Archaeological digs and berlin's urban environment: Remembering and forgetting the traces of the Second World War

Excavaciones arqueológicas y el entorno urbano de Berlín: recordar y olvidar la huellas de la Segunda Guerra Mundial

Eloise Florence

(RMIT University)

[florence.eloise@rmit.edu.au]

Abstract:

This essay examines how the Second World War can be remembered through archeology at two tourism sites in Berlin. Through data collected from site visits and observations, the motifs of burial, authenticity, and historical value are found to engage directly with ongoing negotiations of remembering the Second World War. This contributes a revised way of examining cultural remembering through material traces of the war on Berlin's urban environment.

Resumen

Este ensayo examina cómo la memoria de la Segunda Guerra Mundial está mediada por la arqueología en dos sitios turísticos en Berlín. A través de los datos compilado de sitios visitados y observaciones del sitio, los motivos de entierro, autenticidad y valor histórico se relacionan directamente con la negociación en curso de recordar y olvidar la Segunda Guerra Mundial, ya que está integrada en el entorno urbano de Berlín.

1. Introduction

The Topography of Terror is a city block in Berlin that houses several different memorial, museum, and archaeological elements. It is located in Berlin's central tourism district. The site's website states that it is one of the most frequently visited sites in Berlin, with over one million people visiting in 2015.[1]

The area was once home to the central Nazi institutions of persecution and terror: the Secret State Police (Gestapo) Office, the leadership of the SS and SA, and the Reich Security Main Office. A permanent on-site exhibition and "documentation centre" covers the creation, methods, victims, perpetrators, and organisational structures of these institutions. It also houses a library on National Socialism, Jewish persecution, the Second World War, reconciliation, the persecution of war criminals, and memorialisation and commemoration.

The site is also home to the second largest surviving piece of the Berlin Wall in the capital. Visitors can approach, photograph, and touch the Wall fragment, which has been left largely in the condition it was in at reunification. Below the Wall fragment is an open air "exhibition trench", recounting Berlin during the 12 years of Nazi rule, in both German and English. The exhibition trench sits in the former foundations of the state security buildings, which were often used for holding prisoners.

The bombing raids of the 1940's, the processes of demolition and reconstruction that characterised immediate post-war de-Nazification, and Cold War and reunification urban development, have left the site mostly empty. Other than the documentation centre, the Wall fragment and the exhibition trench, the only thing that interrupts a wide flat expanse of grey shingle is a copse of trees in the south-eastern corner. Wandering around the site, one can find various foundations and archaeological remnants of the buildings that stood on the block over the 20th century, as well as piles of rubbish and rubble that have been dumped over the intervening years.

A short ride on the S-bahn away is Teufelsberg, rising 80 meters above the Teltow plateau. Teufelsberg ('Devil's mountain') is a *Trummerberg,* or rubble

---

1   http://www.topographie.de/en/

mountain, artificial hills that are made up of the resultant rubble from the destruction of German cities. Almost every major German city has at least one *Trummerberge* – the 60 million cubic meters of rubble generated by the 15,000 destroyed buildings of wartime Berlin left the capital with seven.

During the Cold War, the American intelligence agency NSA took advantage of Teufelsberg as the highest point in the western sector of Berlin and established a listening station on its summit. The station was equipped with audio surveillance equipment to listen over the Wall to the American's Soviet counterparts. After the fall of the Wall and the Soviet Union, the site was abandoned, then used by local art and music communities for events and art.

The site is now leased by a private real estate agent, and there are current discussions within the Berlin senate over its fate. Teufelsberg is at once a city green space, accessed by train, car, bike, or hike, and a popular counter-tourism site for visitors searching for the real, authentic or untouched history of Berlin. The hill blends almost seamlessly into the Grunewald, and is crisscrossed by hundreds of paths, from paved roads through to animal tracks. One can wander these tracks for hours, noticing (often tripping on) the pieces of rubble, which don't so much litter the ground as *make up* the ground. This ground appears to shift and circulate over time to throw up and reveal different rubble pieces.

This article spawns from a question continually asked in the author's field-notes from a research visit to Teufelsberg: why is there an archaeological dig at Topography of Terror, but not at Teufelsberg?

Asking this question brought forth a tangled consideration of the rhetorical and conceptual definitions of archaeology, and how it is present in Berlin at various tourism sites. These two sites are technologies of remembering Berlin's destructive past: Teufelsberg is a tool of post-war reconstruction processes, both physical and socio-political, as much as it is an embodiment of the destructive processes of urban and aerial warfare of 75 years ago. The Topography of Terror, itself a site of war-time destruction and reconstruction, is also a result of archaeology as a communicative practice of remembering, digging into pre- and post-unified Germany's past.

This article endeavours to compare the similarities and differences of these two popular tourist sites to draw out the narrative and spatial functions of archaeology in memory texts. It takes an approach to cultural memory

that considers such texts as constitutive of –rather than simply reflecting– ongoing communicative and cultural practices of remembering. In this way it will investigate why archaeology –as much a representational device as it is a scientific or political endeavour– is available in one site of mediating Berlin's wartime past and not another.

2. Cultural memory

The study of collective, cultural, public, or historical memory has been one way of approaching the processes by which the past is imagined in and through a culture. Memory studies is, in general, concerned with the social role or utility of the past, and the way in which a past is imagined and created by and through a culture. The cultural function of the event of the Second World War in Anglo-American art, literature, news, politics, identity, economics, and social dynamics has been thoroughly explored. This is often done from a position that is occupied with the flow of influence between the present and the past. In many of these studies, the past is considered as a discrete entity that exists on its own and is then remembered, either collectively or individually. A central question of many works (Lowenthal 1985; Judt 1992; Wilson 2002) is the role that this object of memory plays in either viewing the past through frames of the present, or identifying the influence of the past in contemporary affairs.

Within this context, archaeological digs at tourism and heritage sites carry with them narrative and mnemonic connotations that are parts of communicative constructions of cultural memory. The study of archaeology, as it is present in memorials of the recent past remains preliminary (Wolde, 2017; Moshenka, 2006; Czaplcika, 1995; De Silvey, 2007; Moshenka, 2009). This often mingles with investigations of the past as it is manifest in material culture. This includes viewing the built environment as witnesses to history and repositories of culture (Ladd, 1997), and the destruction of this material culture as tantamount to destruction of the actual culture and history of a people (Friedrich, 2008; Hewitt, 1983). Archaeological artefacts are often discussed as a physical manifestation of a history and an unmediated encounter with the past (Edensor, 2005 p. 834). Others (Arnold de Simine, 2015; Clark 2015; Steinmetz, 2008) have investigated the representational aspects of the material

remnant through ruins, specifically the use of ruin as a memorial. Two other sites in modern Berlin, Anhalter Station and the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church, are further examples that make us of the subversive potential of remnants to disrupt hegemonic public memory projects (de Silvey & Edensor, 2012).

This study considers tourism and heritage sites as memory texts. Too often, studies orientated around place-based mediations of the past conduct surveys of the political function of cultural memory as it is expressed through the memorial sites. These kinds of studies are tasked with identifying the motivating factors behind the "official" memory programs, political actors, or "regimes" (Ebenshade, 1995; Langenbacher, 2010) of which the memorial, heritage site, or monument are the final product. These studies often limit themselves to investigations of political actors enacting a very homogenised form of memory, which they view as solidified in the sites.

Where they do engage with non-governmental spatial memorialisation projects, studies of memory places often still maintain an acute distinction between official and vernacular memory projects (Forest et al., 2004). Memory and history are conceived of as "ideological battle grounds" (Torbakov, 2011, p. 210), upon which the different parties, actors and figures of both governments, media, citizens, artists, writers, and filmmakers, all struggle to maintain control. There is a growing movement in memory studies of the Second World War investigating counter cultural representations of memory – counter-memorials, counter-monuments, counter-memory texts (See Gould & Silverman, 2013; Morgan, 2016; Stangl 2008). Archaeological remnants are often characterised as revealing these counter memory narratives, which directly oppose dominant ones (Langenbacher, 2010, p. 35). They are characterised as "disrupting the official order" (McRae, 2002, p. 2).

This stance not only ignores the agency and diversity of populations engaged in cultural remembering, it also reifies an understanding in which archaeological remnants are perceived as completely neutral in terms of narrative or argument. Remnants of the past are often considered within the context of memory studies that "focus on acts of resistance and the creation of alternative place of memory in way that also maintains the official and popular memory distinction" (Forest et al., 2004, p.362). Edensor (2005) characterises ruins as poorly classified, flexible, un-encoded spaces, with no intensive regulation. He argues ruins make available meanings and significances that aren't readily

prescribed by the designers of a place (Edensor, 2005). Archaeological remnants and digs are often considered in the same light.

However, archaeological remnants still have their own textual and representational meanings — they are by no means "poorly classified". As I will outline below, when viewed as a representational device, archaeological remnants afford authenticity to the past they embody, because they are widely understood as authentic. They also imply a certain temporal distance from and historical significance of the events to which they gesture. And they are understood to be reflections of processes of burial and exhumation that speak directly to the political projects of remembering in urban environments.

This has particular implications for remembering the Second World War through Berlin's landscape. The material impacts of the war on Berlin, in particular area bombing campaigns from the Allies, often struggles to find and maintain a position within the normative cultural memory of the Second World War (Sebald, 2004; Taberner & Berger, 2009; A. Assmann 2006) This absence has been discussed widely in the discipline of memory studies, but the absence of the material traces of destruction in Berlin specifically is only recently beginning to be fully examined.

As such, the rethorical function of archaeology at these sites relates predominately to remembering the destruction of Berlin during the war. The material traces of wartime damage must be understood within a wider context of debate surrounding representations of German victims of Allied attacks as they sit alongside the historical narratives of Holocaust victims. Hegemonic narratives of the war remain influential in the ways in which it can be remembered in Berlin's contemporary tourism landscape. When visiting archaeological sites in Berlin, visitors are engaging with these narratives, both as they are present at memorials, museums, and tourism sites, and as they are present in their ongoing internal imaginaries of the war. The presence of archaeology, and the narrative connotations it carries, must therefore be understood within this context.

3. Fieldwork

Drawing on site-visits documenting memorials in Berlin 2017, this study examines the archaeological aspects of two sites. Considerable research

into the contextualisation of archaeological sites as embedded within wider communicative practice remains necessary, if not possible within the confines of this article. Both the Topography of Terror and Teufelsberg are highly complex sites, with different commemorative and musueal elements overlapping, interacting, and often contradicting each other, depending on the position and expectations of the visitor. On the one hand, and at least from an official perspective, the entire city block of Topography of Terror has been curated to be experienced as one homogenous (albeit layered) conceptualisation of Berlin's Nazi past. A guided tour around the remnants of the site works in harmony with musealised depictions of the SS and the SA in Berlin during the Nazi regime inside the documentation centre. In a similar vein, Tuefelsberg is not free from processes of musealisation and heritage curation — fences, an entry free, guided tours, and its presence in tourism literature are all testament to curatorial influences from various government and community actors. These also present a singular –though layered– memory text.

On the other hand, the sites are also made up of several different spatial and mnemonic elements: Topography of Terror is at once an empty, open space, a buried and exposed archaeological site, and a musealisation project documenting the crimes and systems of Nazi state-terror. With contemporary tourism practice, 90's alternative cultural use, Cold War intelligence gathering, piles of rubble, and a not-quite destroyed Nazi military facility lying beneath it, Teufelsberg is a literal palimpsest. It can be seen as layers of the physical traces of key parts of Berlin's history: globalisation, post-reunification, Cold War, post-war, and National Socialism respectively.

These different and on occasion competing conceptualisations of different pasts beg detailed analysis for ways in which Berlin's wartime past might be remembered. It is important to therefore analyse the archaeological parts of the sites within the context of these other textual and material aspects.

4. The authority of authentic remnants

Sites of memory, like all memory texts, construct their own specific biographies. How they were formed, and the actors behind this formation, are continually revealed through the materiality of the sites. The voice of the

designer in texts involved in remembering is almost always considered as crucial when determining the form and function of a text (Leith & Meyerson, 1989). Places of memory, in particular, are often assessed as to how well they convey the message and intent of their designer. A material remnant is often offered up as an antidote of sorts to overt attempts at codification on the part of these designers, particularly if they are state figures or bodies. Archaeological digs often make claims to ideas of authenticity that might challenge the assertions of official memory projects, which seek to solidify particular narratives. "Material remnants," argues Tumarkin, "provide entry points into otherwise unheard stories, and to histories that elude language" (1985, p. 200). Remnants are often deemed to reflect a forensic truth, an unmediated encounter with the past (Edensor, 2005). Because of the presence of archaeological remnants, both the Topography of Terror and Teufelsberg engage the idea that the past might be considered outside of commodified and explicitly coded encounters with the past. Remnants that have been left to be discovered at random and without control of site-designers can be read as giving testimony, not only to the events which they witnessed, but to the authenticity of this testimony.

However, far from being an unmediated point of access to the past, as Edensor argues, the meaning of detritus can be controlled –although not fully, as Clark argues (2015 p. 86)– Clark refers to on-site attempts to code remnants (signs, tours, information plaques), but archaeology is also a form of narrative device itself. What archaeology represents is continually reproduced and circulated elsewhere, through other representations and texts – film, television, literature, art, politics, museums, even news–.

The perceived dichotomy between official memory projects and "counter" narratives is often evoked in discussions of Topography of Terror (for example: Fraser, 2012), largely because of the accidental nature of its creation and the presence of ruin, rubble, and archaeological remnants. Indeed, the ordered, carefully curated information present in the documentation centre contrasts starkly with the abandoned relics on the rest of the site. In its initial commemorative phases, however, the site that is now the Topography of Terror was less of a centralised, homogenised site, and more of a collection of loosely related relics. The site was only established as a permamnent exhibition in 1992. Before that, the remnants and archival information uncovered in 1985 was displayed in a decidedly temporary exhibition. This make-shift, community-

lead site was regarded as thoroughly outside of the control of Berlin's official bodies, who's complicity and accountability the site was seen to interrogate.

After reunification the site was co-opted and funded by a body that included the Berlin senate. This brought with it concerns over "the perpetrators seizing the narrative. "Amidst the remnants whose preservation is undoubtedly the product of the postmodern supposition of many histories coalescing on a site," argues Fraser, in a visit to the site much more recently, "is a narrativisation of the past, an attempt to make it more accessible through an ordered representation that apportions responsibility for events of the past, and explains how that past is to be encountered." (2012, p. 138). Moshenka (2015) argues we should apply the same kind of cynicism to remnants that we do to monuments and memorials. Echoing Lucas and Buchli (2001), Moshenka calls for the same cynicism we apply to memorials to be applied to ruins: "War memorials considered in this necessarily cynical and systematic fashion are first and foremost a form of cultural and political capital, and it is important that we also understand curated ruins through this lens" (2015, p. 88). Applying this same cynicism to archaeology indicates that far from being an accident, the sense of found remnants can be deliberately emphasised. The subdued presence of official design projects at Topography of Terror gives the remnants more authenticity as a raw encounter with Berlin's wartime past, untouched by manipulation. Visiting the site whilst it was still in its somewhat temporary stage in 1995, John Cazplicka stated that at the site, "several experiential paradigms related to the telling of history and to investigative archaeology, as well as to the aesthetics of the ruin and to the viewing of a landscape, converge and render the commemorative experience at the site authentic" (1995, p. 157). Archaeology is one of these paradigms, and it has been employed to give the history the site the elevated cultural status of authentic. These remnants are still, in a way, curated. Their very existence betrays their preservation. The fence cordoning off the site from the rest of the city and a purpose build path winding around the site and drawing attention to the remnants indicate outside intervention in the preservation and presentation of the archaeology that occurred in the 1980's.

Topography of Terror is an official memory project, but one born out of accident, community engagement and memory activism, as well as local and international political and cultural pressures. It is funded and administered by a government body, but guided heavily by circumstance and the physical (and thus

wholly contingent) aspects of the site itself — destroyed buildings, its proximity to the Wall, archaeological remains, the copse of trees in the south eastern corner.

Teufelsberg is similarly complex in regards to design. Whilst it is a deliberate project of post-war construction –and post-war memory work (Anderson, 2015)–, it is also subject to processes of environment and social use that are largely outside of official governance: rain churning up the soil to expose more rubble; young people repurposing the spy station for arts and music spaces; animals and trees that have moved in and made claim to the site, which now shade and disorient the hiker. The definitions between authentic and curated, natural and "man-made", are blurred at Teufelsberg. The hill is the product of a memory project of post-war reconstruction, a pragmatic solution to the largely non-political problem of the piles of rubble that Berlin had become by the end of the war. At the same time, the hill *is* the city, a very authentic remnant of a lost time and a lost world. And yet it remains in every sense manufactured. Its very existence, as a topographical anomaly on the marshlands of the Teltow Plateau, betrays an internationality that undermines the claims on truth that remnants have through the label of authentic.

At Topography of Terror, the dig-site sits in tension with the highly coded, explicitly narrativised information boards in the documentation centre and exhibition trench. The influence of authenticity appears to flow two ways: against a backdrop of authentic exposed foundations, the information boards gain authority from material remnants of the time they describe, and the remnants can be considered authentic because the signs deem them so. At Teufelsberg, this exchange of authenticity is absent –without information boards, or an archaeological dig, the rocks under hikers' feet could be just "natural" …rocks–. The authenticity of the rubble pieces remains unverified, as there is very little to hint at the true nature of the hill as a pile of archaeological remnants.

Of key interest in many studies of memory places is the question of design. This has particular relevance when considering Berlin's past as it has materialised in its physical environment. Young (2000) calls Germans "suspicious" of monuments, because of their use (and abuse) by National Socialism. Aggressively political urban planning during the Third Reich and the chilliest parts of the Cold War (especially in the East), combined with the memory politics of the post-reunification era, has resulted in a continuing cynicism of the utilisation of public space in Berlin as a way of communicating

the past (Young, 2000). In these studies, "the past" is considered as a discrete object, with a history of being exploited, manipulated, and represented in a particular way, to further political (often authoritarian) agendas. Nazi and Soviet architecture in particular, is regarded with a solid cynicism as a physical manifestation of authoritarian strangleholds on history. Gould and Silverman (2013) identify this ongoing negotiation that plays out on Berlin's streets:

> The public landscape of the capital is lined with monuments and memorials advertised to tourists, many who specifically travel to witness a past that cannot be glorified. Urban planners, city officials and citizens have spent decades negotiating the details of the memorialization of Germany's past and they use the urban landscape as an expression of both remembering and forgetting. (Gould & Silverman, 2013, p. 792)

The Topography of Terror itself is seen as one of these physical embodiments of political negotiations of remembering and forgetting – both the burial of the city's National Socialist past and its subsequent uncovering. Teufelsberg, however, despite having a much more deliberate and pragmatic biography involved in post-war projects — the solution to a problem of 25 million cubic meters of rubble — also contains more natural characteristics. It therefore doesn't explicitly engage with the idea of authentic archaeological remnants, either of the Second World War, or of the politics of remembering and forgetting it.

Archaeological remnants are continually endowed with narratives of authenticity, considered as free from state-controlled manipulations of the past. A burned piece of masonry might authenticate bombs falling on Berlin, but its burial indicates processes of post-war remembering and forgetting of that and more devastating violences on German soil.

5. Burial and uncovering

In the period leading up to the fall of the Wall, the area of what is now the Topography of Terror was marked for the construction of a highway bypass

(Till, 2012). In response to this, in May 1985, two civic groups staged a protest at the site as an act of memory activism. The activist-archaeologists demanded the site of Nazi state-terror be uncovered and preserved. The groups asserted the more cultural and social idea of digging for traces of Berlin's Nazi past through a physical archaeological dig, unearthing the remains of a Gestapo prison and mess hall. Under community pressure, the Berlin Senate cancelled the plans for the bypass, and a temporary exhibition was established over the dig site in 1987, as part of the celebration of Berlin's 750th anniversary. The exhibition displayed the information that is now housed in the documentation centre. After the fall of the Wall, demands grew for more open and responsible acknowledgement of Nazi crimes on the part of German government. The exposed remnants at the Topography of Terror now appeared "to reveal physically the refusal of the state to come to terms with its violent past in the attempt to become a 'good' democracy through economic recovery" (Till, 2012, p. 76). In direct response to the burial of its Nazi past in the foundations of the city, the Berlin Senate, supported by the German federal government, made the temporary exhibition permanent, and established the Topography of Terror Foundation in 1992.

Through the Topography of Terror, National Socialism began to be remembered as foundational in the most literal sense. Through an act of memory activism, an archaeological dig exposed the veins of Nazism running deep into Berlin's sand. The motto of the activist-archaeologists was "act, dig where you stand." (Till, 2012, p. 76). This was in direct reference to a movement in the 1970's wherein European citizens began to probe the recent histories of their families, neighbours, institutions, industries, colleagues, teachers, and officials, to determine their witness to, complicity in, or perpetration of the Holocaust. In the exhibition trench, the dug out mess hall, the foundational traces of the Prince Albetz buildings, the zig-zag markings of a bunker behind the documentation centre, the message was clear: under your feet remain traces of Berlin's dark past, and we are bringing them back up into the light of day.

This is a common theme in Holocaust and Second World War memorial projects and discourse, wherein the physical attributes of a place are painted as, if not outright allegorical, then at least indicative of wider cultural-political memory trends. In this case, the dig at Topography of Terror is widely understood as indicative of the "turn" in German cultural memory in the 1980's towards openness and accountability (Judt, 1992). This was a

period drenched in metaphors of the body. At Topography of Terror, the dig is still seen as a re-opening of the wounds (Moshenka, 2009; Till, 2012). Many cases of archaeology in memory projects make use of allegories of revealing, exposition, or uncovering. De Silvey and Edensor similarly assert that decay "strips away layers of time and exposes others, revealing hidden strata and obscured material memories" (2012, p. 471). Here the subversive and disruptive potential of historical remnants is key. The process of digging through layers of dirt becomes synonymous with digging through layers of cultural and political projects of remembering and, more often than not, forgetting.

This forgetting is embodied in the process of burial. The act of digging into the ground in Berlin's central government district not only "revealed" evidence of Berlin's National Socialist past, it also revealed the negligence or outright suppression of evidence of this past, manifest as layers of dirt. The archaeologists dug into "the 'forgetful' layers of grass and denial that covered up a shameful national past"(Till, 2012, p. 6).

This reflects a response to uneasiness about what Steinbach deems "perpetrator history". Steinbach identified this at Topography of Terror:

> It is in my opinion especially impressive because it opens up not only the historical site, but also it's meaning for 'remembering' in the postwar period. Sand mountains and plateaus become symbols of the active suppression, the excavation symbols of a new recollection. (quoted in Czaplicka, 1995, p. 181)

Teufelsberg, meanwhile, can be considered as a burial ground for a destroyed city (Anderson, 2015). Anderson figures the forest planted over the remains of the city as an act of forgetting, walking over it an act of self-induced amnesia, akin to walking over an unmarked grave. This aligns with what many see as the burial of particular aspects of the war (namely the aerial bombings of German cities) from German national consciousness. Anderson identifies Teufelsberg as the mark of "a society consumed by guilt for the murder of millions at the very moment when it was faced with the immense task of reconstructing its cities." (2015, p.79). "To walk on and over Teufelsberg is to be complicit with the ruination of Berlin without ever experiencing its effects" argues Anderson (2015, p. 79).

Anderson also aligns digging with exposing, revealing, remembering. He argues that an archaeological dig would bring the remains of the city and thus the memory of its destruction to the surface. This position reflects the idea that the physical act of digging entails a direct link with a more cultural-political act of uncovering narratives. The act of uncovering and reopening of the ground to bring forth realities of history would be symbolic of uncovering the destruction of Berlin from the depths of Teufelsberg. Moshenka argues that "by opening up these sites to the popular gaze, archaeologists have the power to bring these debates into the public sphere, potentially undermining the hegemony of the officially sanction memory" (2006, p. 1). In the way that the dig at Topography of Terror exposed the National Socialist foundations of contemporary Berlin, Anderson argues the unheard voices of Berlin's civilian (non-Jewish) victims would be heard through an archaeological dig at Teufelsberg, and the self-induced amnesia lifted (2015, p. 81). His argument stems from the idea that the normative mnemonic framework of understanding the war, with the Holocaust at the centre and taking precedence, is restrictive. This idea is shared by others and is argued frequently, not only by far-right historians and neo-Nazi groups, but by others who argue for a more nuanced and flexible mnemonic framework for the second world (see A. Assmann, 2006; Taberner & Berger, Sebald, 2004; Schmitz, 2007; for just a few examples of this long and complex debate).

However, the rubble at Teufelsberg was deliberately moved and (in a way) curated in the 50s and 60s in an act of both forgetting and remembering. The rubble, at least in its current state, heaped high above the Teltow Plateau, is therefore perhaps more a relic of post-war processes of forgetting and remembering, rather than a relic of wartime destruction of Berlin. The experience of Teufelsberg as a whole, as a mounded pile of debris, or even as a topographical anomaly, embodies this. Even the act of tripping on rubble pieces and climbing a steep hill embodies an encounter with a processes more (re)constructive than violent, to twist slightly Clark's argument on remnants: "In ruins, the layering is the product of historical forces, both violent and commemorative." (2015, p. 84). Teufelsberg is a trace the destructive forces of the falling Allied bombs, but more than anything, it is a trace of the massive clean-up and cultural remembering project of immediate post-war Berlin.

An encounter with rubble at Teufelsberg is also not strictly archaeological. For one, there is no digging required to locate the material remnants of Berlin's

destruction. Teufelsberg is literally constructed out of the remnants. Shattered pieces of rock, brick, marble, terracotta, porcelain tiles, are found, not so much across the surface of the hill, but making up the surface. Teufelsberg is not characterised by an exposed archaeological dig, but by the lack of it. In this sense, archaeology is not used by the designers of the site but by the audience. In tripping over the remnants of pre-war Berlin, the visitor might wonder at what lies below, dig with their imagination, so to speak. This imagined archaeology can be achieved through photography and cinematics, too: "I imagine my film being a type of X-ray, sending electromagnetic waves through the hill's surface to reveal what lies buried[2]. Yet, the film will show only what I see: dirt, grass, shrubs, trees and rubble." (Anderson, 2015, p.75). The rubble is prominent, insistent — the paths are often littered with pieces of rubble that trip the unsuspecting walker. Contrary to Anderson's (2015) thesis, the rubble of Berlin is neither buried — rather than being hidden *under*ground, it is piled high above and over the ground — nor is it covered by a forgetting forest. The rubble, and thus the post-war recovery processes that brought Teufelsberg into being, are intrusive into an otherwise quite normal urban green space. One can't help but draw parallels with Gunter Demnig's "Stumbling Stones" project[3]. These were designed to interrupt smooth movements of the urban walker through European cities, to suddenly and painfully remind walkers of the trauma once played out on the ground on which they walk (Gould & Silverman, 2013, p. 796). The tripping of the visitor to Teuelsberg takes on a more complex meaning given its proximity to a city that has some narratives and experiences of the war embedded within it (i.e the millions killed and exported in the Holocaust) and some deliberately omitted (the thousands killed and terrorised by the bombings). In contrast to the Topography of Terror, the past that is revealed by buried remnants at Tuefelsberg is one that is not widely engaged within more normative mnemonic lexicons of the Second World War. (Connelly, 2001) This highlights and perpetuates the

---

2   Anderson is referring to the Nazi military school that is rumoured to lie buried under Teufelsberg

3   Demnig's memorial consists of over 20 thousand 4x4 inch tile-sized brass plaques, designed to mimic the cobble stones of European city's streets in which they are embedded. Demigs stones can be found in cities in Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Hungary, outside the homes and businesses of victims of the Holocaust and other persecuted families under Nazism. Each stone caries the inscription "Hier wohnte" ("Here lives") and then the names, year of birth and, if possible, year of death of its former occupants .Many of the stones simply carry the inscription "deportet", but occasionally "emordet in Auschwitz".

normative framework of these Holocaust-centered narratives (A. Assman, 2006), but also shows a certain insistence of the destruction of Berlin that won't go away, even after 75 years. The rubble of Berlin at Teufelsberg is anything but dormant, quiet, lying underground, waiting to be uncovered.

Buchli and Lucas argue the value of interrogating why and when particular archaeologies of the recent past (for instance digs at battle sites from the Second World War) appear when they do. They ask "What are the social and historical circumstance that permit such cultural work?" (2001, p. 15). For future research, it might be fruitful to investigate the reasons why an archaeology of the material destruction of Berlin is absent, whilst one of National Socialism and its historical repression is permitted.

6. Archaeology and historical value

Archaeology, however, doesn't simply uncover something that was already there. The act of archaeology in fact "wills into being archaeological objects of discourse" (Buchli & Lucas, 2001, p. 16). Buchli and Lucas argue that archaeology constitutes the un-constituted, makes discursive the un-discursive, enfranchises disenfranchised narratives (2001, p. 16). Archaeology's potential is to uncover what was hidden, to bring to fore not just that which was absent but which may have been drowned out by other information. Perhaps the answer to the question that spawned this investigation is the most obvious: Teufelsberg hasn't been dug up because it hasn't (yet) been designated a site of archaeological importance. This may be because of the value an archaeological dig would assign, not only to the remnants, but to the episode of history to which the remnants gesture. Trigg (2009) argues that ruins are often rationalised into a usefulness that gives them value beyond newness. The allocation of archaeological status to an object not only assigns it historical value, but assigns value to the event to which it was witness as well.

Herein lays a strange paradox of archaeology: whilst it can subvert dominant historical narratives, it can simultaneously consign them to history. Archaeology neatly cordons off the past from the present, behind glass and velvet rope, at the same time that it ensures the continued insistence of that past into everyday life.

In the 1980's, Topography of Terror was held up as a symbol of digging into a country's foundations to expose the repression of parts of the past that had not yet been examined. It assigned historical value to National Socialist remnants. But today, Topography of Terror serves a slightly different function. Archaeology creates a safe temporal distance from the historical period being exposed. At the same time that the activist-archaeologists churned up and exposed hard truths and horrors of Germany's past, they immediately relegated them to "History", the stuff of museum, text book, and library. Young touches on this phenomenon when he discusses the invisibility of Holocaust memorials. These can also relegate the past to a gated-off area of discourse, creating a smooth, even finish on a rather complex and rough history: "It is this 'finish' that repels our attention," argues Young, identifying the stasis that turns the dynamic memory into stone, that "makes a monument invisible. It is as if a monument's life in the communal mind grows as hard and polished as its exterior form, its significance as fixed as its place in the landscape" (2000, p. 12). Young argues that our gaze "slides off" the past as soon as it is becomes cemented in the stone of a monument. Archaeological digs in Berlin, as memorial and museum sites, have the potential to take on a similar qualities. The safe temporal distance implied in archaeology holds echoes of "drawing a line"[4] under Germany's Nazi past (Langenbacher, 2010). This temporal distance must be thought of beyond the strictly linear sense. When he expressed fears of "drawing a line" underneath the Second World War, Herman Brinks did not flag concern for the gradual passing of time, but for the cordoning off of the influence of the war from the present.

Archaeology entails an admission that there is something hidden, something missing. An archaeological dig at Teufelsberg would suggest there is an aspect of Berlin's history to be uncovered, which would suggest that the covering happened in the first place. It would acknowledge Teufelsberg as a political, historicised, memory project. The forgetting enacted in burying the rubble (what Steinbach identified as suppression by sand and dirt at Topography of Terror) is a point of encounter with the memory regimes of the post-war

---

4   A famous line by Dutch academic Jan Herman Brinks. The term became shorthand for instances of post-unification memory culture in Germany that embodied a desire to "move on" from Germany's National Socialist past by and consigning it to history.

occupiers and the way they dealt with a history of defeat and guilt. What this reveals is the representational clout of non-state-sponsored heritage or tourism sites. Real, unmediated encounters with the past can be provided as well as undermined by archaeological digs. It is important at this stage to note that the archaeological dig assigns value to an object that is at once "historical", in the state-sponsored, ratified, publicly rigid sense, *as well as* the value of authentic raw materials of the past. The presence of themes of burial, suppression, and uncovering outlined above only reinforce this.

7. Discussion/Conclusion

Buchli and Lucas ask of archaeology "What are the social and historical circumstances that permit such cultural work to exist?" Archaeological digs communicate Berlin's past in the specific context of current cultural-political remembering of the Second World War. The way the representational device of archaeology is present at these sites reveals the nature and position the destruction of Berlin has in the context of the cultural memory lexicon of war.

The archaeological assertion of authenticity as it is present at Topography of Terror evidences the persistent need to authenticate the memory of the Holocaust and the war crimes of the Nazis. At Teufelsberg, however, archaeological remnants indicate how the material impact and destruction of the war — namely, Allied aerial attacks — does not need to be (or perhaps cannot yet be) authenticated.

The remnants at Teufelsberg are not legitimised by an archaeological dig. Furthermore, buried remnants signal the geneaology of Second World War cultural memory debates as layers of dirt and clay. This has shifted from an era that demanded acknowledgement and uncovering of the deep roots of Berlin's Nazi past to an open acknowledgment, even of the processes of self-induced amnesia that was symbolised in the buried foundations at Topography of Terror. The lack of a dig at Teufelsberg suggests the material remnants of the destruction of Berlin remain covered, and thus largely unacknowledged by Berlin's official memory-makers. The socio-political processes, which pushed tonnes of rubble to points in the city and allowed a forest to grow over them, remain covered as well. However, the rubble is not buried, but heaped upon itself. Its insistence

into the memorial landscape of Berlin –as a topographical anomaly and a churning mass of debris— prevents the destruction to which it is witness from being considered completely buried. The pile of rubble stands as testament to both the massive clean-up effort and the massive attack that made clean-up necessary, but it isn't quite deigned with historical significance in the same way the Gestapo, SA, and SS are at Topography of Terror. The Holocaust and National Socialism are given vital historical value at Topography of Terror. Contrasting that site with Teufelsberg outlines the persistent yet secondary historical narratives of damage caused to European cities during the Second World War in European cultural memory. Archaeology, when considered as a spatial rhetorical device, reveals mnemonic projects and their histories, just as much as it reveals strata of earth beneath our feet.

8. Bibliography

——— Anderson, B. (2015). Trümmer geographies. *Performance Research, 20*(3), 75-82.

——— Arnold-de Simine, Silke (2015). The ruin as memorial–the memorial as ruin. *Performance* Research 20(3), 94-102.

——— Assmann, A. (2006). On the (in)compatibility of guilt and suffering in German memory. *German Life and Letters,* 59(2), 187-200.

——— Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— Buchli, V., & Lucas, G., (2001). The absent present. In V. Buchli, G. Lucas & M. Cox (Eds.) *Archaeologies of the Contemporary* Past. London: Routledge, 3-18.

——— Clark, L. B. (2015) Ruined landscapes and residual architecture: Affect and palimpsest in trauma tourism. *Performance* Research 20(3): 83-93.

——— Connelly, M. (2001) *Reaching for the Stars: A New History of Bomber Command in World War II.* London: I.B.Tauris.

—— De Silvey, C. (2007) Salvage memory: constellating material histories on a hardscrabble homestead. *Cultural Geographies,* 14(3), 401-424.

—— De Silvey, C., & Edensor, T. (2012). Reckoning with ruins. *Progress in Human* Geography, 37(4), 465-485.

—— Edensor, T. (2005). *Industrial* ruin: spaces, aesthetics, and materiality. Oxford: Berg.

—— Erll, A. (2011). *Memory in Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

—— Esbenshade, R. (1995). Remembering to forget: Memory, history, national identity in postwar East-Central Europe. Representations, 49, 72-96.

—— Forest, B., Johnson, J., & Till, K. (2004). Post-totalitarian national identity: public memory in Germany and Russia. *Social & Cultural Geography, 5*(3), 357-380.

—— Fraser, E. P. (2012). Interrupting progress: ruins, rubble and catastrophe in Walter Benjamin's history (Master's thesis). University of Technology, Sydney.

—— Friedrich, J. (2008). *The fire: the bombing of Germany, 1940-1945* (A. Brown, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

—— Gould, M. & Silverman, R. (2012). Stumbling upon history: Collective memory and the urban landscape. *Spatially Integrated Social Sciences and* Humanities 78(5), 791-801.

—— Hewitt, K. (1983). Place annihilation: Area bombing and the fate of urban places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 73(2), 257-284.

—— Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present Pasts: Urban Pamilpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

—— Judt, T. (1992). The past is another country: Myth and memory in postwar Europe. *Daedalus,* 121(4), 83-118.

—— Ladd, B. (1997) The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

——— Langenbacher, E. (2010). Still the Unmasterable Past? The impact of history and memory in the Federal Republic of Germany. *German Politics,* 19(1), 24-40.

——— Leith, D., & Myerson, G. (1989). *The power of address: explorations in rhetoric*. New York: Routledge.

——— Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

——— Marschall, S. (2015) Touring memories of the erased city: Memory, tourism and notions of 'home'. *Tourism Geographies 17, 332-349.*

——— McRae, L. (2002). The Postmodern Prometheus: Collective experience and the carnivalesque. *Transformations* (3).

——— Morgan, F. (2016) What lies beneath: Reading Melbourne's CBD through "The Another View Walking Trail". *Philosophy, Activism,* Nature 12, 69–80.

——— Moshenska, G. (2006). Scales of memory in the archaeology of the Second World War. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology,* 17, 58-68

---- (2009). Resonant materiality and violent remembering: Archaeology, memory and bombing. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 15(1), 44-56.

---- (2015). Curated ruins and the endurance of conflict heritage. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 17(1), 77-90.

——— Schmitz, H. (2007). Nation of Victims: Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945 to the Present. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.

——— Sebald, W. G. (2004). On the natural history of destruction *(*A. Bell, Trans.). London: Penguin.

——— Stangle, P. (2008). The vernacular and the monumental: memory and landscape in post-war Berlin. *An International Journal on Geography, 73*(3), 245-253.

——— Steinmetz, G. (2008). Harrowed landscapes: white ruingazers in Namibia and Detroit and the cultivation of memory. *Visual Studies,* 23(3), 211-237.

——— Taberner, S. & Berger, K. (2009). Germans as victims in the literary fiction of the Berlin Republic. Rochester: Boydell & Brewer.

——— Till, K. E. (2004). Emplacing memory through the city: The New Berlin. *GHI* Bulletin 35, 73-83.

---- (2012). Wounded cities: Memory-work and a place-based ethics of care. *Political* Geography 31, 3-14.

——— Torbakov, I. (2011). History, memory and national identity: Understanding the politics of history and memory wars in Post-Soviet lands. *Demokratizatsiya,* 19(3), 209-232.

——— Tumarkin, M. M. (2005). *Traumascapes: the power and fate of places transformed by tragedy*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Publishing.

——— Wilson, J. K. (2002). Nature and nation: The "German forest" as a national symbol, 1871–1914. (Doctoral Dissertation), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

——— Whybrow, N. (2001). Leaving Berlin. *Performance Research,* 6(1), 37-45.

——— Wolde, C. (2017) Making memory: Culturescapes and the communication of archaeological meaning. In R. Bernbeck, K. P. Hofmann & U. Sommer (Eds.), *Between Memory Sites and Memory Networks: New Archaeological and Historical Perspectives* (pp. 315-339). Berlin: Edition Topoi.

——— Young, J. E. (2000*) The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning.* New Haven: Yale University Press.