Marija Ratković

TESTIMONY IN STONE: ARCHITECTURE OF WAR FROM KLUGE TO HERSCHER AND WEIZMAN

ABSTRACT

The article contributes to creating an outline of the significant postwar theoretical approaches that examine the role, purpose, and significance of architecture in war and war crimes. Starting from the Clausewitz thesis that "war is not autonomous", this paper attempts to reveal "the blood that has dried in the codes" (Foucault), politics hidden behind the four walls of architecture. From the concepts of Brutality in Stone (Kluge), Warchitecture (Herscher) or Forensic Architecture (Weizman), through the lenses of architecture, the article exposes war, politics, and ideologies that shape and drive architecture by reimagining and repurposing it both in its primary, functional and cultural, representative sense. A shift from "the era of the witness" (Felman) to the decade of evidence (Weizman) promotes architecture and its remains to the level of science, global governing, and law. The connection of timely-distanced emancipatory practices influenced by Holocaust studies establishes a discursive field for architecture as a performative rather than representative practice. The theoretical frame of the postwar landscape as second nature (Adorno) is crucial for discussing the role of architecture in the Holocaust. Furthermore, it stresses the work of Herscher and Weizman as a contribution to the critique of the depoliticized processes of resolution of the contemporary war crimes and post-conflict reconciliation. Architecture as a societal practice could potentially have a central position in memory and knowledge production, as well as the production of a counter-public sphere.

Marija Ratković: PhD Candidate, University of Arts in Belgrade; hello.marijaratkovic@gmail.com.

Introduction: Present of the Past

> *"War is only a branch of political activity… it is in no sense autonomous."*

Carl von Clausewitz[1]

The first draft of this text in 2011, emerges from the author's artistic practice within the group Four Faces of Omarska, collaborations with Grupa Spomenik (Monument Group) and the project Living Death Camps, archive and research work led by Eyal Weizman, and Forensic Architecture project by the Centre for Research Architecture on Goldsmiths, University of London. From 2010 to 2012 we did a series of art projects and exhibitions (led by Milica Tomić), public events, collaborative translations, and reading groups (led by Branimir Stojanović[2] and Noa Treister under the concept of Ignorant Schoolmaster and his Committees Group) as well as architecture[3] and film theory workshops (led by Pavle Levi[4]) and co-authored projects (The Culture of Memory: Present of the Past[5]). There was a need to theorize and intertwine the interdisciplinary knowledge of the pasts and the presents we went through the research, a draft was named Architecture of War in film Brutality in Stone by Alexander Kluge. Since none of the group members was a historian, the interest in the

---

1   Clausewitz 1940: Book 8, Ch. 6.
2   Foucault 2003; Močnik 1999; Agamben 1998.
11 april 2011 the Working Group FFO had a workshop with Milan Radanović: Historical context of the crimes of Nazi German occupiers on the territory of Serbia and Belgrade 1941-1944. and Olga Manojlović Pintar: And After Camp – Camp!
13 April 2011 Discussion of the text: G. W. F. Hegel, Observation of selfconsciousness to its immediate actuality. Physiognomy and Phrenology. In The Phenomenology of Mind (1908) with Branimir Stojanović.
4-5 May 2011 Grupa Spomenik [Monument Group] and translation/discussion group What is the Name of War Today?, the Ph.D. dissertation written in 2004 by Catherinne Hass and entitled "Qu appelle t-on une guerre? Enquete sur le nom de guerre aujourd hui".
3   13 April 2011 the Working Group FFO had a Working Meeting (Working Group Four Faces of Omarska, Monument Group, Centre for Research Architecture, Goldsmiths University of London).
24 May 2011, the Working Group FFO had a workshop with Andrew Herscher.
13 July 2011, the Working Group FFO had a workshop with Eyal Weizman and Srđan Jovanović Weiss.
4   2-3 August 2011, the Working Group FFO and the newly formed Initiative for Contemporary Art and Theory had a workshop "Film, politics of memory and the production of a counter-public sphere" with Pavle Levi, film theorist, professor at Stanford University, and a member of the collective Grupa Spomenik [Monument Group]
5   The Culture of Memory: Present of the Past was the series of art exhibitions (work of Milica Tomić, Vladimir Miladinović, Andrea Palašti, Vahida Ramujkić…) and events (lectures and talks by Milan Radanović, Ana Vilenica, Milica Tomić, Andrea Palašti…) in Serbia and abroad (Pančevo, Šabac, Novi Sad, Zagreb, Ancona, Vienna…) initiated and curated by Marija Ratković and Dejan Vasić in 2012, read more in Ratković, Vasić 2014.

past we have seen as an archeological practice of *digging deeper*[6] to reveal politics and ideologies behind the well-known atrocities, such as the Holocaust or contemporary war crimes worldwide. As an architect, I was particularly interested in the role of architecture in war conflicts and particularly in war crimes. The *Testimony in Stone* is an attempt to connect timely and spatially distanced concepts of Kluge's intervention into the discourse of postwar Germany through his film Brutality in Stone (1961) and the works of contemporary theorists of architecture – Andrew Herscher with his concept of *warchitecture* and Eyal Weizman's series of multimedia projects under the name of Forensic Architecture, as the emancipatory practices influenced by the Holocaust and trauma studies but of vital significance for the understanding of the role of the architecture in war conflicts.

In 2011, along with collaborators, I was translating the introduction to Eyal Weizman's Belgrade talk on Forensic Architecture[7], which he held in CZKD, under the name „Forensic aesthetic: The Arhitecture of Skulls and Other Living Matter". Both as an architect and as a theorist, I was confused by his thesis the Trial of the Wall[8]. Such an essential turn in the domain of legal science and moving the concept of the trial of the accused man to the trial of the wall – object, architecture, required a more thorough theoretical study of the topic. Throughout the lecture, Weizman gives an introduction outlining this starting point in law, a whole previous shift from insisting on (human) testimony, through osteoanalysis[9] to forensic DNA research, which is the dominant form of today's jurisprudence around the world, when it comes to terms of war crimes[10]. Thus, from the "Decade of Witnesses" as Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub (Felman 1991) called the last decades of the 20th century in "The Crisis

---

6   With a clear reference to the Kluge's character (from both Germany in Autumn and The Patriot) Gabi Teichert. She is the history teacher who denies the state-provided misrepresentations of the history and digs deeper in her quest to reveal the buried truth about WWII.
7   Derived from the Latin *forensic,* The word forensics refers at root to "forum". Forensics is thus the art of the forum – the practice and skill of presenting an argument before a professional, political or legal gathering. Forensics is in this sense part of rhetoric, which concerns speech. However, it includes not only human speech but also that of things (Weizman 2012: 9).
8   The trial of the wall in Palestine, refers to the trial in which the pre-trial structure with the existence of defendants, prosecutors, and witnesses, the trial of only one actor – evidence, which is an inanimate object and an architectural object, a wall.
9   As the name suggests – *osteoanalysis* is an analysis of skeletal remains found at the atrocity locations
10   Weizman states "Within the field of war-crime investigation, a methodological shift has recently led to a certain blurring. The primacy accorded to the witness and the subjective and linguistic dimension of testimony, trauma, and memory / a primacy that has had such enormous cultural, aesthetic and political influence it has reframed the end of the twentieth century as "the era of the witness" – is gradually being supplemented (not to say bypassed) by an emergent forensic sensibility, an object/oriented juridical culture immersed in matter and materialities, in code and form, and the presentation of scientific investigation by experts" (Weizman 2012: 5–6).

of Testimony", according to Weizman, a shift was made towards the decade of evidence[11], in which earthly remains, by the both (hu)man and architecture, become the basis of science, global governing and law.

The first attempt to theorize this process, of course, is anti-humanist[12] discourse, basically a set of poststructuralist theories, which question the perspectives of new technologies and their character. To what extent is the existence and use of new technologies, the anti-humanist process, which excludes (hu)man, and to what extent technoculture[13] represents only an extension of human action and practice, is one of the key questions of postmodern theory. This shift of focus from human speech and action to the speech of machines, objects, living matter[14], in this paper is seen not as a practice of desubjectification of (hu)man, nor a step in that direction, but as part of the process of political subjectivization (Rancière 2004) of (living) matter. Since its beginnings, architecture has been reduced to a mere technique, representative practice, and/or a way of presenting thoughts, by no means succeed in rising to the status of performative utterance, thought itself, or even performing politics, producing ideas, or knowledge through the production of space and visual production[15]. Through case studies of the radical practice, both Kluge's film Brutality in Stone and a series of multimedia projects on Forensic Architecture, I will try to contextualize the aspiration of architects, to seriously consider the rethinking of architecture and understand this area beyond the domain of technical science.

---

11   Weizman (Weizman 2013) created a timeline where the Decade of Witness is marked by the Nuremberg trials and the shift from the witness to the evidence is marked by the exhumation of Mengele in Brasil in the 1985.

12   "Poststructuralist theories and practices, in general, share an oppositional stance toward traditional intellectual categories. This has been especially pronounced in the refiguring of the subject. No longer depicted as unified or possessed of control or initiative, the subject is now often seen as a product of linguistic or discursive practices, without "essence" or an irreducible nature. This position has often been described as anti-humanism since it argues that the very concept of "man," in the sense of "humanity", is itself a linguistic construct, devoid of any meaning outside of the system of relationships in which it exists. This logic has been used by poststructuralists to attack and attempt to undermine any theoretical system that claims universal validity" (Childers, Hentzi 1995).

13   As seen by Frederic Jameson as culture in the "Postindustrial age" (Jameson 1991).

14   As Weizman stated in the name of his Belgrade talk – Forensic Aesthetic: Architecture of the Scull and Other Living Matter, held on 12 April 2012, in CZKD, Belgrade

15   Through twentieth-century architectural theory, a key shift in this direction was made in the 1960s with situational utopian practices, with the 1980s the developed deconstruction and practices that followed this aspiration were the dominant type of theoretical consideration of architecture. The thesis is supported by the fact that Eyal Weizman, and Andrew Herscher, whose concepts are mentioned in this paper, are in the leading positions of prestigious universities around the world Goldsmiths University of London, AA School of Architecture, Yale University, Harvard University, and others.

Urbicide: The Basis of Forensic Architecture

Unlike human life, the durability of architectural objects is often implied. From the first laws, such as The Code of Hammurabi an ancient Mesopotamian code (Handcock 1920), durability is the basic quality of the building for which the author, the architect, is responsible. Today's requirements/standards of safety, solidity, and durability of architectural structures are also dealt with by legislation, ie today as before, at the state level, but also by many private contractors, insurance companies, and non-governmental agencies. The durability of buildings largely goes beyond the field of architecture itself as a construction practice, because the buildings themselves are large and complex structures, which reflect the political and economic power of institutions and individuals. Therefore, when a crash occurs, the first step in solving that problem is the process of establishing responsibility. As for reminder, in The Code of Hammurabi[16] the punishment for a builder-architect, in case the building collapses, was death because the chain of responsibility began and ended in the work of one man-author. Today, thanks to the hypertrophied system of division of responsibilities, it is almost impossible to identify a person responsible, or the "culprit", so it is important to emphasize that the anti-humanist setting is present in the very set of legislation that deals with these issues. Impersonal liability of legal entities entails punitive measures in terms of monetary amounts and other sanctions compatible with this provision in which one or more persons cannot be directly responsible for the "death of the object", liability is usually legal or collective, and such is the disposition of jurisdical measure.

On the other hand, a significant percentage of buildings were destroyed in armed conflicts, because modern wars are also not waged (declaratively) against people, but for the acquisition and redistribution of economic and political power. Thus, the basic type of attack on one country is military interventions aimed at the destruction of industrial or military complexes, capital, and strategically valuable facilities. Such devastation of space necessarily leads to economic impoverishment which is reflected in the (co-)dependence of state entities and is the basis of future colonial relations, debts, and further, the basis and motive of future investments, and thus the space of power manipulation.

---

16   "229. If a builder builds a house for a man and does not make its construction firm, and the house which he has built collapses and causes the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death.
230. If it causes the death of the son of the owner of the house, they shall put to death a son of that builder.
231. If it causes the death of a slave of the owner of the house, he shall give to the owner of the house a slave of equal value.
232. If it destroys property, he shall restore whatever it destroyed, and because he did not make the house which he builds firm and it collapsed, he shall rebuild the house which collapsed at his own expense.
233. If a builder builds a house for a man and does not make its construction meet the requirements and a wall falls in, that builder shall strengthen the wall at his own expense" (Handcock 1920).

Therefore, it is not surprising that the current tendency to consider this type of urban destruction (urbicide[17]) within the legal framework dealing with international law and international war crimes tribunals.

The Death of Living Matter: Forensic Architecture and Warchitecture

Adorno, in his critique of the Adenauer era (Adorno 1967; Adorno 1986), systematized German oblivion of the recent past by (a) denying collective guilt for World War II and the Holocaust, (b) relativizing both the existence and significance of death camps, (c) bickering over exact statistics of the number of Jews killed[18], and finally (d) systematic repression of memory, which takes place more on a conscious than an unconscious level (Rentschler 1980: 3). This last claim indicates that oblivion or rather denial was the sign of conscious rather than unconscious processes of selective remembering and forgetting[19].

In such an atmosphere of denial and a collective oblivion, Kluge's 1961 short film is the first film to go beyond the commercial constraints of the film industry based on war structures of power. The political detachment from commercial film enabled what Kluge later called the "counter-public sphere", a community that emerges from the sphere of what is allowed and depoliticized/private, but acts in public, not with the intention of appropriating it, but to prevent its abuse by political elites. (Negt, Kluge 1993).

In 1961, Alexander Kluge's film Brutality in Stone, began the practice of film reckoning with the appropriation and monopoly of power over the public sphere by the state. This film is an introduction to the Oberhausen Manifesto[20], a charter of a New German Cinema[21], politically (and in every other sense) engaged

---

17   Andrew Herscher (Herscher 2007) uses Bevan's definition of urbicide as "violence against architecture and cities is described as the result of attempts to erase "the memories, history, and identity attached to architecture and place" (Bevan 2006: 8). But at the same time suggests further reading on „urbicide": Shaw 2004; Coward 2004; Bogdanović 1995; Bevan 2006.
18   Rentschler states altering between five and six millions (Rentschler 1980: 30).
19   Here is important to mention Rentschler's note of "public demonstration of philo-Semitism" in German postwar media production, and what he calls "half-hearted reeducation programs" (Rentschler 1990: 30).
20   Oberhausen Manifesto is a chapter signed by 26 German filmmakers at the International Short Film Festival Oberhausen, North Rhine-Westphalia on 28 February 1962, among the signatories are both Alexander Kluge, and Peter Schamoni, authors of Brutality in Stone.
21   New German Cinema (Neuer Deutscher Film) is the postwar period of German cinema (1962 to 1982), significantly influenced by Oberhausen Manifesto and left politics, intended to overcome inherited Nazi production models in German film with non-commercial, experimental and art house films. Authors of the period include Harun Farocki, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Peter Fleischmann, Werner Herzog, Alexander Kluge, Ulli Lommel, Wolfgang Petersen, Volker Schlöndorff, Helma Sanders-Brahms, Werner Schroeter, Hans-Jürgen Syberberg, Margarethe von Trotta and Wim Wenders.

film, signed by 26 young filmmakers in 1962. According to Kluge, from the time of the Third Reich, in Germany, the state mechanisms of power continued the ideological process in the field of film, which began in the 1930s with Hitler's coming to power, until the 1960s. The state of financial dependence of the film industry on the state apparatus has led to a situation in which any fundamental critique of Hitler or his regime is impossible. In his analysis, Rentschler refers to statistical research of Hans-Peter Kochenrath (Kochenrath 1975: 289–290) and radically states "even as late as 1957 about 70 percent of all West German feature films employed either a director or a scriptwriter who had been active under Goebbels" (Rentschler 1990).

Warchitecture[22]: A Carrying Out of War by Architecture

Brutality in Stone is a film whose title refers to Hitler's thoughts on the didactic aspect of architecture as *Words in Stone*. Kluge's Brutality is as much a political as well as a stylistic determinant of the architecture of the Third Reich, which will be considered in this text under the term *Warchitecture* (Hercher 2010). According to Andrew Herscher, who writes about the concept of warchitecture, bearing in mind "architectural objects demolished, reconstructed or built-in war", he understands it as a performative act[23], a continuation of war by other means[24] – architecture. Therefore, Hitler's thesis, which was twice emphasized during the film, about the revolution that destroys and the Nazi understanding of the revolution as a constructive process, is the same – whether

---

22   The term "warchitecture" emerged in Sarajevo as a name for the catastrophic destruction of architecture during the 1992-1996 siege of the city. Blurring the conceptual border between "war" and "architecture," the term provides a tool to critique dominant accounts of wartime architectural destruction and to bring the interpretive protocols of architecture to bear upon that destruction.

23   "J. L. Austin (1976) defined the terms performative and performative utterance in a series of lectures at Harvard University in 1955 as the "utterance that acts" – that is, the utterance that performs a certain action. The performative utterance cannot be subordinated to cate- gories of true/false, as is possible with the constatives, which refer to facts of reality and establish a relationship with them. A performative utterance is an utterance that, besides communicating something by the very act of speaking, also performs (begins or finishes) the same action. One of the main examples of a performative utterance, which has become a synonym of the performative, is the statement of a promise. With the word "promise" itself, the speaker performs the act of promising, which may turn out to be "happy" or "unhappy" ("felicitous" or "infelicitous"). Thus, by identification with the act of promising, performative utterances, in the Austin theory of the performative, are divided into "felicitous" and "infelicitous" depending on whether or not they fulfil the "promise" given in the statement. An important characteristic of the performative is that a performative is a conventional action, which means that it is preceded by certain conventions – (necessary) "felicity conditions", which are required for its fulfilment" (Kobolt 2014)

24   For Clausewitz, "war is not merely a political act but a real political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, a carrying out of the same by other means" (Clausewitz 1940: 280).

to build or destroy, war/revolution performs itself through materialization, ie through architecture. The legitimization of war/revolution cannot be found in the effect of these processes, whether they result in construction or demolition, as Hitler does, but like politics and political decisions that precede it, and which are made through architecture.

As Kluge pointed out in the film, it is only an apparent discord that arises from the simultaneous existence of the mega architecture of the Märzfeld (March Field/Fields of Mars) in Nuremberg, the idea of underground housing, concentration camps, and the process of renaming Berlin under the Third Reich. According to Herscher, these are all outcomes of the same politics, a programmatic outcome based on inequality with Nazism as its fundamental principle. Each of the social categories assumed by Nazism has forms in architecture, intended and deployed accordingly. So we have the Fields of Mars for the top management of the party and its admirers, those who are building history together in Nuremberg. It is the architecture of the future past[25], the (self-)consciousness of Germany within the Third Reich about itself as an empire, behind which stands a politics able to change the course of history and sees itself as a dawn of the new great civilization, following the ancient ones – Greece and Rome[26].

On the other hand, there are millions of war and the Holocaust victims, the population of the bombed areas, the collateral damage to the war/revolution process, whose victim status is temporary, so the architecture that corresponds to their role is subordinated to higher goals. Therefore, the state leadership does not care what type of housing are those, what their materialization is, as Hitler states "[he] can imagine mud huts or holes in the ground simply covered with planks"[27], his statement is just one of the problematic (architectural) program solutions that can be easily removed. The guards could remove suspicions of untrustworthy detainees of murders taking place, or by silent and discreet killings out of sight, the detainees themselves could be quietly removed.

The last textual example in Kluge's film is the decree renaming Berlin, the capital, to Germania. Unlike previous, material practices of carrying out war through architecture, this example represents the semantic practice of re-signification. Without considering here the very politics of Nazism or the particular reasons that led Hitler to this decision, dealing only with the formal aspect of this act, which is renaming (something into something else), we come again to Herscher's thesis, ie whether it is construction or destruction. new Germany name better or worse than the old-Berlin), the act of renaming is a demonstration of state power and ownership – over territory and over the

---

25   Concept of the future past is derived from the two concepts one of Svetlana Boym (Boym 2011) and Gilles Deleuze (Deleuze 2005).

26   "As world capital Berlin will only be comparable with Ancient Egypt, Babylon, and Rome! What is London, what is Paris compared to that!" Hitler vision of the empire according to Werner 1980: 318.

27   Brutality in Stone [Brutalität in Stein]. Directed by Alexander Kluge and Peter Schamoni, Alexander Kluge Filmproduktion, 1961.

population. Regardless of the construct of the name of the city (Germania and its significance directed toward the German unity[28]), this construct is not an end in itself, ie it is not a mere act done on architecture in the name of a certain politics, but a specific form of violence through architecture over previous politics that established the existing architecture of the city (Herscher 2010).

A radically inverted case, as an extension of the thesis on the warchitecture towards the architectural syntax of war, is a military action called "inverse geometry", carried out in Israel in 2002 under the leadership of General Aviv Kokhavi. Weizman sees this action as "the reorganization of urban syntax by means of micro-tactical action" (Weizman 2010). This practice is somewhere between waging war through architecture and rendering architectural concepts of space within the practice of war, that is, directly through war actions based on spatial concepts from the theory of architecture. Namely, in the mentioned action of the Israeli army inside the city of Nimbus, the soldiers were moving around the city inside a tunnel made of specially made material, fabric. Weizman states that on that occasion, several thousand Israeli soldiers and several thousand Palestinian guerrillas were moving around the city simultaneously, while the fabric protected them from visibility/recognition from the air. The soldiers moved not using the existing axes of space, streets, courtyards, nor did they use the existing openings on buildings, windows and doors, but completely contrary to the logic of the city, they moved through openings in the walls and floors they broke through. This concept of intervention relativized the concepts inside and outside, as well as all the given architectural characteristics of the city, partially destroying the geometric logic. Similar to a video game, the soldiers reduced the space to simplified three dimensions without obstacles, vertical up-down and horizontal left-right and forward-backward. According to Weizman, such an action emphasized the performative character of the urban space, its dissatisfaction, making the city a field, a "liquid medium" that is constantly changing in construction, especially the construction of meaning. Moreover, General Weaver answered Weizman's question about the nature of that intervention with almost philosophical views on urban space:

> When Kokhavi claims that "space is only an interpretation", and that his movement through and across the built fabric of the city reinterprets architectural elements (walls, windows, and doors) and thus the city itself, he uses theoretical language to suggest that one can "win" an urban battle, not by the destruction of a city, but by its "reorganization". If a wall is only the signifier of a "wall", un-walling also becomes a form of rewriting – a constant process of undoing fueled by theory. Could rewriting amount to killing? If moving through walls becomes the method for "reinterpreting space", and the nature of the city is "relative" to this form of interpretation, could "reinterpretation" murder? If

---

28   "The name Germania for the Reich capital would be very appropriate, for in spite of how far removed those belonging to the Germanic racial core will be, this capital will instill a sense of unity". Hitler explained the reasons according to Hillgruber, Picker 1968: 182.

"yes", then the "inverse geometry" that turns the city "inside out", shuffling its private and public spaces, would imply consequences for urban operations that go beyond physical and social destruction and force us to reflect upon the "conceptual destruction" they bring. (Weizman 2006)

Film (after) War: Revolution by Film Means and Counter-politics

If we look further at Kluge's film through the thesis of architecture as a means of war that creates or alters – materially or semantically with the aim of destruction and "reinterpretation", we will come to the overthrow of Hitler's thesis on the Third Reich as an "architectural revolution" (Alexander Kluge and Peter Schamoni, *Brutality in Stone* [Brutalität in Stein], 1961). Through Brutality, Kluge spectacularizes the processes that the architect Hitler planned and/ or carried out, as a material component of the aforementioned revolution. The construction and conversion, as well as the renaming of megastructures, whether intended for the party, the common man or the enemy, is a testimony to a politics that is by no means one-sided because Speer under the Theory of Ruined Value assumed the fall of the Reich. The "process of gigantic construction," as Hitler sees the "revolution", is a more far-reaching process than "carrying out the war" (Clausewitz 1940).

We can interpret it as a process of constituting the memory, because Hitler, in the moment of speech, views the present (in which it is built) as the future past (in which it will be demolished), and in the struggle with time, he tends to neutralize the damage to the inevitable disappearance processes. The constructiveness or destructiveness of this thinking consists in the vision that Hitler offers, which is not only discriminatory but also anti-humanistic. Namely, in the future past, which will occur after the overthrow of the Third Reich, some people will eventually live. What architecture in the didactic sense should convey to them is only the great, the subject content of the present embodied in architecture for the future, architecture as the materialization of the politics of the Third Reich. The future memory will omit those hidden temporary settlements for people and factories converted into settlements for "temporary people". From the parts of the speech related to the architecture of the Third Reich, we see only objects of public importance, the Märzfeld (March Field/ Fields of Mars) and Hitler's drawings of Berlin/Germania, that is, what we do not see is everyday, private life, a life of people leaving the role of the party member and the of the rally, we do not see war survivors taken care of (in social housing) or a public enemy (in a prison, or a camp). In the present from which Kluge operates, in Brutality, we see nothing but infinitely long scenes, framed details of the Märzfeld (March Field), and Hitler's architectural designs. According to Eisenstein and Vertov, editing as a procedure corresponds to the dialectical, materialist conception of film text and scene (Komoli 1982). According to their theory of sound as a counterpoint (kontrapunkt) or opposition

of sound to the image, the sound is not dominant or subordinate to the image but builds a dialectical relationship with it. In Brutality, a long and static frame, Kluge dialectically contrasts the sound image, sound documentary recordings from the Reich era, and transcripts from the Nuremberg trials. Also, although there is no unity in the flow of visual and sound images, sound does not represent a voice from off, but along with the visual image forms the basis of Kluge's inner field of narrative film. The sound image deciphers the visual image, because the shots of the architecture of the Märzfeld (March Field), in the absence of the sound of the enthusiastic mass or the voice of the leader, failed to fulfill their supposed didactic role – "word in stone". To this signifying potential of the visual image, Kluge adds the time before and the postscript of the Third Reich, which consists of sound recordings from the Nuremberg Trials and the liberation songs of the Weimar Republic. In this way, Kluge inscribes on the stone not only the past that was intended for him in the Third Reich, but also the one that preceded, but also the one that followed. In this way, like Deleuze's thesis on three presents (Deleuze 2005) running simultaneously, and whose peaks meet at the same time, in Kluge we have during the same visual frame three pasts – past past, present past, and future past[29], which is not yet reached the moment of Kluge's present, the moment from which the narration unfolded. Therefore, the question posed by Eric Renschler in his text on Brutality remains:

> What does Brutality in Stone tell us about the past? More importantly, what does it tell us about the present that examines the past? And most crucially, what does this film, as a political intervention from the recent past that addresses a problematic cultural heritage, reveal about present-day issues and interests? (Rentschler 1990)

Provisional Conclusion

Fifteen years after the end of World War II, when Kluge made a film, *the counter-public sphere*, is the name for what eludes the eye and eludes public and private classifications, a term beyond state appropriation and monopoly over the field of power. The essence of the problem that Kluge opposes, first with film, and then through theoretical work, with the later Oberhausen Manifesto and the book *Public Sphere and Experience: Towards an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere* (Negt, Kluge 1993), is the topicality and urgency of opposing the hierarchy of power – because it assumes privacy as the only

---

29   A concept derived from Giles Deleuze's concepts of three presents – "Adopting St Augustine's fine formulation, there is a present of the future, a present of the present and a present of the. past, all implicated in the event, rolled up in the event, and thus simultaneous and inexplicable", earlier Deleuze states "If the present is actually distinguishable from the future and the past, it is because it is presence of something, which precisely stops being present when it is replaced by something else".

alternative to the public political sphere, even though it has been apolitical since ancient times, and modeled by the principles of Anthic[30].

Politics in the medium of film, which was one of the first appropriated as a means of propaganda of the Third Reich, on the topic of (architectural) heritage of the Nazi period that still serves as a means of war and testifies to the continuation of not only the three most important roles – theater, symbolic and didactic, but also political. Kluge forms the mentioned concept of the counter-public sphere_ which represents the political field of activity of subordinate social groups for which the war continues by other means (Foucault 2003). Transferred to the period of 1960, it would be a space where war victims and survivors as well as political opponents of the Third Reich have the political voice to oppose the continuation of the politics of the Third Reich, in which they are the subjects of speech, not the collateral victims of the war-revolution. For this reason, Kluge's film *Brutality in Stone* is an avant-garde, emancipatory practice and introduction to the transformation of German national film and a direct predecessor and basis for the first generation of German new filmmakers.

As we see architecture as a semantic practice in the previous parts of the text, we could conclude the concept of architecture as the *testimony in stone* – a form of a specific type of material practice, performative rather than representative. According to the analogy of inseparability of the thought and the language, we could also derive the definition of a landscape as a structure that does not only include architecture but refers primarily to the system in which the products of the architectural performatives exist both as felicitous or unfelicitous. According to Czepczynski, a theorist of anthropogeography, the landscape represents the social, economic, and spatial background of human activities, which consist of a network of institutions, rules, laws, social order, and representations. As a language-like structure – it is a specific, spatial, and grand scale signifying system, connecting both *the signifier* and *the signified* (Saussure 1974) and a representational system of signs, places, and icons that can be read and interpreted as *geosymbols*. The landscape is therefore visual and communicative a medium for (non) performative architecture as a cultural and political practice. Human thoughts, ideas, and feelings, as well as social and cultural constructions and distribution of power, exist in the landscape and through it. Thus, architecture is the central place of the landscape where processes of production of knowledge take place. Concerning the distribution of power, architectural objects are the very place where one group has to condition or control the behavior of others. In this way, the possibility that the architecture (sign) alongside the landscape (system, language) could belong to

---

30   According to Hanna Arendt political freedom was a feature of the public sphere, while the private space of an individual was the realm of (physical and physiological) necessity, in which inequality, force, and violence were the means of mastering the necessities. Arendt sees the urban spaces of polis or civitas as the places of political freedom for (hu)man (Arendt 1958: 38).

the field of nature besides the concept of second nature[31] (Adorno 1984) has been abandoned. Architecture as the testimony in stone is not, nor it could be (part of) the concept that exists independently from the human material practices. Furthermore, the architecture is a meaningful tool for interpreting but as we could see – constituting the testimony, building the history itself, displaying past and present depictions of power are „an integral part of landscape discourse, especially in post-traumatic landscapes" (Czepczynski 2008).

References

Adorno, Theodor W. (1955), "Cultural Criticism and Society", in Theodor W. Adorno, *Prisms*, Harvard: MIT Press, pp. 17–34.

Adorno, Theodor W. (1986), "What Does Coming to Terms with the Past Mean?", in *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective*, Geoffrey Hartman (ed.), Timothy Bahti and Geoffrey Hartman (transl.), Bloomington: Indiana UP, pp. 114–129.

Adorno, Theodor W. (1984), "Idea of Natural History", Robert Hullot-Kentor (transl.), *Telos* 60: 111–124.

Agamben, Giorgio (1998), *Remnants of Auschwitz*, Cambridge, Massachusets: MIT Press.

Arendt, Hannah (1958), *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Benjamin, Walter (1968), "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction", in Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, pp. 219–253.

Bevan, Robert (2006), *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War*, London: Reaktion.

Bogdanović, Bogdan (1995), "The City and Death", in Jeri Labon (ed.), *Balkan Blues: Writing Out of Yugoslavia*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp. 37–74.

Boym, Svetlana (2011), "Ruinophilia: Appreciation of Ruins", (internet) available at: https://http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/r/ruinophilia/ruinophilia-appreciation-of-ruins-svetlana-boym.html (viewed 14 April, 2022).

Childers, Joseph; Hentzi, Gary (1995), *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Clausewitz, Carl V. (1940), *On War*, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., LTD.

Czepczynski, Mariusz (2008), *Cultural Landscapes of Post-Socialist Cities: Representation of Powers and Needs*, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis.

Deleuze, Gilles (2005), *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, London: Continuum.

Feldman, Allen (1991), *Formations of Violence: The Narrative of the Body and Political Terror in Northern Ireland*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Felman, Shoshana (1991), "The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann's Shoah", in Shoshana Felman, Dori Laub (eds.), *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 204–283.

Foucault, Michel (2003), *Society Must Be Defended*, New York: Picador.

---

31   "Nature itself is transitory. Thus it includes the element of history. Whenever an historical element appears it refers back to the natural element that passes away within it. Likewise the reverse: whenever 'second nature' appears, when the world of convention approaches, it can be deciphered in that its meaning is shown precisely in its transience" (Adorno 1984: 120).

Guerin, Frances (2021), "Re-presenting histories: Documentary Film and Architectural Ruins in Brutality in Stone", *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media* 21: 13–34. doi: 10.33178/alpha.21.01

Handcock, Percy S. P. (1920), *The Code of Hammurabi*, London and New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Heller, Charles (2015), *Liquid Trajectories: Documenting Illegalised Migration and the Violence of Borders*, Doctoral thesis, Goldsmiths, University of London [Thesis].

Herscher, Andrew (2007), "Urbicide, Urbanism, and Urban Destruction in Kosovo", *Theory & Event* 10 (2). https://doi.org/doi:10.1353/tae.2007.0062

Herscher, Andrew (2008), "Warchitectural Theory", *Journal of Architectural Education* (1984) 61 (3), 35–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1531-314X.2007.00167.x

Herscher, Andrew (2010), *Violence Taking Place*, Standford, California: Standford University Press.

Higson, Andrew (1989), "The Concept of National Cinema", in Alan Williams (ed.), *Film and Nationalism*, London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 52–67.

Hillgruber, Andraes; Picker, Henry (eds.) (1968), *Hitlers Tischgespräche im Führerhauptquartier 1941–1942*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag.

Huyssen, Andreas (1988), "An Analytic Storyteller in the Course of Time", *October* 46: 117–128. https://doi.org/10.2307/778682.

Huyssen, Andreas (2000), "Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia", *Public Culture* 12 (1): 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-12-1-21.

Huyssen, Andreas (2006), "Nostalgia for Ruins", *Grey Room* 23 23: 6–21. https://doi.org/10.1162/grey.2006.1.23.6.

Huyssen, Andreas (2010), "Authentic Ruins: Products of Modernity", in Julia Hell, Andreas Schönle (eds.), *Ruins of Modernity*, Durham, NP: Duke UP, pp. 17–28.

Jameson, Frederic (1991), *Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Keenan, Thomas; Weizman, Eyal (eds.) (2011), *Mengele's Skull: Special Issue of Cabinet Journal*, *Cabinet* (43).

Keenan, Thomas; Weizman, Eyal (2012), *Mengele's Skull: The Advent of a Forensic Aesthetics*, Berlin: Sternberg and Portikus.

Kobolt, Katja; Zdravković, Lana (eds.) (2014), *Performative Gestures, Political Moves*, Ljubljana: City of Woman Association for the Promotion of Women in Culture.

Kochenrath, Hans-Peter (1975), "Kontinuität im deutschen Film", in Wilfred von Bredow, Rolf Zurek (eds.), *Film und Gesellschaft in Deutschland: Dokumente und Malerialien*, Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, pp. 286–292.

Komoli, Žan-Luj (1982), "Tehnika i ideologija", *Filmske sveske: časopis za teoriju filma i filmologiju* 14 (1-2): 97–153.

Krier, Léon (2013), *Albert Speer Architecture 1932–1942*, New York: The Monacelli Press.

Liebman, Stuart (1988), "Why Kluge?", *October* 46: 4–22.

Močnik, Rastko (1999), *3 Terije: Ideologija, Nacija, Institucija*, Ljubljana: Založba /*c.

Moorhouse, Roger (2010), *Berlin at War: Life and Death in Hitler's Capital, 1939-1945*, London: Bodley Head.

Negt, Oskar; Kluge, Alexander (1993), *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere*, *Theory and History of Literature*, Vol. 85, Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Rancière, Jacques (2004), *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, Gabriel Rockhill (ed. and transl.), New York: Continuum.

Rentschler, Eric (1990), "Remembering Not to Forget: A Retrospective Reading of Kluge's Brutality in Stone", *New German Critique* 49: 23–41. https://doi.org/10.2307/488372.

Saussure, Ferdinand; Culler, Jonathan D.; Bally, Charles; Sechehaye, Albert; Baskin, Wade (1974), *Course in General Linguistics*, London: Fontana.

Shaw, Martin (2004), "New Wars of the City: 'Urbicide' and 'Genocide'", in Stephen Graham (ed.), *Cities, War and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*, London: Blackwell, pp. 141–153.

Shoshan, Malkit (2015), "Andrew Herscher: Warchitecture / Post-Warchitecture", *Archis* 11, (internet) available at: https://archis.org/volume/volume-11-andrew-herscher-warchitecture-post-warchitecture/

Shoop, Casey (2016), "The Bones in the Concept: Big History, Theodor Adorno and Second Nature", *History of the Present* 6 (1): 63–86. https://doi.org/10.5406/historypresent.6.1.0063.

Speer, Albert (1970), *Inside the Third Reich*, Richard Winston, Clara Winston (transl.), New York: The Macmillan Company.

Urang, John Griffith (2013), "Solitary Confinement: Reproduction and the Law in Kluge's 'Abschied von Gestern'", *New German Critique* 120: 111–135.

Weizman, Eyal (2010), "Forensic Architecture: Only the Criminal Can Solve the Crime", *Radical Philosophy* 164 (9): 9–24.

—. (2012), *Forensic Architecture: Notes from Fields and Forums = Forensische Architektur: Notizen Von Feldern Und Foren*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz.

—. (2017), "Forensic Architecture: Political Practice, Activism, Aesthetics", in Suzanne Hall, Ricky Burdett (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of the 21st century city*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 630–652. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526402059.n35

Weizman, Eyal; Manfredi, Zachary (2013), "'From Figure to Ground': A Conversation with Eyal Weizman on the Politics of The Humanitarian Present", *Qui Parle* 22 (1): 167–192. https://doi.org/10.5250/quiparle.22.1.0167.

Weizman, Eyal; Gandorfer, Daniela (2021), "Epilogue: Theory, Momentarily", *Theory & Event* 24 (1): 399-410.

Werner, Jochmann (ed.) (1980), *Adolf Hitler. Monologe im Führerhauptquartier 1941–1944*, Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus.

Marija Ratković

Svedočenje u kamenu: arhitektura rata od Klugea do Heršera i Vajcmana

Apstrakt

Svedočenje u kamenu mapira značajne posleratne teorijske pristupe koji ispituju ulogu, namenu i važnost istraživanja arhitekture rata i ratnih zločina. Polazeći od Klauseviceve teze da rat nije autonoman, tekst pokušava da otkrije „krv koja se osušila u kodeksima zakona" (Fuko), politike skrivene "u svoja četiri zida" arhitekture. Kroz koncepte „brutalnosti u kamenu" (Kluge), arhitekture rata (Heršer) i forenzičke arhitekture (Vajcman), kroz prizmu arhitekture – rad izlaže rat, politike i ideologije koje su oblikovale i usmerile arhitekturu preoblikujući i prenamenjujući je i u primarnom – funkcionalnom, ali i u kulturalnom, reprezentativnom smislu. Pomak od „dekade svedoka" (Felman) do dekade dokaza (Vajcman) arhitekturu i njene ostatke čini osnovom nauke, globalnog upravljanja i zakona. Povezivanjem vremenski udaljenih emancipatornih praksi nastalih pod uticajem studija Holokausta, formira se diskurzivno polje za mišljenje arhitekture i kao performativne, a ne isključivo reprezentativne prakse.

Teorijski okvir posleratnog pejzaža kao „druge prirode" (Adorno) je ključni za razumevanje uloge arhitekture unutar Holokausta. Posebno se ističe i rad Heršera i Vajcmana u kritici depolitizovanih procesa rešavanja ratnih zločina i postkonfliktnih politika pomirenja. Arhitektura kao društvena praksa može imati centralno mesto u proizvodnji znanja i sećanja, kao i u stvaranju *kontrajavne sfere* (Kluge).

Ključne reči: arhitektura, rat, film, studije Holokausta, arhitektura rata, kultura sećanja, Aleksandar Kluge, teorija pejzaža