

Adrian von Buttlar

Preserving Postwar-Modernity A Special Debate in Germany?

An attack on a building in war is usually meant as an attack on the people who inhabit it, or who are hiding in the building and are defined as »the enemy.« Nowadays we frequently find that a building itself is declared »the enemy« and its destruction is defined as an act of liberation. Indeed buildings and housing-schemes in our public debates are often blamed for the deficiencies of those for whom they were designed or who live there today: deficiencies such as poverty, drugs, prostitution, disorder or political radicalism. Political and social issues, it seems, become much easier to handle if they are reduced to mere problems of urban design. Thus the spectacular 1972-blasting of Minorou Isovaki's Pruitt-Igode-Housing scheme in St.Louis, dating from the early 1950s – the first deliberate demolition of very recent architecture – has been interpreted by postmodern advocate Charles Jencks as a decisive victory over modernism.¹ And thus the photographic documentation of these two seconds of a destruction that was both sublime and picturesque has become an icon for the alleged defeat of the modernist architectural paradigm, in a long-term battle over aesthetic and social ideals.

It is a curious coincidence that in that same year the same architect started planning another architectural complex, which was also destroyed in a spectacular event nearly thirty years later: New York's Twin-Towers, which collapsed in the horrible »9/11«-plane-attack by Al-Qaeda-terrorists. Although their declared aim was to kill as many people as possible in one stroke, the World Trade Center was – of course – primarily a symbolic target representing western economy and, as a significant architectural landmark, western capitalist lifestyle with all its ambivalent implications.

Hence we have to be aware that the annihilation of buildings for the sake of renewal and improvement is likewise often part of a clandestine war against what these buildings and architectural images represent to different groups of society in various discourses. While everything which looks »old« today seems to be sacred by way of its assumed history and beauty, the debates about our more recent architectural heritage frequently reveal an aggressive attitude, not only towards the supposed »ugliness« of modernism, but also towards its philosophy and morals – which depend on a balance between seemingly antagonistic values like freedom and democracy, individuality and collectivism, liberalism and socialism.

We cannot deny that this much disputed heritage is presently at risk. There are several serious reasons for this: Maintenance usually has been neglected and consequently the repairs needed today are extensive, and sometimes economically unjustifiable investments; technical and material standards – especially in regard to energy – have considerably changed and require difficult and costly refitting of the infrastructure. In addition, there is a constantly undulating shift in taste and fashion, due to new habits of perception and the search for novelty by new generations. Last but not least, shrinking cities, as for instance in some eastern regions of Germany, require the reduction of unused or deteriorating large-sized housing schemes, originally planned with industrialized prefabricated elements (»Plattenbauten«), which in fact have become a challenge for concepts of adaptation and modernization, with surprising results in regard to the postulate of sustainability. The egalitarian expression of socialist housing, which was part of its political mission, has been wiped out by the new owners – large private real estate companies – by means of aesthetic surgery in

favor of more individuality and sometimes a bit of intrusive cheerfulness as well.²

While the general conditions for the preservation of postwar modernist buildings under global technological and economic conditions seem to be at least comparable everywhere, their symbolic and representational quality is rather different due to the various contexts, conditions and discourses of their emergence, production and reception. The following argument, which aims at an exemplary matrix for analysis, is about the particularities of the German preservation debate, which is based on the unique conditions for buildings in a formerly divided country, during and after the Cold War. The buildings' role as representatives of the rivalry between the political systems becomes even more complex on both sides of the Iron Curtain, by the common opposition to the architectural language of the National-Socialist past. I will restrict my examples to divided Berlin, as the basis of different arguments and strategies for preservation and its opposite.

The best known example of the old strategy of a »damnatio memoriae« is the gradual process, approximately fifteen years long, of the mental and physical erasure of the Palace of the Republic as a symbol of the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic (thoroughly analyzed by Michael Falser in his dissertation on »Identity and Authenticity,« which I had the pleasure to supervise in 2008).³

This strategy would have had no chance without the counteraction of a »restitutio memoriae« – a simultaneous discourse first propagated by a small minority of activists and only reluctantly adopted by the relevant politicians in the capital and in the federal parliament. These activists replaced the Palace of the Republic with the image of the famous Hohenzollern Castle that had been partially destroyed in the war and finally was completely blasted by the Communists in 1951 to give way for the new symbol of their ideology in the heart of the city.

The Palace of the Republic, which housed the more or less impotent GDR Parliament and provided a multifunctional flexible auditorium for more than 6,000 people attending the Socialist Party Congress, and also housed spectacular concerts and other cultural events, restaurants, exhibition spaces etc., was designed by a collective around Heinz Graffunder and opened in 1976 on the Marx-Engels-Platz (today »Schlossplatz«). It actually functioned as a sort of »Volkshaus« once proposed in the late 1920s for the Soviet Palace in Moscow. As a new landmark in the City Center and as a technical highlight of modernity for those positively involved and participating in the events, the Palace became an object of reconciliation and even identification with the reigning socialist order. The building and its function was iconized on stamps and in the media, for instance.

Public debate on the reconstruction of the Castle and the subsequent demolition of the Palace was strongly fostered by the castle simulation on canvas, initiated in 1993 by the merchant Wilhelm von Boddien from Hamburg, who founded a civic association and since then has become the chief lobbyist for the castle, while the counter-association fighting for the Palace soon found itself on the losing side of history. In 1999 Chancellor Schröder, already sensing the coming trend, voted for reconstruction, stating that from his temporary residence in the »Staatsratsgebäude« he would rather not look out onto the Palace opposite because it was »too ugly.«⁴

The Chancellor and also the castle lobby carefully avoided official arguments aiming at a reactionary restoration of Prussian monarchy or notoriously imperialistic German policy, or even an offensive annihilation of socialist values. Instead they argued in terms of townscape, aesthetics and long-term identity, pretending to heal the »wounded image« of the city and the distorted collective memory. As Aleida Assmann recently put it, the historically relevant site should be regarded as a palimpsest, and reconstruction as a legitimate and democratic cultural technique for correcting history⁵ – which reminds us of Orwell's »1984,« where this sort of brainwashing was attributed to the Stalinist party terror in 1948: »Who controls the past,« ran the party slogan, »controls the future: who controls the present, controls the past [...] All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed as often as necessary.«⁶ On the other hand, Berlin's chief conservator Jörg Haspel was deliberately prevented from listing the Palace, or at least the plenary hall, as an outstanding historic document, where in 1989 the »Volkskammer« had freely voted for union with the Federal Republic. Although in 2002 and 2003 the Bundestag voted with a small majority for the reconstruction of the castle exterior, including Andreas Schlüter's facades on three sides, which are to be financed by Boddien's private donors, the doubts about the moral legitimacy of the decision remained, as expressed in Lars Ramberg's provocative inscription »Doubts« on top of the derelict building in 2005.

The boulevard-press headlines about the start of destruction in January 2006 very frankly reveal the political satisfaction of the victors. Even seven years later, with plans for the Humboldtforum as main user being established and Franco Stella's uninspired project being chosen as the winner of a highly restricted rebuilding competition, doubts have not really ceased. »Be enthusiastic!« was the headline of an article by Ijoma Mangold in the weekly »Die Zeit« on the 29th, June, 2011, which advises us: »It seems time to file away the troublesome case history and recognize what chances are emerging for Germany.« What we learn from that case in general is Michel Foucault's »L'ordre du discours« exemplified by means of preservation issues, including the iconization of buildings in both »damnatio« and »restitutio memoriae.«

A failure in the preservation discourse may be the reason that the parallel transformation of the »Reichstagsgebäude« never reached the popularity of the Palace debate, although it meant a comparable challenge for West German identity.⁷ The ruin of Paul Wallot's Reichstags building (1884–1918) – which served as an impressive setting for the monumental anti-communist demonstrations after the erection of the Berlin Wall – was repaired and substantially modernized in 1961 to 1973. Omitting the glass-iron dome and stripping the structure of historical ornaments was to be understood as a considered attack against German »imperialist« history in favor of »democratic« modernism. Thus the »new« Reichstagsgebäude became an important building block of the political iconography of the free West.

The interior space was completely pitted, in order to house the new plenary hall designed by Paul Baumgarten for the German parliament, which in effect was still residing in Bonn. Its use, if only for committees or the president's election assembly, according to the political doctrine of »three territories,« was highly provocative and caused symbolic reactions by the Soviet airforce. Our concern is about the metaphorical quality of Baumgarten's rebuilding, which was listed as a monument: it seemed to combine an unpretentious simplicity with a somehow sublime transparency, expressing the noble modesty and democratic openness of the »better« Germany. In addition Bernhard Heiliger's abstract steel sculpture »Kosmos 70« of 1963 to 1969 expressed the optimistic western potential for freedom and technological superiority. The Vice-president of the

Bundestag, former East German citizen Wolfgang Thierse, in 2005 explained in the opening of a retrospective, that Heiliger created »Kosmos 70« in close collaboration with Baumgarten, both of them »symbolizing the values of the democratic system and the future-oriented determination for freedom.«⁸ Immediately after the German union in 1990 this seemed an obsolete statement of Cold War politics and had to be replaced by a more imposing representation of Germany's new role in the world. Baumgarten's severe but modest political space subsequent to Christo's mystic action of packing and symbolic unveiling of the fabric (24th of June to 7th of July 1995), was replaced by Sir Norman Foster's new plenary hall and his spectacular dome, opened in 1999 and becoming the nation's most popular emblem of state.

Political branding had a long tradition in Cold War building practice, including monuments which at first sight seemed apolitical, like West Berlin's Congress Hall by Hugh Stubbins, opened in 1958. As Stephan de Rudder has shown in his 2007 monograph, the site was deliberately chosen close to the border of the Soviet sector, so that the building could be seen from there, and could also be visited easily by East Berliners before the close-down in 1961. The project was promoted and financed by the special Berlin-deputy Eleanor Dulles, sister of the Foreign Secretary, John Foster and CIA-chief, Alan Dulles. Moreover its shell construction, despite its famous nickname »pregnant oyster,« served successfully as another metaphor for the dynamic and progressive habitus of western freedom. This function as an iconic medium was even considered more important than its constructive solidity, when in 1956 the young architect Frei Otto warned that the building might collapse as a consequence of deficiencies in its construction.⁹

That is exactly what happened twenty three years later. At that time the Congress Hall just had become obsolete because Berlin's gigantic new International Congress Center ICC was opened in April 1979. Thus there emerged a critical discussion on whether the collapsed »pregnant oyster« could and should be repaired. As a prominent symbol for the American-German partnership in the heyday of Cold War struggles, it became clear that the removal of this icon would have a disastrous effect. The »salvatio memoriae« included an alternative roof construction that had only a small impact on the aesthetic outline.¹⁰ When the student camp Schlachtensee, built in 1963 also by the support of the United States and their deputy Eleanor Dulles, was under serious danger of demolition by the government authorities who planned a speculative real-estate deal, preservationists successfully employed the same arguments of its historic importance and significance as an instrument and post-war symbol of democratic re-education by our allies. Meanwhile it has been listed as monument of national importance.¹¹

In 2000, greed fostered by restrictive building regulations was declared responsible for tearing down the Ahornblatt, a modern restaurant in East Berlin. It was built from 1971 to 1973 as a canteen for more than 800 employees of the GDR Building Ministry and the workmen of the nearby Palace of the Republic by a collective together with the engineer-architect Ulrich Mütter. It served as an eye-catcher in the new neighborhood of the Fischerinsel by emulating the »organic« inventions of reinforced concrete pavilions by Felix Candela, Eero Saarinen and also Stubbins' Berlin Congress Hall, which Mütter had imitated in 1967 for the Tea-Pot Restaurant in Warnemünde.

In order to exploit the full capacity of the real-estate after the union of Germany the investors insisted on building another high-rise apartment building on the site of the popular Maple Leaf, a scandal which coincided with the new Masterplan, established by Berlin's municipal building surveyor, Hans Stimmann. This plan looks with disdain upon the landscaped postwar city with its open spaces

and architectural solitaires. Instead it propagates the reestablishment of the »historic« (which means 19th century) city ground plan, in which the façade of the block rigidly defines the threshold between public street and private space.¹² The long protests preceding the demolition of the building, which had been listed as a monument, revealed the clandestine attack on the building's potential for inspiring identification with this socialist landmark. The planning authorities approved its demolition and the municipal conservator, subordinate to them, had to withdraw the monument protection as »economically unacceptable« for the investor.¹³

A deliberate change of identity was likewise the intention of the Masterplan for certain areas of West Berlin, especially for the commercial center around Breitscheidplatz and the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Memorial Church, which in the Cold War period had become the principle emblem of the free part of the metropolis. The church became so popular, because as an easily readable icon it reconciled prewar imperial history, admonition against the war and destruction represented by the ruin, as well as new hope for humanistic and spiritual values, mediated by Egon Eiermann's impressive new structure with its mystic light effects. The impression made by this group of vertical accents was enhanced by the explicitly horizontal frame of the lower commercial buildings, especially the Schimmelpfenghaus bridging the Kantstrasse, which defined a new public space around the church.

This exceptional postwar building was sacrificed in 1999/2009 in favor of the reopening of the Kantstrasse as a visible axis in accordance with the prewar ground plan for this site, and, furthermore, in favor of the implementation of two high-rise buildings, which according to planners are supposed to give a certain metropolitan air to the good old City West. The northern tower, Zoofenster, designed by Christoph Mäckler, will be opened in 2013 as the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel Berlin. Building the southern Upper-West starts at the same time. What was sold to the public as a strategy of gentrification for an allegedly deteriorated area in reality proves to be the destruction of its valuable artistic substance and its distinctive historic character. The Schimmelpfenghaus by Karl-Heinrich Sobotka and Gustav Müller, 1957 to 1960, was listed as monument of postwar architecture for its fanciful features, like a pasticcio reminiscent of the architects' teachers, Adolf Loos and Erich Mendelsohn, of Gropius's Bauhaus at Dessau and Le Corbusier's Unité d'Habitation, Berlin.¹⁴ Again, after ten years of controversy, the coalition between the chief surveyor and the investors finally triumphed over the attempts of conservation authorities and civic campaigns to rescue the building. The Zoofenster Tower anxiously tries to fill all the gaps of the triangular site. By its displeasing height of 118 m it marginalizes the famous church, destroys the spatial relationship between the framing structures of the late Fifties, and annihilates the important historic identity of that place, as an auxiliary city center representing western values during the Cold War. Collective memory of this role by the triumphant actors was denounced as »West-nostalgia,« while on the other hand at the very same time, the »dialogic structure« of Berlin's postwar townscape (»Doppeltes Berlin«) is being proposed for the Unesco World Heritage List.¹⁵

It should be mentioned that there are of course also many positive and encouraging examples of preservation and rehabilitation of postwar modernism in Berlin, as for instance the listed building of the former Minors Faculty of the Berlin Institute of Technology at Ernst-Reuter-Platz by Willy Kreuer (1955–1959). In 2004 the steering committee of the university, sensing a promising bargain and fostered by Berlin's Masterplan authorities, wanted to tear it down in favor of another high-rise tower by Hans Kollhoff. Again, a wave of protest actions by experts against these plans, and simul-

taneous miscalculations in regard to the would-be profit caused the plan to be finally dropped. Instead, from 2010 to 2012, a professional repair and rehabilitation of this important structure was undertaken, which once had demonstrated the new western and democratic orientation of the University in comparison to the authoritarian neoclassical pomp of East Berlin's Stalinallee and moreover counteracted its dominant role in the National Socialist era.¹⁶ An East German architectural icon like Hermann Henselmann's group, the »house of the teacher,« combined with the elegant congress hall of 1961 to 1964 at Alexanderplatz, luckily could be completely restored in 2002 to 2004, including Walter Womacka's monumental frieze presenting scenes depicting the happiness of socialist life. It signaled opposition to the former Stalinist neoclassicism, and in terms of construction, material, and aesthetics successfully rivaled the standards of western modernism. It is distinguished only by a realistic, moralizing work of art in the tradition of Diego Rivera, as opposed to the usually abstract applications to western architecture. It seems that the socialist legacy in this case has been accepted, at least as a document.¹⁷

My last case study of actors and motivations, reconstruction of icons and the issues of rehabilitation has recently taken place in my hometown of Potsdam only 15 miles from Berlin city center. Distinguished by its history, beautifully landscaped surroundings and its importance in the historic heritage of Prussian castles and gardens, it has again become a most attractive resort for rich and prominent westerners. In the last twenty years these newcomers mingled with and increasingly dominated the GDR elite, at least those of the elite who had profited from the changes of the revolution in 1989. The inspiration to reconstruct the Baroque castle in the city center as the new seat of the regional Parliament of Brandenburg was appreciated by a relative majority of 42% in a referendum in 2006, but it was fostered mainly by the new westerners: Germany's most prominent TV moderator, Günther Jauch, and others had financed the reconstruction of the Fortuna-Portal as a forerunner as early as 2001, and billionaire Hasso Plattner, founder and chairman of the software giant SAP, saved the project by the donation of more than 20 million euros for the application of the 18th century facades onto the concrete core of the building and for a copper coverage of the roof.

While the reconstructed castle housing the Brandenburg State Parliament is quickly approaching its completion, a new donation by Plattner has caused trouble. He promised the town an exhibition gallery to show his collections of GDR art on the site opposite the reconstructed castle in the former Royal Gardens, which since 1969 have been occupied by the former Interhotel Potsdam, now Hotel Mercure. This high-rise with seventeen storeys was once meant as a sign of the rise of the old residential town to a modern socialist provincial capital, offering acceptable standards to an international public. Although not an architectural highlight and without legal protection, in public discussion the Interhotel /Mercure became a symbol of the direction of Potsdam's future development. Plattner, the mayor, Jann Jacobs, and others argued for a new iconic accent in the skyline, while the Hotel luckily would disappear. Others have long been striving for the demolition of the Hotel to restore the Royal Gardens and to complete the historic 18th century scenery. In the proposal for the gallery, fashion designer, Wolfgang Joop saw the only chance »to get rid of the ugly GDR chump.« However the protagonists of Potsdam's relative prosperity in the socialist past, feel excluded by the western palimpsest strategy and deprived of their own historic memory and identity. And even for visitors the fabric adds some realism to the growing picturesqueness of the historic skyline. Hasso Plattner was sensitive enough to concede to these objections by finally choosing one of his private sites outside the town for his exhibition hall.¹⁸

The patterns visible in my series of examples show what sort of disputes have been fought within the complex historical framework of recent German history in the name of or through architecture. In the light of what I have discussed, I would summarize that the preservation debate has been, and still is, extremely lively, and

at the same time serious and bitter in Germany. But I leave it to later discussions, whether similar sets of actors and motivations – as I assume – are not also present in less dramatic circumstances whenever buildings are up-graded to icons for various beliefs and different affiliations.

Notes

- 1 Charles Jencks: *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, London 1977, p. 9. – Cf. Sabine Horlitz, current PhD-thesis 2012: *Pruitt-Igoe: Ikone des Scheiterns? Planungsparadigmen, Lenkungsmodelle und Rezeption des US-amerikanischen Sozialwohnungsprojekts* (Transatlantisches Graduiertenkolleg, Center of Metropolitan Studies Berlin Institute of Technology/Free University Berlin – Kennedy Institute). – Wikipedia, URL: <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pruitt-Igoe> [28.12.2012]
- 2 For many recent publications, conferences and vivid discussions (blogs) about destruction, restoration and modernization of big housing schemes of the 1960s and 1970s cf. Internet contributions as for instance: <http://www.deutsches-architektur-forum.de/forum/showthread.php?p=333774> [28.12.2012]
- 3 Michael Falser: *Zwischen Identität und Authentizität: Zur politischen Geschichte der Denkmalpflege in Deutschland*. Ph.D. Diss. Berlin 2006. Dresden 2008. – Adrian von Buttlar: *Berlin's Castle versus Palace – A Proper Past for Germany's Future?* In: *Future Anterior IV/1* (Columbia University). New York 2007, p. 12–29. – Anke Kuhlmann: *Der Palast der Republik. Geschichte und Bedeutung des Ost-Berliner Parlaments- und Kulturhauses*. Petersberg 2006. There is a wide range of recent publications on the »palace« and the »castle« to be rebuilt from 2014 onwards as »Humboldt-Forum«: cf. http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palast_der_Republik; <http://denkmaldebatten.de/kontroversen/palast-der-republik/>; <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humboldt-Forum> [28.12.2012].
- 4 »Der Kanzler kann den Palast der Republik nicht mehr ertragen – Palast sprengen? Stadtschloss bauen? In: BZ, 05.11.1999.
- 5 Aleida Assmann: *Rekonstruktion – Die zweite Chance, oder: Architektur aus dem Archiv*. In: *Geschichte der Rekonstruktion – Konstruktion der Geschichte*. Ed. by Winfried Nerdinger. Munich 2010, pp. 16–23.
- 6 George Orwell: 1984, 1st book, chapter 3.
- 7 Michael S. Cullen: *Der Reichstag*. Im Spannungsfeld deutscher Geschichte. Berlin (2nd ed.) 2004. – Stephanie Grüger: *Der Reichstag als Symbol. Untersuchung seiner Bedeutungen von 1990 bis 1999*. Stuttgart/Berlin 2003. – For the interim modernization by Baumgarten cf. Paul Baumgarten – *Bauten und Projekte 1924–1981* (= Schriftenreihe der Akademie der Künste, 19). Berlin 1988, pp. 219–224. – Dieter Bartetzko: *Zwischen Pathos und Pragmatismus – Paul Baumgartens Umbau des Reichstagsgebäude*. In: »Dem Deutschen Volke« – *Der Bundestag im Berliner Reichstagsgebäude*. Ed. by Heinrich Wefing. Bonn 1999, pp. 136–161.
- 8 Opening speech at the exhibition »Bernhard Heiliger: Licht Bild Skulptur« in the Marie Elisabeth Lüders Haus Berlin: http://www.bundestag.de/kulturundgeschichte/kunst/kunst_ausst/heiliger/rede_thierse.html [13.07.2012].
- 9 Steffen de Rudder: *Der Architekt Hugh Stubbins – Amerikanische Moderne der Fünfziger Jahre in Berlin*. Berlin 2007, pp. 59–62.
- 10 *Die Kongreßhalle. Geschichte, Einsturz, Wiederaufbau*. Ed. by the Senator für Bau und Wohnungswesen. Berlin 1987.
- 11 Gunnar Klack in his unpublished PhD thesis at Berlin Institute of Technology (2013) gives a thorough analysis of the »Studentendorf« by Hermann Fehling, Daniel Gogel, Peter Pfankuch and Hermann Mattern (1958/59, 1962–1964). – Cf. Fehling und Goge – *Die Max-Planck-Gesellschaft als Bauherr der Architekten Hermann Fehling und Daniel Gogel*. Ed. by Peter Gruss/Gunnar Klack/Matthias Seidel. Berlin 2009, pp. 94–97.
- 12 *Planwerk Innenstadt Berlin – Ein erster Entwurf*. Ed. by the Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, Umweltschutz und Technologie. Berlin 1997, URL: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/planwerke/de/planwerk_innenstadt/index.shtml [12.07.2012]. – For a critical response cf.: »Landesdenkmalrat zum Planwerk Innenstadt« (Adrian von Buttlar/Simone Hain), in: *Der Architekt*, 12, 1997, pp. 721–725.
- 13 Michael Falser: *Zwischen Identität und Authentizität. Zur politischen Geschichte der Denkmalpflege in Deutschland*. Dresden 2008, pp. 243–250.
- 14 Adrian von Buttlar: *Architektur der Nachkriegsmode als Forschungs- und Vermittlungsaufgabe*. In: Rolf Gutbrod – *Bauen in den Boomjahren der 1960er* (= Schriften des Süddeutschen Archivs für Architektur und Ingenieurbau, 2). Ed. by Klaus Jan Philipp. Salzburg/Wien 2011, pp. 32–49.
- 15 For the Unesco-initiative »Doppeltes Berlin« cf.: https://www.google.de/search?q=Zooenster&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:de:official&client=firefox-a&source=hp&channel=np#hl=de&gs_l=de&gs_ri=serp&tok=mvdzuybaWstl4eYnZ2sw&pq=unesco%20welterbe%20berlin%20st%C3%A4dtebau&cp=23&gs_id=2e9&xhr=t&q=unesco%20Doppeltes%20berlin&pf=p&client=firefox-a&hs=cl&tbo=d&rls=org.mozilla:de%3Aofficial&channel=np&sc=psy-ab&oq=unesco+Doppeltes+berlin&gs_l=&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or_r_gc_r_pw_r_qf.&bvm=bv.1355534169,d.Yms&fp=30a3908a783e9fb0&bpcl=40096503&biw=1902&bih=891 [28.12.2012].
- 16 Roman Hillmann: *Das Fakultätsgebäude für Bergbau und Hüttenwesen der Technischen Universität Berlin*. Ed. by tht Technische Universität Berlin. Petersberg 2013.
- 17 http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/denkmal/denkmalpflege_vor_ort/de/erkennen_erhalten/oeffentlich/haus_lehrer_kongresshalle.shtml. – Meanwhile research about the legacy of the socialist modernism («Ost-Moderne») has been considerably increased, cf. for instance: Andreas Butter/Ulrich Hartung: *Ostmoderne: Architektur in Berlin 1945–1965*. Berlin 2004. – *Denkmal Ost-Moderne – Aneignung und Erhaltung des baulichen Erbes der Nachkriegsmode* (= *Stadtentwicklung und Denkmalpflege*, 16). Ed. by Mark Escherich. Berlin 2012.
- 18 For the press on Plattner's project and withdrawal cf.: https://www.google.de/search?q=Landesamt+f%C3%BCr+Denkmalpflege+Berlin+Haus+des+Lehrers&hl=de&client=firefox-a&tbo=d&rls=org.mozilla:de:official&channel=np&source=Inms&sa=X&ei=n8PIUJfDC8bGtAaTtICYBQ&ved=0CAYQ_AUoAA&biw=1902&bih=891#hl=de&gs_ri=1&gs_ri=serp&tok=cUffBNmQrL1GPEKi7MvbEw&pq=hotel%20mercure%20potsdam&cp=10&gs_id=6m6&xhr=t&q=Kunsthalle%20potsdam&pf=p&client=firefox-a&tbo=d&rls=org.mozilla:de%3Aofficial&channel=np&biw=1902&bih=891&sc=psy-ab&oq=Kunsthalle+potsdam&gs_l=&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or_r_gc_r_pw_r_qf.&bvm=bv.1355534169,d.Yms&fp=30a3908a783e9fb0&bpcl=40096503 [28.12.2012].