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The 1980s and 1990s can retrospectively be characterized as obsessed with issues of memory and commemoration. In Europe and the United States, calls to commemorate the victims of the state’s and its citizens’ wrongdoings, from the colonial period to the Cold War, led to a reconsideration of monument practice. It is generally recognized that old heroic forms had to fall by the wayside, as the new monuments were generally dedicated to groups that had suffered at the hands of the society commemorating them. But more pressing than such iconographic and building-technical considerations were the ethical challenges of such undertakings, however physically beautiful or fit for their appointed task. There might be no “right” way to retrospectively deal with atrocities. To take responsibility is to do something, but the reflective attitude on being confronted with a monument can only provide absolution, even if a “guilty” one. There is an inherent tension in these “exculpatory” monuments between those who are remembered and those seeking active commemoration as a public sign of catharsis, reform, or closure. My case study, the Judenplatz Vienna, the memorial competition, and the execution of the Monument and Memorial for the Jewish Victims of the Nazi Regime in Austria, carried out between 1994 and 2000 and in some sense still ongoing, will show that there is often another tension that must be attended to, one that connects practical questions of building and demolishing with moral questions of agency and responsibility. The search for authentic or quasi-authentic places of remembrance that dominated public debate on commemoration in the 1990s bore with it the careful orchestration of historic authenticity, not always connected to historical truth, but deeply connected to a longstanding modernist preoccupation with the subjective experience of spectators and inhabitants of art and architecture. My text begins with an account of the site and the chronology of the Vienna memorial competition, as these histories are crucial for my argument: they deliver the problem of motivation pervasive in such projects for a good decade on either side. Alois Riegl’s argument that *Stimmung* (mood) is a crucial element in the reception of monuments is a neglected aspect of his essay “The Modern Cult of Monuments” (1903). Above all, his concept of the “unwilled” nature of historical monuments addresses a profound need in memorial discourse: a conceptualization of those factors that convert monuments from their original purposes to ours and constitute their very interest in the present. Through a consideration of Riegl’s elaborations, I will give an account of the paradoxical state of “responsible irresponsibility” or the exculpatory excuse of contemporary monument viewing, wherein the unwilled ravages of time (and of human action)
are intentionally recalled and thus “willed” in the present. Problems of fit between willed and unwilled forms of commemoration are to be expected, in Vienna and in monumental scenarios throughout Europe, as is, I will argue, the search for “authentic” moods that allow broader audiences to assume some sort of (however forged) historical consciousness.

In December 1994, Nazi hunter and concentration camp survivor Simon Wiesenthal publicly stated that Austria should have a memorial dedicated to the Austrian Jews murdered under National Socialism. Vienna’s new mayor, Michael Häupl, reacted affirmatively. As a magazine dedicated to the cause recounts the story, Häupl “spontaneously agree[d] to the erection of a memorial on Vienna’s Judenplatz.” First excavations began in summer 1995, preceding any competition for the monument. This hurry is understandable, given the then-ongoing open competition for the Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin as part of a bigger “commemorative turn.” The Berlin project brought not only positive international press to the city but also uncomfortable questions concerning how neighboring Austria dealt with its past. A related reason for the interest in the memorial might have been that Austrian politicians, at least on the left, had begun to relinquish the myth of Austria as the “first victim” of Nazi Germany, and needed deeds to match this new political direction. On a local level, the city needed to end the controversy sparked by Alfred Hrdlicka’s 1988 Memorial against War and Fascism on the Albertina-platz (Figure 1); intellectuals and the Jewish community objected to the vague dedication (against “war and fascism”)

Figure 1 Alfred Hrdlicka, Memorial against War and Fascism, 1988 (author’s photo, 2012)
that tiptoed around the issue of Austrian guilt. More prominently, there was outrage over the “street-washing Jew” portion of the memorial, a bronze sculpture of a bearded man on hands and knees holding a brush (visible in Figure 1 centered behind the two upright pieces in the foreground), which called to mind actual indignities suffered by Viennese Jews following the Anschluss. The sculpture, which could be sat or stepped on, clumsily added modern humiliation to the historical degradation it addressed; it did not help matters that Hrdlicka’s gallery sold a smaller version as a stand-alone desktop sculpture. Yet controversy would not be easy to avoid, for the site Wiesenthal proposed for the new memorial was politically complex.

The Judenplatz had been the center of Jewish life in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but the name stems from the fifteenth century (and became official in the nineteenth), after the Jews had been expelled from it as a result of the Vienna Gesera (pogrom) in 1421 (Figure 2). To avoid forced baptism, part of the Jewish community had committed suicide in the synagogue on the square. The building was demolished soon after, some of the stones reputedly being used for an annex of the relatively new (and Catholic) university, but in any case the structure was dismantled and the building materials used elsewhere, as was customary at the time. Given this history, it is no wonder that the city’s archaeology department undertook exploratory excavations in the spring of 1995, in advance of any construction for the memorial. Before long, the archaeologists found more than they had expected. The foundations of the synagogue as well as parts of the bimah, a raised platform from which the Torah was read, came to light half a meter below the pavement in August 1995 (Figure 3). Soon after, a closed competition was launched.

The competition call vaguely suggested that “interaction” with the ruins was possible but not required; as jury president Hans Hollein carefully put it, artists were “given permission to incorporate this archaeological find into their concepts.”

Though the primary reason for the dig was the erection of the new memorial, the remains came to play a leading role in shaping what was to come. Excavations continued, under time pressure, as the archaeologists recall, and in January 1996, a jury consisting of international curators, city representatives, and members of the Viennese Jewish community selected British sculptor Rachel Whiteread’s untitled project, soon dubbed “The Nameless Library”: the sculptural ghost, in concrete, of a Viennese living room turned inside out, complete with rosette ceiling (mounted on the roof), handleless double doors, and rows of books whose spines, facing inward, were to gesture vaguely at Jewish learning and its destruction (Figure 4). Whiteread had initially proposed mounting a 30-millimeter-thick glass plate under the memorial, level with the pavement, in which visitors would have

Figure 2  Situation plan of the Ghetto before 1421, installation at Museum Judenplatz (author’s photo, 2012)
seen themselves, and the base of the monument, reflected—but the glass would have had concrete beneath, and thus would not have provided visual access to the ruins. There might have been good reasons, aesthetic as well as political, for the refusal to incorporate the glass: the decision to construct a purely contemporary memorial would avoid opportunistic use of the remains. A combination memorial could only have encouraged the reading of Austrian Jewish history as one long catastrophe, lumping together the Gesera and National Socialism. So the decision to keep history and commemoration apart might have reflected the good sense of the artist and jury.

There are, however, hints that the issue was much more complicated from the very start. In November 1995, competitors were flown to Vienna to attend a colloquium or briefing, as the printed literature puts it, but also, it seems, to see the...
archaeological findings. The invited teams, recounting the startling urgency to incorporate the remains that the jury exuded during this visit. "It was clear at that point that you could not ignore the synagogue, that it had to be made visible in the project." Although presented as an issue of preservation, the findings put pressure not just on Whiteread's project but on the city's choice between education and moral statement, and more generally between the remembered and those doing the remembering. The corresponding utterances in the award decision reflect this dualism. We read in the jury report that "this 'anonymous library' will not be accessible," per Whiteread's wishes. But the jury went on to make its own demands. The jury unanimously recommended Rachel Whiteread's entry for implementation, but asked the artist to make some changes: "The two inscriptions indicating the theme of the monument are to include the places where the Jews were exterminated. Of the archaeological finds bearing testimony to the holocaust of 1421, at least the bimah should be accessible or visible." In other words, the jury wanted to have things both ways, with as much correspondence between monument and synagogue as possible. Whiteread objected immediately when asked to open the building for passage to the synagogue: "Ms. Whiteread considers it incompatible with her concept, to add any openings to the building," reads the protocol of the debriefing after the jury's decision.

The monument would ultimately be inaugurated with some modifications and without visual access to the remains (Figure 5): a base was added to prevent pedestrians from walking on the inscription of the concentration camp names, faced not in the problematic glass of the proposal but in compressed marble powder, and the footprint of the structure was moved by a meter so that it would not be directly atop the bimah. Before this occurred, between March 1996 and March 1998, a heated debate went on in the Viennese press and political offices pitting Whiteread against the ruins. In March 1996 the city decided to make the remains accessible by means of a subterranean showcase; in June, the head of the Jewish Welcome Service, an organization that invites exiled Jews to return to Vienna, declared that the remains would make the better memorial—a position the political right strategically latched on to in order to prevent the execution of the huge "modern" monolith by Whiteread. In July the city decided to double the exhibition space; it was doubled again in October and the archaeologists were given more time to dig—all of which postponed the opening of Whiteread's memorial; in August, the Misrachi House on the square, then and now the location of the Zionist Misrachi organization, was proposed both as an access point to the remains and as a museum of Jewish medieval life; the Jewish community again declared that the memorial could not be built above the synagogue, or at least the bimah.

In March 1998 the mayor stressed once again that the city would build the monument. Relations with the Jewish community, which Häupl had at first so warmly courted, were by now fairly cool. The museum project was put under the care not of the young Jewish Museum, which Häupl had at first so warmly courted, were by now fairly cool. The museum project was put under the care not of the young Jewish Museum, which now oversees it, but of the Historical Museum of Vienna, and opened the day of the memorial inauguration in October 2000 (Figure 6). The museum in the Misrachi

Figure 5 Rachel Whiteread, Monument and Memorial for the Jewish Victims of the Nazi Regime in Austria, 2000 (author's photo, 2009)
House was entered at street level, where computer terminals hosted a research project about Austrian victims of the Shoah. After descending a set of stairs, the visitor encountered a state-of-the-art digital reconstruction of the synagogue as part of a virtual walk through the quarter (to which I will return; Figure 7), and an underground path to the actual remains. Most momentous, though hardly discussed in public, was the decision to move the remains. Because the synagogue was found less than a meter beneath street level, there was essentially no space for a subterranean room in which a person could stand: the remains had to be exposed or submerged. The bimah and surrounding area, 4 by 4 meters, were lowered 1.6 meters, which resulted in an archaeological situation with the visitor standing on the level of the Roman
city, looking not at the walls of the synagogue but at its lowered foundations, with the bimah now occupying the ground level of “Roman Vienna.”

What are we to make of all this? The remains of the synagogue, a monument-through-its-own-destruction belonging to the Jews, and the city project dedicated to the Jews embody, in their opposition, a tension between historical remains that become monuments by granting insight into the past and “willed” monuments that are built to commemorate causes known to the builders. But with the drastic intervention into the structure of the remains, unknown to visitors, and the confusing demands from several quarters to combine medieval and contemporary history, we must wonder if any opposition is possible between contemporary monument and historical remains. Have both not been so radically manipulated and set in relation to one another that we must see them as a historical continuum, or as contemporary objects of architectural and political debate? Such a reading makes some verifiable claims. Yet I am suspicious of any leveling approach, because it is precisely the motivation and effects of the interventions, so different, in the fabric of archaeological remains and in the artist’s new proposal, that are interesting here. The Whiteread monument was moved a meter laterally so that it would not extend over the bimah, but the bimah was moved deeper so that it could be accessed subterraneously; both the bimah and its audience are invisible to the people on the square.

Just what kind of history is being commemorated through this dizzying manipulation of remains? It helps here to step back from the flow of events and view the case in theoretical perspective. In 1903, when Alois Riegl, then general conservator (Generalkonservator) for the Kaiserlich-königliche Zentralkommission für Kunst- und historische Denkmale in Vienna (the Imperial and Royal Central Commission for Art Monuments and Historical Monuments), wrote an essay regarding the new draft law on the conservation of monuments, he could not have expected it to become the most influential modern treatise on the relation between objects and private. The novelty of Riegl’s text lies less in its elaborate outline of various kinds of value found in monuments than in its practical orientation as prolegomena to a law. Riegl’s emphasis is on reception, predicated on the notion that artifacts age, and this unites the diversity of purposes that monuments serve. He famously divided and subdivided monuments according to the kinds of value they embody, which we should not read as a bureaucratic attempt to instill order on the past, but as an effort to categorize possible relations between viewers and artifacts, relations that change over time. Among these, Riegl proclaims age value (Alterwerth) the “most modern” of the values, one that currently “figures in the greatest number of monuments.” Age value has an aesthetic, sensual side, but also a contextual, discursive one: to paraphrase Riegl’s careful discussion, it involves the dissolution by natural forces of the closed formal unity we expect from new artifacts, but also the acknowledgment of the passage of time by the “modern man” of the early twentieth century, who can relate the life cycle of monuments to his own life. The result is not relativism of the “anything goes” variety but a radical dependence on time and other objects that we might call historical relativity. For Riegl, an abgerissener Zettel or torn sheet of paper, if it is the only document of a lost period, possesses historical and aesthetic value, and is a monument as irreplaceable as any ruin.

Riegl’s essay itself acquired the status of a cultural monument with the memory boom of the 1980s and 1990s, reaching a peak around the time of the Vienna memorial competition. Two motives of this revival are directly pertinent to the Judenplatz project. First, Riegl’s intricate value scale, while perhaps the sharpest of Riegl’s distinctions, the one between “willed” (gewollte) and “unwilled” (ungewollte) monuments, with its hint of his own art historical master concept of collective intentionality, or Kunstwollen, became important in the discussion of the legitimacy of commemoration. Riegl used the willed/unwilled pair, which I translate literally, as relative rather than absolute categories: every monument is a willed one to its builders, but all things can become monuments over time, regardless of whether their makers willed this status. All of Riegl’s values are values for us; it is we “modern subjects” who make the monument into a Denkmal—literally a mark to think about or with—whether it was a monumentum in the willed sense or not. It is paradoxical, but undeniably accurate, that destruction often generates interest in what is destroyed.

Of specific interest for the 1990s was Riegl’s effort to understand the role of decay, its unwitting progress turned into signs of historical change by attentive spectators. French architectural theorist Françoise Choay used the gewollt/ungewollt distinction to set apart commissioned and historical monuments in her 1992 book L’allégorie du patrimoine. Riegl himself thought the distinction of historical import:
the ancients built monuments but recognized no “unwilled” ones. The use of older buildings as markers of the past characterizes modernity, whether it issues in the desire to “restore” a ruin to its imagined original state, or to allow it to decay picturesquely. For Riegl, the reason age value so dominates us moderns is that our access to the past, to art, and to the world in general is thoroughly subjective. Age may not confer quality, but it instills a mood, a Stimmung, a term Margaret Olin has described in terms of the ability to “unite the ‘inner mood’ of the individual with the ‘atmosphere’ of the environment, either natural or social,” rather like the tuning of musical instruments, which Stimmung also means. Scholars differ over whether Riegl owes the concept to Ruskin—Riegl cites Ruskin frequently, not as an authority but as representative of what he calls the ultrasubjective or “impressionist” approach to historical monuments, from which Riegl maintains a certain distance. What is important for our purpose is not whether Riegl approves of Stimmung—he is enthusiastic in his writings before 1900, rather detached in the monument essay, and downright critical in his final writings—but that he finds it central to the modern “cult” of monuments, which he compares to the movement for the protection of animals (Tierschutz) and to preservation movements in general. However his own attitude toward Stimmung changed, Riegl held consistently that one could not get around it in understanding monuments, in the modern period at any rate.

There are practical implications of Stimmung for public intervention in the built environment. In a 1902 newspaper article discussing the plans to restore the entrance portal of St. Stephen’s Cathedral (the so-called giant gate, Riesentor), Riegl presents Stimmung as the principal obstacle to intervention. Against the modernism that values the Romanesque element as bolder, more original, meriting freedom from its Gothic encumbrance, Stimmung promotes a detachment that sees Romanesque and Gothic as equal in being just plain old—though, of course, not equally old.

What kind of rationale can be given for this curious stance? Riegl describes Stimmung as “that way of seeing that takes in things as much as possible from a distance . . . that direction in art which seeks real life, which it wishes to represent, not in the direct sensible appearance of things, which should only function as stimulus, but essentially behind them in the thoughts thus stimulated.” What idea of distance is at play for such spectators? The literal distance that allows us to put together the whole, as in divisionist painting? It seems that Stimmung also implies closeness, personal attachment. The result is Stimmungswert (mood value) achieved through a psychosomatic Stimmungswirkung (mood effect). It is important here that Riegl, even though he uses the term “value,” does not include Stimmungswert as a category in his monument essay, though the two texts are contemporaneous. Perhaps that is because, in its radical application to modern ways of viewing, Stimmungswert would be revealed as central to many of the values attributed to spectators, leveling the field in a way Riegl explicitly sought to avoid. The expressly modern appeal of age value, for instance, is given the same explanation in the monument essay that Stimmung gets in the “Riesentor” article, and it is possible to see in the subjective mental processes that generate Stimmung the unwilled, to say nothing of the unconscious. Through Stimmung, we are confronted with the natural life cycle of monuments, and maybe also, as Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht has characterized it, with the “desire for a cosmological order . . . which had lost its theological guarantee in early modernity.”

Even if Stimmung seems to promise modern spectators such cosmological riches, we need to be careful not to stifle the historical flexibility of Riegl’s conceptions. The Secessionists of Riegl’s time stood for this “impressionist” view, wholly devoted to Stimmung, while the architects of the time, according to Riegl, stand for intervention; but Riegl predicts a time when the roles will reverse. Both approaches are modern, according to Riegl, and both are valid, which is why he argues for a solution answering to neither alone, but rather to the nature of the building: if it is true that the Romanesque gate has a unity lacking in the several Gothic modifications, only detailed research and publication of the components of the entrance can convince the public that restoration is in order. Thus, very subtly, Riegl votes for intervention, but only through a campaign of documentation and public information more typical of the 1990s than of the empire and its public building projects.

There is a rough spot in all this, which must not have occurred to the scholarly Riegl. For the “impressionists” it is crucial to Stimmung that monuments be authentically old, not reconstructed. If mood is achieved through sense illusion and the thoughts it causes, how could it ever serve as a guarantee of age, and not just of the appearance of age? “It is,” as he notes, “an inevitable assumption that these artworks are really old and not imitations, or they would not be witnesses of the twelfth or thirteenth, but of the twentieth century.” The real presupposition, made clear in Riegl’s recommendation that the object as a whole be rigorously documented and published, is that the connection between experience and age is assured through public knowledge. But that knowledge might as well be used to craft better illusions. It seems doubtful that mood value is firmly tied to age value, to the injunction not to destroy, overbuild, or modify, unless one is a consummate historian whose mood is instantly correlated with an accurate historical judgment. But even if so, the objection runs, one can use that knowledge to mislead people, just as
a connoisseur can craft a convincing fake. If this is correct, Stimmung cannot serve as a criterion for deciding what to do, much less for distinguishing unwilled (genuinely historical) from willed (present-oriented) monuments.

Returning to our starting point on the Judenplatz, we must recognize not just the uncanny survival of Riegl’s concerns but also how they make the situation trickier than it was in the as-yet unlegislated imperial context around 1900. The theoretical shift in commemoration of the 1980s and 1990s makes an obvious difference: once traditional monuments, built with the intent of recalling an event or complex of events (Riegl’s gewollter Erinnerungswert, willed memory value) became questionable as organs of nationalism, inapt for commemorating victims and the public taking of responsibility, access to a seemingly “authentic” past—in our case the geographical site of actual history—seemed the only concrete alternative.51 Choay could thus declare the barracks of the concentration camps the only real monuments of the twentieth century, unwilled and in fact hostile to artistic interventions: “The camp, become monument, functions as relic.”52 On the one hand, Choay’s immediate concerns are not Riegl’s; preserving baroque additions to a medieval church, say, is certainly different from asking how to commemorate the Shoah. On the other hand, Riegl’s distinctions are helpful, not just in the way Choay appropriates them but also in ways they fail to fit with their recent use. The camp is only a relic if treated as such by authorities and the public. It is a matter of Stimmung, of the psychological effect of site on spectator.

By the 1990s, historical value and Stimmung had become so identified in the public discourse, in part because of a rapidly expanding literature on memory and oral history, that Riegl’s opposition of the two had been blurred altogether. Perhaps startling to a previous generation of architects and theorists, who had condemned Stimmung as unfit for the disillusioned, democratic age following the Second World War, theories of the fragmentation of history led to new definitions of the success of monuments, and of memorial places more generally, in which Stimmung, freed of its symbolist, aestheticist trappings, came to stand for a subjective but direct, corporeal experience of history.53 The point was to provoke individuals to experience history rather than school them historically. Given this postmodern shift, the physical fragment, the relic, could stand in for historical consciousness much better than the untouched whole. For the fragment, whatever its authenticity, seems more authentic in its fragmentation than does the whole. We are moving here on the plane of Stimmung and subjective illusion, as Riegl recognized, but far from having in age value a precondition on our access to historical fantasy, there is just another field of illusion, “historical authenticity,” for monument makers, politicians, and historical experts to colonize. Concentration camp barracks are authentic monuments only because they are being presented as such, and that might require showing them in their subsequent disrepair or polishing them to make them look newly used.

In the 1990s, there is thus no simple answer to the question whether historical conviction is best achieved through preservation, restoration, or decay. In every case of a suggested change, the effect on spectators has to be judged, not assumed according to the formula “the old is deemed authentic.” The lowered bimah of the Judenplatz can count as a relic owing to its genuinely old material and the anecdotes regarding its discovery, but it is made accessible by a bold offense against objective age value, with the foundations as walls, and urban remains from different sites and times jumbled together—in short, through a fabrication framed by modern architecture.

Christian Jabornegg and Andráss Pálfy, the architects who planned both the exhibition space and the renovation of the square above into a pedestrian zone, including custom lighting of the Whiteread monument, are known for their postminimalist exhibition architecture, often inserted into older buildings, from the Generali Foundation Vienna (Figure 8), a former hat factory, to the museum of the Benedictine monastery at Altenburg, a baroque palace with roots in the twelfth century. Jabornegg and Pálfy call their approach “building in context,” which is striking considering that they adhere to clean industrial design, with visible steel and concrete, and generally construction techniques and materials by no means available in (or in any way related to) the historical context they are joining. Building in context is thus not historicist blending, nor even a postmodern symbolic “homage” to its site, but rather a precisely controlled framing of the unwilled, a showcase of the seemingly authentic space around it, a shell into which we step to experience history. The Stimmungswert of these interventions does not inhere in themselves, and is thus immune to Riegl’s objections: as frames, they tend to intensify the (purely subjective) sense of age by contrast alone.

This raises the question whether an unwilled monument, through acknowledgment of age value by its spectators, can become a new willed monument. Riegl saw destruction and memory as exclusive factors, incompatible in the same place at the same time. Age value is for him “intrinsically the deadly enemy of willed commemorative value” (“von Haus aus der Todfeind des gewollten Erinnerungswertes”), which, in order to stay operative, must fight decay.54 This might sound melodramatic, and indeed, it is not that Riegl was unaware of
resulting in a never-ending layering of historical accounts. But the site as it stands makes claims of historical authenticity that it cannot fulfill. The whole appeal of the unwilled, from Riegl to Choay and the Viennese Jewish community, is that it offers us, even if only subjectively and illusorily, a glimpse of human intentions specific to their time. The paradox, made painfully concrete in the Judenplatz, is that to articulate such past intentions seems to be immediately to appropriate them for other purposes.

In this broader sense, the project may be compared with its postmodern peers, such as the Frauenkirche in Dresden (Figure 9), which was re-created almost entirely from scratch, on the basis of a few remaining stones, between 1992 and 2005. According to the official website, the “Frauenkirche should be rebuilt using its original structural substance to the largest extent possible in accordance with the original construction plans.”55 To raise the money for the re-creation, watches were sold containing authentic pieces of the original sandstone. Here the church was to be rebuilt with money earned from further destruction, even if the fragments were tiny and presumably of no use for the restoration. Apart from the practical and political questions this fund-raising device raises, one could argue that the act was a violation of Stimmungswerth, which restoration must in some sense hold as an ideal. But this Rieglian conception of mood as consistent with authenticity can be opposed to more direct ways of demanding assent from spectators, among which the postmodern interest in fragments, and the naive desire for a rebuilt whole, are no longer seen as incompatible. For instance, the old stones of the Frauenkirche are darker than the new, and therefore easily identified. They “resemble the scars of healed wounds,” the website declares enthusiastically. Mark Jarzombek sees here a “problematic interweaving of overlapping and competing narratives about its past and future,” and warns that “the historian must thus be on guard to transcend the false pairing of memory and modernity, where memory, by implication, is assigned a positive value and modernity a negative one.”56 I agree with him that in Dresden, history is occluded through reconstruction, however careful this was. The church as socialist monument against Allied bombing, for instance, which would have been a fine unwilled monument for a post-reunification Germany, was made invisible by all the spectacular scar tissue. Postmodern unwilled monument manipulation has entered a troubling alliance with archaeological strategies for conveying age value and historical context generally. Historical information and modes of conveying it are rapidly turned into sources of edification. The Viennese solution, with its conceptually rigid, physically uncomfortable confrontation between new monument and subterranean lieu de mémoire, papers over fewer historical cracks.57
The Judenplatz museum works despite, but in a sense also because of, its refusal to reconcile imagination and historicity. The low ceiling and the need to walk through a claustrophobic tunnel, problematic for many Jewish visitors, create an enormous psychic distance from the present. The visitor finishes the site in his or her head, like Riegl’s “impressionists,” though of course the distance is an illusion, the narrow space fully modern. In addition, before seeing the remains, the digital reconstruction conditions what the audience is about to see. The designers reportedly went to pains to avoid the appearance of a first-person video game, but any historian of the 1990s will recognize the affinities; and even Riegl, innocent of video games, would recognize the unreal torchlight and murky medieval ambience as desperate bids for Stimmung. The result on the one hand was immersive, but on the other, through formal choices, it gave the impression of a virtual reality tour through something distinct from the synagogue. Of course one could argue, as in Dresden, that this unreality is the didactic heart of the reconstruction, that it prevents confusion of old and new, but such an argument is inconsistent with the heavy, romantic air of subjective immersion. It seemed that the desideratum of gaining access to history as bodily interaction, announced as a refusal of modernist master narratives, ended up as the offer of Stimmung divorced from age value, a myth or politically motivated “master narrative” par excellence.

This part of the museum has recently been changed, and I gather from curators that the film in particular, in being so reflective of the late 1990s, is now regarded as outdated. It has been replaced by a film reconstructing the buildings in analogous terms, but with a much more minimalist formal approach. But what will happen in the long run, and, just as important from our perspective in the present, what should happen? If we take Riegl seriously, we need to do more than critically update him, taking account of the values sought today—for Riegl did foresee changes in this field, but he could not foresee virtual synagogues. To really learn from Riegl, we have to hold on to the normative element in his evaluation of values. This would not answer our theoretical or political questions for us, but it might help us become clearer about why we prefer certain monumental solutions.

In this spirit, a quick look at Whiteread’s competitors for the Judenplatz commission will help me conclude on a practical note.
Austrian performance artist VALIE EXPORT proposed a tunnel-like structure of glass and stone with an audio installation as memorial, and a glass floor with water running through it through which the ruins could be seen. EXPORT was not a finalist, but her “continuous surface design” for the square as a whole was held up for emulation in Whiteread’s debriefing. More dramatic still, Ilya Kabakov’s “ditch” was an attempt to stage not just the whole square but also the synagogue underneath. Confronted with Kabakov’s patented “small objects hanging at equal intervals—buttons, bent nails, crumpled wires—insignificant, small fragments that were found in the ground . . . the viewer . . . sees to the right of him a large glass window” revealing the “ruins of the old synagogue, mysteriously shining in the depth, and the tragic events of an ancient epoch combine with the tragedy of the recent past.” This sounds sentimental, even at the peak of the 1990s memory boom, and the jury “worried about priorities” in this jumbling of the aesthetically self-referential and the historical. Yet Kabakov’s contribution also obviously attempts to construct a mood offering access to rather diffuse associations with history, from the everyday to the religious. Here, too, Stimmung would have served as an ambiguous meeting point of the subjective and the historical: the buttons and little items would probably have consisted of litter from somewhere in the city, since the historical ditch that Kabakov wanted in a sense to rebuild had been filled with waste in the fifteenth century. Still, the modern detritus would have been presented not just as scraps of Jewish history but unavoidably also as reminders of the absence of their human users, Jewish or otherwise, and by extension of our own mortality, leading ultimately, one suspects, to an interpretation of the space as faintly commemorating the Shoah. Kabakov’s proposal thus captures perfectly well the atmospheric, bodily approach to historical consciousness of the 1990s, as it manifested itself in the installations of Christian Boltanski and other artists specializing in commemoration.

In comparing Whiteread to her competitors, what emerges beside common rhetorical strategies of 1990s commemoration are the deviations in Whiteread’s approach, which could almost be called conservative, if that term is understood not as an adverse value judgment but as a description of its relation to monuments of the past. Consider Clegg & Guttmann, who like Whiteread used a symbolism of the “People of the Book” in their proposed library tower, but obligingly provided “access to a larger subterranean area containing all the archaeological findings.” It is understandable that given this glut of proposals physically and conceptually confronting the new with the old, the city stuck to its own authentic “unwilled” site without forgoing the contemporary project, the “willed” nature of which it needed for international prestige: the remains alone would not do aesthetically, nor politically, since they would have shown Austrian violence against the Jews without its redemptive counterpart, an utterance of “we remember” in an impressive size and format. But the crucial context for this commemorative speech act is still missing: a clear reference to the past. How to achieve this given Whiteread’s resolve against reference to the synagogue? The bimah is where religious books were really read: yet the nameless library makes no gesture to it. Whiteread’s project, with its hermetic closure, rather seemed to deny that any “coming to terms” with the Nazi past is possible. The unreadable books at the center of Whiteread’s allegory thus took on the significance of a moral principle. It could not, however, be simultaneously a moral conduit to the past. Stimmungswert, which should have bound a present spectator subjectively to the real history of the object, is freed here, as in the tunnel beneath, from historical reference.

In many ways, the references that emanate from Whiteread and the site head in different directions, pointing to place, historical consciousness, and our own rather timid moral stance toward historical processes; this variety of reference perfectly matches the taste of the memory boom generation. That Whiteread did not bring about one coherent entry into history might not surprise us, and should not be taken as failure. I am not sure, though, that the city representatives had such a resigned view of the matter, for they continuously intervened in the difficult exchange between monument and synagogue. Probably against the spirit of Whiteread’s project, an outline of the bimah can be found on the square, on which cars are no longer allowed (Figure 10). A statue of Lessing, originally erected in the 1930s and re-created in the 1960s after its destruction by the Nazis, has stood on the square since 1981 (Figure 11); entrants in the competition were explicitly warned that the new monument should “not be juxtaposed with the Lessing monument.” Despite this injunction, Lessing remains, and today faces Whiteread’s monument, not far from an anti-Semitic medall plaque (visible on the white house in the background in Figure 11) that celebrates the deaths of the Jews in 1421. In 1998, just as the Judenplatz debate had reached its peak, the Catholic Church attached a sign on another house on the square, citing together the pogrom of 1421 and the Shoah and, at least vaguely, declaring the church’s failure to act against anti-Semitism. If the copresence of the memorial and the museum allows for problematic deductions about the homogeneity of history, the Judenplatz as a whole, shot through with Jewish as well as with political and national history, is a site of memory valuable precisely through its imperfection.
Is commemoration inevitably flawed? Perhaps, but it does not follow that anything goes. Speaking of Stimmung in his last text, a newspaper article on the yet-unrealized monument law in 1905, Riegl found its purest expression in nature conservation:

When it is demanded, for example, that a rock face should not be quarried, it is not so much because the aesthetic effect of the vertical against the horizontal of the earth would thus be lost, as because it discomforts modern man, that so to speak the living body of the earth should be attacked, and through its wounds visibly deformed. There is indeed some danger to the modern monument cult of thus losing itself in a boundless sentimental muddle; but this should not prevent us from seeing that its demands, moderately pursued, deserve full and honest consideration.64

I should claim that Riegl’s rock face is less like the Judenplatz as a whole than like Whiteread’s monument: it is an object not of historical reflection but of pure Stimmung, valuable as long as it retains, together with its subjective interest, a subjective promise of bearing witness to some past.65

Notes
1. This text was first given as a talk in June 2012 at the Deutsche Forum für Kunstgeschichte in Paris on the occasion of the conference titled The Monument in Question. For critical feedback I would like to thank Andreas Beyer, Michael Clegg, Werner Hanak-Lettner, Heidrun

Figure 10 Outline of the bimah on Judenplatz (author’s photo, 2012)

Figure 11 Judenplatz with statue of Lessing and an anti-Semitic medieval inscription mounted on the wall in the background (author’s photo, 2012)
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