hans Kollhoff
Berlin
Third Prize
“The people want the Schloss. However, it is not only about regaining the Stadtmitte [city centre district] and the idea of a centre, but about the embodiment of an urban consciousness. The Schloss therefore has to be believable as a whole.”
Written evaluation by the jury:
The design shows an independent solution to the competition brief, but does not adhere to one compulsory aspect: the design of a dome. It can only be considered therefore in a special round. The jury praises the outstanding features of the design: the glass-roofed ‘Eosanderhof’ creates a new public space, an extended agora. The interior view of the reconstructed façade reminds us of the destruction of the Schloss. The galleries offer an excellent view over the area of the city surrounding the Schlossinsel. In the daylight and lit up in the evening, the roof gives a new lightness to the building. The façades are firstly constructed with solid brick walling, with the ‘finished bare brickwork’ having its own aesthetic qualities (reminding us of Schinkel and Italian churches). Depending on building work progress and funding, the baroque brick façade can be covered - at first just the entrances, then further sections. In all of these phases, the Humboldt Forum is an attractive building. - The jury decided unanimously to award this design a special prize.

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)

Kuehn Malvezzi
Berlin
Special Prize
“The central idea behind the design is to expand on the idea of an agora. A sequence of spaces, integrating exterior and Interior, provide a fluid connection of the Humboldt Forum to the city. The Eosanderhof under its cupola is a public foyer.”

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)
Written evaluation by the jury:
The designer has broadened the task of reconstruction by updating the historic baroque façade on the eastern side and thereby presenting the structure as a coherent entity to which the historic cupola also belongs. However, there were controversial discussions within the jury whether these additional façades stood in contradiction to the history and to the new content of the Schloss. - The open space structure in the exhibition cube positioned within Eosanderhof offers numerous possibilities for flexible use. The circulation structure in the light wells was seen rather critically. The layout of the functional areas is not really convincing, in particular the division of space in the library area would lead to some difficulties in use, particularly as the connection to the agora is missing. The position of the single-story agora under the cube comes across as cramped and leaves little space for activities and encounters. The translucent media façade of the Schlüterhof seems rather extreme in contrast to the three historical façades. - The opening on the ground floor on the eastern side and the construction of a riverside promenade were looked upon favourably.

(\textit{Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt})

\begin{flushright}
\textbf{Sergei Tchoban}
\textit{Berlin}
Honorable Mention

\textit{“The central idea behind this design is that, in building the Humboldt Forum, the urban space will be reconstructed according to its historical legacy and the dialogue with the neighbouring structures renewed.”\textsuperscript{7}}
\end{flushright}
Written evaluation by the jury:
Keeping both courtyards free of any structures is the outstanding feature of this design. However, it would have been nice if the designer had made a statement as to the design of these free spaces.
- The organisation inside appears to have been coherently and functionally resolved. Above all the library, organised on one level around the Schlüterhof is ideal for its use. Also the direct sight-line in the special exhibition area to the Altes Museum is an asset for this area. An unwanted effect of keeping the courtyards free is the relocation of the foyer and hence of the agora to the east wing of the Schloss. This relocation of the main area of the Schloss was controversially discussed among the jury. On the one hand the visitors who enter the Schloss via portal III must cross two courtyards in order to reach the agora; on the other hand the entire Schlüterhof is upgraded to an agora. The connection to the agora and the special exhibition in the east wing however generates a somewhat undifferentiated broad structure along the Spree, with its simple, rather banal façade design, which does not establish a dialogue with the baroque façade.
- The agora in the suggested form is not the self-contained space which is expected for this use and remains more of a space of circulation than a place for communicative encounters.
- Unfortunately the exterior design of the façade and above all the cupola do not match the quality of the functional organisation and pervasiveness of the interior. This is also true for the integration of the art chamber and the concept room of the Humboldt University in the exhibition tour. Both areas are a story lower and only joined by stairs, so that they remain an appendix. If these rooms were to be made directly accessible, then there would be problems with access control.

Reimar Herbst
Berlin
Honorable Mention
“The central idea behind the design of the Humboldt Forum is the completion of the Stadtschloss’ outer body picking up and expanding on the cityscape-defining baroque façade, and the addition of a closed modern cube building at the Schlüterhof.”

(Humboldt Forum Berlin: The Projekt)
## Appendix II

**Competition Information**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization Area</th>
<th>FLOOR AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The “Gate to the World” (Agora)</td>
<td>9,500 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication, education and experience room for Non-European culture. Includes shops, gastronomy halls, and an auditorium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Collections of the National Museums at Berlin</td>
<td>24,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exhibition areas on art, archeology, and cultural history in comparison to other continents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Regional Library</td>
<td>4,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>library stacks with contents of Non-European and the Humboldt University’s collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections of the Humboldt University</td>
<td>1,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concept room, archive of sounds, administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas for disposition depending on concept</td>
<td>1,500 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. art chambers and other historical interior rooms, exhibition on the history of the site, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (main usable area)</td>
<td>40,000 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The new Stadtschloss is, just as once its demolition was, the result of a political decision which concerned both the past and the future of the city. Beyond this political significance, the real aim seems to be to make the Schloss spectacularly reappear: its new presence with the old façades as a spectacle in the midst of the other historic buildings between the Museumsinsel and Unter den Linden. The value and singularity of the new Schloss as an architectural symbol in itself was not given any consideration in the competition brief. The logical conclusion to this requirement would have been simply to build a replica of the old Schloss, a second Schloss which would be as identical as possible to the first one. This is a hypothesis which is hard to dismiss, but in which architecture would play little part. The architectural competition would also not have been necessary.

Two additional questions needed to be answered, one of a pragmatic nature and a fundamental part of the competition, the other one of complex methodological character, where architecture does play a role. First of all, the aim was to develop a project with substantial financial backing, whose results would be as grand as possible. This results
in an agenda with differing concepts for the use of the building: exhibitions, congresses, theatre performances, commerce, etc. The so-called Humboldt Forum clearly has little to do with the Stadtschloss ‘as it once was’. The second question - for me of greater significance long term - concerns the architecture of the new construction: its own raison d’être as architecture, which would be able to give the original building a more appropriate and more complex meaning. In short, it is about the new Schloss being a symbolic form of the old one. In my view this is the only plausible raison d’être for the new Schloss in this location. Not a copy of the old construction, but an independent structure which evokes the past with its outer form. It is this which is the specific task of any creative interpretation, the development of an architectural design, and in my opinion this is the real task to which the participants should have applied themselves. It is not so much the outer form of the original Schloss which is important, but the remembrance of it, de facto the intrinsic life of this form as an expression of the history of the city; the history of which the first building was a part until its end. This is of course only my personal view, the view of an architect. As such, I have to say that I am very disillusioned by the results. All of the designs presented - those selected as well
as those which did not make it to the second round - could not or did not want to respond to this very specific task, almost as if they were not even aware that they were not actually supposed to be dealing purely with ‘how it was,’ but to look beyond the outer form at the dramatic history of the original building. A quantum of sensitivity and visual judgement - and not least a great deal of mastery - that such a difficult task demands, would have been required. Instead, all the designs submitted were technocratic responses to the competition brief, more or less successful, more or less elegant, more or less honest, therefore ultimately more or less appropriate to the task at hand. One mistake was certainly within the brief itself, with its focus on a representative and perfectly functional structure. I feel however, that the faintheartedness of the participants in the face of this task has also been profound. They were uncritical of the brief and therefore broke away from their real task as architects.

In my assessment of the designs I followed the principle of damage limitation, of the relatively less bad, in the hope that some substantial rethinking and exploration will take place during the planning stage.\textsuperscript{11}
Far from being an isolated episode in European architecture, the project for the partial reconstruction of the former palace of the Hohenzollerns fits into a well-stocked narrative. While the parliament of the Third Republic in Paris refused to restore the Tuileries, regarded as a symbol of absolutism, Boris Yeltsin’s post-Soviet regime in Moscow did not hesitate to rebuild the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in its entirety by way of expiation, after it had been blown up on Stalin’s orders; only its iconostasis had been preserved. These two decisions were both motivated by political rather than artistic considerations, as was the destruction of the Berlin Schloss in 1950.

The creation of a Humboldt Forum that would integrate a copy of significant elements of the destroyed building, decided on by the Bundestag, reflects symbolic considerations that relate to different periods of time. It involves a reversal of the vandalism of the so-called ‘Democratic’ Republic; Schinkel’s Bauakademie was another of its victims. Truth to tell, another dimension, the reminder of the great days of the court of Prussia and the Wilhelmine Reich, leaves a large part of Germany indifferent, if not hostile, as is symmetrically the case where
the mediocre Palast der Republik is concerned. It is idealised by a small portion of opinion in East Berlin and cited moreover in the most kitsch manner possible in one of the competition entries.

The slogan ‘Democracy as the client’ has ruled the undertaking. Thus parliament has played a role similar to that of the great dictators when they remodelled Rome, Moscow and Berlin, laying down a very specific architectural solution. In view of this, it is remarkable that the Renaissance façade of the palace overlooking the River Spree, with its picturesque irregularities, was not regarded as having to be reinstated, unlike the great walls on the south, north and east, as if the building necessarily had to be a product of what could be categorized as sublime. The aesthetic criteria laid down were not only sectarian, but also fundamentally at odds with the competition programme; in addition to an agora with undefined objectives, fitted into the Forum as if to create a Greco-Roman chimera, the recommended inclusion of the volumes required by a museum and a library in the envelope imposed was almost impossible to achieve in terms of space. Therefore the principle of rebuilding the historical envelope has also led to the reinstatement of the constraints that historic buildings impose on contemporary programmes. Another very surprising contradiction:
the insistent instruction that the façades and dome should be reinstated - which led some competitors to design lamentable pastiches - went hand in hand with a total block on the archaeological data not mentioned in the programme. Yet the poetic potential of revealing the basements and foundations can scarcely be doubted. What is more, no scheme included any evocation of destruction in the imagined building, except for Johannes Kuehn’s, which is extremely ingenious in its suggestion of a gradual reconstruction of the façades and the replacement of the compulsory dome by an enigmatic diaphanous superstructure.

There is nothing surprising about the fact that European professionals were reserved in responding to a competition that left so little room for the imagination as regards the ways and means of effecting a historic reinstatement that could have inspired fruitful design strategies if their hands not been tied in advance. In the end what took place was a contest between German teams, for all that the winner was the Italian, Franco Stella. Alongside the clumsy classical orders or demagogic excesses of many of the competitors, hardly any of whom could overcome the internal contradictions of the programme, the jury decided on a geometrically clear approach, but its habitability may well prove
problematic. Unfortunately no other project that respected the political ruling provided more exhilarating or more realistic solutions. Its linear agora in the shape of a passage and the gallery open to the east made it stand out sufficiently for it to become, despite the impracticability of its wing overlooking the Spree, the object of a consensus strangely lacking in enthusiasm within a jury that was almost astonished to get out of the impasse it was in.¹²

An unspecific fear of the new is not a good premise for ambitious architecture. In a way this is also true for the task of creating a ‘House of World Cultures’ inside the historic outer shell of the Stadtschloss in Berlin.

The decision by the German Bundestag to reconstruct the historic façade of the Schloss was made ahead of the competition. This government policy-makers’ decision was to have a far-reaching impact on designs for the detailed use of the building. There followed a call for competition entries whose scope of creative freedom would inevitably be limited and would not allow a great deal of room for looking into alternative possibilities. As the decision regarding the outer shell had already been made, attempts by the jury in preliminary meetings to allow for more freedom of creativity in the competition failed.

These limitations meant that there were disappointingly few entries to the competition, especially from the international arena.

In the first stage of the two phase competition process, the jury found it difficult to select the required minimum of thirty entries to go forward into phase two. Eventually, entries which had not fully complied with the requirements of the brief
were allowed through to the second phase with the instruction that the specifications of the brief were to be adhered to in the next round.

However, in the second phase of the competition, the ratio of entries which adhered to these parameters and those which did not was approximately the same. The contradiction of replicating the cubature of the Stadtschloss and a complete change in the function of the interior demanded almost that participants square the circle and proved to be a challenge which was particularly difficult to rise to. The jury had the problem of having to select suitable ideas from the remaining entries. At the same time, during a further selection meeting, it was hard to ignore the quality of some of the entries. The fact that these entrants had allowed themselves more room for creativity had resulted in work which was interesting and worthy of discussion. This was especially true for the work of Kuehn Malvezzi of Berlin, awarded the special prize, but also for the work of Georg Scheel Wetzel Architects of Berlin with van der Dank, Vienna.

The winning entry by Franco Stella reflects what was possible within the limits of the competition and adheres to the wishes of authority. For the ‘House of World Cultures’ in the centre of Berlin, I would have wished for a more courageous, more future-oriented reflection of our society today.\(^{13}\)
Fig. 70 Demolition of the Stadtschloss by the East Germans in 1950.
Fig. 71 (previous page) View of Berlin down Unter den Linden after bombing in 1945.

Fig. 72 (above) Mapping exercise overlaying different urban conditions and highlighting historical sites.
Fig. 73 Constellation mapping exercise connecting important historical sites from various time periods.
Fig. 74 Joseph Cornell boxes were looked at as precedents for composing and displaying precious museum artifacts.
Fig. 75 Collage boxes relating to various themes in German history. The themes include war, symbols, sport, division, and the Schlossplatz site.
Fig. 76 Conceptual study models exploring connected views, circulation, and the palimpsest.
Fig. 77 Building concept models exploring different facade techniques, underground museum strategies, and courtyard organization.
Fig. 78 Site Plan
Fig. 82 Site photographs and museum artifacts.
Fig. 83 Conceptual axon
Fig. 84 Diagramatic axon highlighting the two sides of the site; one devoted to the evocation of the memory of the Stadtschloss while the other is a microcosm of the larger Mitte district and its history through staged artifacts.
Fig. 85 Sectional perspective
Fig. 86 City diagram of objects in various Berlin museums showing where each artifact was originally found and its time period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMAGE #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LOCATION (BUILDING)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS (cm)</th>
<th>MUSEUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IMG_0906</td>
<td>Konsolstein (Corbel) des alten Rathauses</td>
<td>Altes Berliner Rathaus</td>
<td>1664-1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IMG_0910</td>
<td>Fragment einer Krale des Adlers</td>
<td>Nationaldenkmal für Kaiser Wilhelm I</td>
<td>1895-1897</td>
<td>42 x 30 x 18</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMG_0924</td>
<td>Mutmaßlicher Grundstein vom Barockflügel</td>
<td>Altes Berliner Rathaus</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>757 x 457 x 60?</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IMG_0926</td>
<td>Schrifttafel</td>
<td>Schleusenbrücke</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>23.4 x 19.4 x 0.6</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IMG_0927</td>
<td>Schriftplatte</td>
<td>Schleusenbrücke</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>21.5 x 25.8 x 0.6</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IMG_0928</td>
<td>Hauszeichen mit Personifikation der Hoffnung</td>
<td>Haus Fischerbrücke 5</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>86 x 612 x 23</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IMG_0929</td>
<td>Fragment von Mezzaninekronungen der Schlossplatzfassade</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>1538-1540</td>
<td>42 x 50 x 10-20</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IMG_0930</td>
<td>Volute</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IMG_0931</td>
<td>Fragment einer Treppenstufe aus der offenen Prunkwendeltreppe vom Renaissancebau</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>Mid 16th c.</td>
<td>Ht. 26, Dia. 30</td>
<td>Nikolaikirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IMG_0932</td>
<td>Gewölbeschlusstein aus dem Gotischen Haus</td>
<td>Hoher Steinweg 15</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>INFO Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IMG_5915</td>
<td>Kopf der rechten Genie (Pax) von Portal V</td>
<td>New Post House on the River (Burgstraße 11)</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IMG_5916</td>
<td>Kopf der rechten Genie (Pax) von Portal V</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IMG_5917</td>
<td>Denkmal Theodor Fontane</td>
<td>Edge of south Tiergarten (near Thomas-Dehler-Str)</td>
<td>1908-1910</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IMG_5918</td>
<td>Denkmal für Johann Friedrich Gottlieb Unger</td>
<td>Tiergartenstraße 28</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IMG_5919</td>
<td>Glocke aus Heilig-Blut Kirche Wilsnack</td>
<td>Heilig-Blut Kirche Wilsnack (Berlin Dom)</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IMG_6500</td>
<td>Glocke aus Heilig-Blut Kirche Wilsnack</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>IMG_6500</td>
<td>Glocke aus Heilig-Blut Kirche Wilsnack</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>IMG_5950</td>
<td>Spätgotisches Gewändeportal</td>
<td>Cöllner Petrikirche</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>IMG_5951</td>
<td>Der Herbst (sculpture)</td>
<td>Ephraim Palais</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>IMG_5952</td>
<td>Wetterfahne</td>
<td>Altes Berliner Rathaus</td>
<td>1861-1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>IMG_5953</td>
<td>Glocke</td>
<td>Altes Berliner Rathaus</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IMG_5954</td>
<td>Kapitell</td>
<td>Berliner Stadtschloss</td>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>IMG_5955</td>
<td>Konsolstein</td>
<td>Blankenfelde Haus (Spandauer Straße 49)</td>
<td>End 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>IMG_5956</td>
<td>Fragment eines Konsolsteines</td>
<td>Blankenfelde Haus (Spandauer Straße 49)</td>
<td>End 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>IMG_5957</td>
<td>Neidkopf</td>
<td>Blankenfelde Haus (Spandauer Straße 49)</td>
<td>End 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Märkisches Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 87 Rendering of overall site and its relationship to its context.
Fig. 88 Rendering at ramp over the landscape garden to the upper level.
Fig. 89 Rendering of public walkway through site framing the view back to the Altes Museum.
Fig. 90 Photographs of site model.
Fig. 1
AP Photo
Das alte Berliner Stadtschloss, rechts, und Skulpturen von Karl-Friedrich Schinkel, links
Photograph
“Italienischer Architekt baut Berliner Stadtschloss”
Epoch Times
28 Nov 2008

Fig. 2
Im Krieg wurde das Schloss beschädigt, aber nicht zerstört. Die DDR-Führung entschied dennoch, es zu sprengen
Photograph
1950
“Humboldt-Forum: Bund beschließt Stiftung für Berliner Stadtschloss”
Berliner Morgenpost
22 Apr 2009

Fig. 3
City of Berlin with the City Castle in 1891
Photograph
1891
“Berlin stadtansicht mit schloss 1891”
Wikimedia Commons
24 Mar 2007

Fig. 4
Scott Schwarzwalder
Map of Berlin, 1237

Fig. 5
Baroque facades, the reconstruction of which is to be envisaged according to the decision of the Deutscher Bundestag and Names of portals and courts Plan
“Reconstruction of the Berlin Castle Construction of the Humboldt-Forum on the site of the Berlin Castle: Competiton Brief”
p. 51 and 52
Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung
Feb 2008

Fig. 6
Author unknown
Stadtschloss Vorderansicht
“Sehenswürdigkeiten Berlins und deren Geschichte”
Internetstammbaum der Familie Kuna
1440’s

Fig. 7
Abraham Begeyn
Leiden, 1637 - Berlin, 1697
Elector Joachim II’s palace in Berlin
Oil on canvas
1690 (copy c. 1850)
Berlin and Its Culture: A Historical Portrait
New Haven, Yale University Press
1997

Fig. 8
Pieter Schenk (after sketch by S. Blesendorf)
Elberfeld, 1660 - Leipzig, 1711
Schlüter’s design for the Berlin palace
Etching
1702
Berlin and Its Culture: A Historical Portrait
New Haven, Yale University Press
1997

Fig. 9
Johann Friedrich Eosander von Göthe
Stralsund, 1669 - Dresden, 1728
The Royal Palace in Berlin
18th Century
The Art Archive/Corbis
2010

Fig. 10
Johann Friedrich Eosander von Göthe
Stralsund, 1669 - Dresden, 1728
Design for Palace Gate, 1706 - 1713
1706 - 1713
“Short Architectural History”
Förderverein Berliner Schloss e.V.

Fig. 11
Eosander Portal with the dome by Stüler
Photograph
1945
Das Berliner Schloss: The History of the Berlin Palace (1st ed.)
Berlin, Gebr. Mann Verlag
2004

Fig. 12
Scott Schwarzwalder
Map of Berlin, 1723

Fig. 13
Scott Schwarzwalder
Berlin City Palace Timeline

Fig. 14
Karl Friedrich Schinkel
Neuruppin, 1781 - Berlin, 1841
Perspective view of the approach to the museum from the juncture of Unter den Linden and the Schloßbrücke with the cathedral and the Schloß
Engraving
1823
Karl Friedrich Schinkel: An Architecture for Prussia
New York, Rizzoli
1994

Fig. 15
Star Hall, Schinkel, 1825-26
Photograph
1945
Das Berliner Schloss: The History of the Berlin Palace (1st ed.)
Berlin, Gebr. Mann Verlag
2004

Fig. 16
Carl Traugott Fechhelm
Dresden, 1748 - Riga, 1819
View of Lustgarten with Royal Palace, Cathedral and Zeughaus
Oil on canvas
1785
Berlin and Its Culture: A Historical Portrait
New Haven, Yale University Press
1997

Fig. 17
Karl Friedrich Schinkel
Neuruppin, 1781 - Berlin, 1841
Schinkel’s Schauspielhaus Berlin
Perspective
Engraving
1818-1821
Karl Friedrich Schinkel: An Architecture for Prussia
New York, Rizzoli
1994

Fig. 18
KARL FRIEDRICH SCHINKEL
Neuruppin, 1781 - Berlin, 1841
Altes Museum Perspective engraving of the upper vestibule, main landing, and colonnade, with view to the Schloß and the city
Engraving
1822-1830
Karl Friedrich Schinkel: An Architecture for Prussia
New York, Rizzoli
1994

Fig. 19
FISCHER
Die eingerüstete Bauakademie um 1835
Oil on Canvas
49 x 50
Karl Friedrich Schinkel: Werke und Wirkungen
Berlin, Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau
1981

Fig. 20
p. 23 bottom
...und den Fragmenten der Bauakademie.
Eine Schauffassade zeigt, wie das imposante Backsteingebäude einmal ausgesehen hat
Photograph
“Dem Schinkelplatz fehlt die letzte Front”
Berliner Morgenpost
17 Oct 2008

Fig. 21
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Bauakademie Photocollage

Fig. 22
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Packhof Photocollage

Fig. 23
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
1867 Map of Berlin highlighting the

Schinkel buildings and Stadtschloss

Fig. 24
Le château en 1945
Photograph
Sylvain Baudoin
“Ichbininberliner.over-blog.org
21 Jan 2008

Fig. 25
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Map of Museum Island highlighting the locations of the former Stadtschloss and Palast der Republik

Fig. 26
LUTZ SCHRAMM
The Palace of the Republik in Eastberlin in Eastgermany in the 1980s
Photograph
1980s
Wikimedia Commons

Fig. 27
“Der Berg”
Photograph
2005
Der Berg
Raumlabor Berlin
2005

Fig. 28
JOTQUADRAT
“Palace of the Republik 2008”
Photograph
2008
Wikimedia Commons
4 Dec 2005

Fig. 29
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Palimpsest map of Berlin Mitte separating historic buildings by era

Fig. 30
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Map of Berlin, 2010

Fig. 31
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Map of Berlin, 2010

Fig. 32
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Parks and Green Spaces, 2010

Fig. 33
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Locations of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum, 2010

Fig. 34
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Major streets, 2010

Fig. 35
Functional Diagram and Proportion of usages on main usable area
Diagram
“Reconstruction of the Berlin Castle
Construction of the Humboldt-Forum on the site of the Berlin Castle: Competition Brief”
p. 81 and 82
Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung
Feb 2008

Fig. 36
Aerial photo of the Stadtschloss (“city palace”) in Berlin, torn down in 1950
Photograph
Ca. 1900
Wikimedia Commons
4 Dec 2005

Fig. 37
SCOTT SCHWARZWALDER
Map of Dresden Neumarkt highlighting the reconstructed buildings and new buildings

Fig. 38
What remained of the crumbling walls were left to stand by East Germany’s communist authorities to serve as a reminder of the World War II damage
Photograph
“In pictures: Dresden’s Frauenkirche”
SgForums
2005

Fig. 39
Frauenkirche Dresden in 2008
Fig. 40
**Thomas Richter**

*Kulturpalast (palace of culture) in Dresden/Germany, seen from the* *Kreuzkirche*

*Photograph*

11 Aug 2006

“Dresden kulturpalast”

*Wikimedia Commons*

2010

Fig. 41

**Maros Mraz**

*The Synagogue in Dresden*

*Photograph*

Apr 2009

“Synagogue - Panorama, Dresden”

*Wikimedia Commons*

2010

Fig. 42

*Image on right: Bulanda Mucha Architekci*

*From left: Prudential, Warsaw, 1934, 66m, Art Deco: Before the war; Prudential, first Warsaw (capital of Poland) skyscraper, destroyed during the Warsaw Uprising in 1944. Photo taken in 1945; Prudential building, 66m, built in 1931-33: Nowadays; Prudential Building To Return To Former Glory*

*Photograph; Photograph; Photograph; Rendering*

1934; 1945; 2002; 2010

*SkyscraperCity; Wikimedia Commons; SkyscraperCity; SkyscraperNews.com 2008; 2008; 2002; 2010*

Fig. 43

**M. Wolagiewicz**

*Remains of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, capital of Poland - blown up by German forces on 27 November 1944, according to Adolf Hitler`s order. Photo done in the middle of 1945*

*Photograph*

1945

“The Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1945”

*Wikimedia Commons*

2010

Fig. 44

**Royal Castle**

*Photograph*

“Travel guide Warsaw Hotels in Warsaw Information”

*Europe-Hotels.gr*

Fig. 45

**Michał Murawski**

*Fig. 1 - From left: John’s House on Castle Square, mid-18th century, as depicted in Bernardo Bellotto’s painting ‘Krakowskie Przedmiescie from the side of the Kraków gate,’ oil on canvas, 1767-8 (Photograph courtesy of the Royal Castle in Warsaw); John’s House during the second decade of the 20th century (author unknown?, photograph courtesy of the Institute of Arts of the Polish Academy of Sciences); John’s House in 2009, reconstruction (1949) led by Kazimierz Thor and Włodzimierz Wapinski*

*Oil on canvas; Photograph; Photograph 1767-8; 1910-1920; 2009*

“(A)political Buildings: Ideology, Memory, and Warsaw’s ‘Old’ Town”

*Proc. of Joint Conference: Docomomo International and The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland*

*Paris, Docomomo International 2009*
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**Scott Schwarzwalder**

*1782 Diagram of Colonial Williamsburg’s siteplan*
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**Scott Schwarzwalder**

*1952 Diagram of Colonial Williamsburg’s siteplan*

Fig. 48

**College of William and Mary, Governor’s Palace**

*Gelatin silver print; 7 x 9 1/4 in Map date: ca. 1781 - ca. 1782, Cornell University Library Photograph date: ca. 1935* *Flickr 2010*

Fig. 49

**Larry Pieniazek**

*Front side of the Governor’s Palace at Colonial Williamsburg*

*Photograph*

3 Apr 2006

*Wikimedia Commons 2010*

Fig. 50

**Stephtodd**

*Capitol Building*

*Photograph*

10 Mar 2008

*TravelPod 2010*

Fig. 51

**Simulation des Schlosses 1993/94 von der Schlossbrücke aus**

*Photograph*

“Reconstruction of the Berliner Castle - Royal Palace”

*Förderverein Berliner Schloss e.V. 1993-1994*

Fig. 52

1993 umgab eine Plastikfolie den Palast und machten ihn zum Schloss

*Photograph*

“Humboldt-Forum: Bund beschließt Stiftung für Berliner Stadtschloss”

*Berliner Morgenpost 1993*
Scott Schwarzwalder
Palace Stages Photocollage

Scott Schwarzwalder
Proposed/Destroyed Palace Photocollage

Hannah Lewi
War memorial to the service in the First and Second World Wars on Mt Eliza scarp

Hubert Robert
View of the Élyséeum, Musée des monuments français, Paris, France (1791-1815)

Giorgio Grassi
Elevations and Sections

Hans Peter Schaefer
Rachel Whiteread, Holocaust-Mahnmal, Wien, Judenplatz

Joerg Von Bruchhausen
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Francesco Stella; Eccheli e Campagnola; Christoph Mäckler; Kleihues + Kleihues; Hans Kohlhoff; Kuehn Malvezzi; Sergei Tchoban; Reimar Herbst
Samples of the Berliner Stadtschloss Competition Finalist Entries
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Appendix I: Fold-out spread
Francesco Stella
Stadtschloss Competition Drawings

Flickr
2010

"Am 7. September 1950 wurde mit der Sprengung begonnen. Kurz darauf war vom Schloss nichts mehr zu sehen"

"Humboldt-Forum: Bund beschließt Stiftung für Berliner Stadtschloss"

"1. Preis Francesco Stella, Vicenza"
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