

STONE GRANDSTAND. ENTER AT YOUR OWN RISK. RELATIONS OF LOCATION, MEMORY AND IDENTITY ON THE FORMER NAZI PARTY RALLY GROUNDS IN NUREMBERG

Ingrid Manka

CONTAMINATED LOCATION. In September 1938, the last National Socialist party rally was held on the grounds in Nuremberg. The 'party rally of peace', planned for 1939, was cancelled because of the Wehrmacht invasion in Poland shortly before. At this point, the rally grounds were a huge building site and there were not going to be any major changes up until the end of the war. This means that the city of Nuremberg inherited an array of partly finished buildings. Amongst these were the Congress Hall and the March field, the flooded excavation for the German stadium, as well as the Zeppelin grandstand, the only complete construction, with its imposing main stand made of white jura limestone. The Germans have only retained a few concrete pictures of the party rallies in their collective memory. The best-known subject will no doubt be the so-called 'cathedral of light', created out of anti-aircraft searchlights. Much to the architect Albert Speer's dismay, it eclipsed his architectural constructions: "The thought that the most perfected architectural creation of my life is a chimera, an immaterial illusion, leaves me with a strange feeling". [1] [a]

However, the grounds will forever be linked with the criminal history of National Socialism since they are the place where both the party rallies took place and the Nuremberg Laws were proclaimed during the 1935 rally. It is as if the grounds had been contaminated by their past. Yet, this contamination is not as obvious and easily perceptible as people still must have thought in the decades immediately following the end of the nazi regime. Alexander Kluge and Peter Schamoni begin their film "Brutalität aus Stein" (Brutality in Stone) (1963) with a film still saying: "All constructions that history has left us witness the spirit of their constructors and their time even if they no longer serve their original purpose." This statement sounds self-evident, however the real link between architecture and location with their past is much more complex. Ever since the constructivist turn in historical studies in the 1980s we know that whenever we look back on the past we are influenced by the present or to describe it in the words of the political philosopher Oliver Marchart: "It is always the present that is at stake - in the disguise of the past". [2] On top of that, we need to consider the questionable role of the authenticity of the concrete historical site. There is no past as such, which on site can be produced out of a drawer in a compact format and as a whole. [b]

So, what does this mean for the location that has been contaminated by its incriminating past? What kind of approach can one take towards such a location? The architectural theorist Neil Leach, in his essay on 'denazification' of burdened sites in the post-revolutionary cities Berlin and Bucharest, presents two alternative strategies: the Berlin wall as an example of physical eradication and Ceausescu's People's house as an example of symbolic re-appropriation. Nuremberg missed the eradication. Ever since the grounds were listed in 1973, the city of Nuremberg as an owner is legally in charge of their upkeep. Of all constructions on the location, it is the grandstand on the Zeppelin field, part of the only completed construction on the rally grounds, that turns out to be the problematic case. Displaying first signs of damage as early as 1942, there was to be much debate about whether to demolish or keep the building since the end of World War II. In 1945, the US-American army demolished the massive swastika on the grandstand. In 1967, the decayed colonnades were demolished and in 1974 the side parts were reduced to their current height. So the grandstand displays several pos-



[a]



[b]



[c]

[a] Josef Winkler, 1938; stadtrarchiv nürnberg, bild-, film- und tonarchiv
[c] festivalplan rock im park 2000; arge-konzerte gmbh, witzburg

[1] Albert Speer, quoted in Anne G. Kosfeld, "Nürnberg", Etienne Francois, et al. (ed.), Deutsche Erinnerungsorte I, München 2002, p. 81

[2] Oliver Marchart, "Unkämpfte Gegenwart. Der „Zivilisationsbruch Auschwitz“ zwischen Singularität, Partikularität, Universalität und der Globalisierung der Erinnerung", Heidemarie Uhl (ed.), Zivilisationsbruch und Gedächtniskultur, Innsbruck 2003, p. 35

sible approaches at the same time: demolition, neglect, maintenance, re-appropriation. Therefore, it is as much a documentation of the period of more than 70 years that has passed since its construction, as it is a petrified witness to its short intended use. That means that the grandstand continues to exist in a strange kind of state; a middle ground between conservation and decay, and between remembrance and forgetting.

Nevertheless, out of all the relics on the site, it is the grandstand with the marching field in front of it that illustrates most clearly the purpose of the rally grounds and the party rallies. The whole field is orientated towards one point on the grandstand, Hitler's balcony. It holds up to 200 000 people, surrounded by 50 000 spectators on the stands around it including 17 000 on the grandstand. All of this was built to be used just one week per year. During the remaining 51 weeks of the year the grounds and the grandstand were freely accessible for walkers, Wehrmacht soldiers on home leave, and tourists, who, even at that time were flocking to the rally grounds (134 000 visitors in 1938) [3]. The free accessibility of both the grounds and the grandstand has been retained to this day.

The historian Anne Kosfeld emphasises in 'Nürnberg', her contribution to the anthology 'German Realms of Memory', that for this reason the location encloses meaning that points beyond itself and the time when it was actively used. It is part of the complex of remembrance constituted by the ns time and Auschwitz. For this remembrance, the sociologists Daniel Levy and Nathan Sznajder claim a process of globalisation. This process makes remembrance universal, which, up until this point, was divided up into national particularities. Thus national remembrance is de-localised. They argue that at the same time, this shift creates a tension between the local and the global. However, this tension is not only created with respect to remembrance. The relation between the categories that seem to naturally link the term 'location' with others such as nation and identity is more fundamentally damaged than the simple dichotomy between local and global makes it seem.

„In a previous formation there was a necessary alliance between identity (,being Red, being French, being Muslim') and the placing of that identity within a national, regional or cultural location (being Turkish, being Northern European, being of the art world). In the current moment, however, the mutual dependence of these two categories has been loosening in intriguing ways.“ [4]

If we question this widespread worry – 'where do I belong?' – this can serve both as a signal and an incentive to concern ourselves with these new relations of identity and location. "Location, then, is by definition the site of performativity and of criticality rather than a set of naturalised relations between subjects and places." [5]

A site that is burdened with a negative past such as the rally grounds in Nuremberg, cannot (for a certain period of time) be endowed with a positive meaning by history. The conditions of identification with such a memorial site swing between reluctant acceptance and desired refusal of the traumatic heritage. Thus, it is more fundamentally involved in the negotiation between location and identity.

TEMPORARY CENTRE. If it becomes impossible to locate, the differentiation between centre and periphery is no longer ensured either. However, all these scenarios of loss presuppose that before, i.e. before the onset of globalisation, it used to be better, that there used to be a definiteness that has been lost today. By contrast, it can be demonstrated for the location "Nazi Party Rally Grounds" that both during National Socialism and in the decades following it, there have been various shifts in the assignment of centre and periphery, which never allowed a straightforward definition.

The cultural theorist Benjamin Steiger, in his book "Raum-Maschine Reichsautobahn" (space-machine Reichsautobahn), describes the whole area of the rally grounds as a "lay-by blown up to some 24 square kilometres", "where the entire National Socialist Reich is condensed to a totalitarian demonstration both within the German nation and for the outside world." [6] During the party rallies the political centre was shifted to Nuremberg which turned the city into the centre of the entire German Reich. In order to realise this, they needed the car, the new means of transport, which made it possible for thousands of people to get to the "heart of the National Socialist motorway network". Steininger speaks of the temporalization of the term "centre". Outside this period of time the grounds were turned back into periphery both with respect to the Reich and also on site on the outskirts of Nuremberg. [6]

Still today, there is a strange relationship between centre and periphery on the rally grounds. Although, it has been described time and again as one of the main locations for the representation of the ns past, it took over 55 years before it was possible to address the problem critically on the location. However, immediately after the war, the grounds were put to different uses. The excellent travel connections of the Nuremberg grounds were one of the practical criteria when the National Socialists chose the premises for their party rallies. At present, the grounds remain an ideal location for a number of mega events such as the "Rock im Park" music festival because of their easy accessibility by both car and train, its dimensions and the availability of the corresponding facilities. The historical location is of no importance for this event. The festival map depicts the Congress Hall and the Zeppelin grandstand as nameless stone blocks. The annual touring car race on the "Norising", a so-called city race track on ordinary streets around the 'stone tribune', directly incorporates the grandstand in its original function as a location for the audience.

Moreover, the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds are also gradually turning into the second biggest tourist attraction in Nuremberg. In addition to a stroll through the medieval old town, more and more tourists choose to visit the National Socialist architecture on site. Sites such as the Nuremberg rally grounds prove to be a plus point location-wise rather than a handicap in the international competition of city tourism since they can be used as unique selling propositions for the respective city marketing. The handling of the National Socialist past in Nuremberg is therefore promoted from "a taboo issue to an image factor" [7] which includes, for instance, the advertisement of the Documentation Centre as part of the city museums. This involves at the same time a shift in the degree of importance of the grounds for the city. Up until the 1980s it was a common approach to hide the grounds on the periphery of Nuremberg and to strip it of all its meaning by not providing any information. By contrast, ever since the opening of the Documentation Centre in 2001 it can and will take centre stage.

TRIVIALISED MONUMENTALITY. The grandstand of the Zeppelin field, the only complete construction on the rally grounds, is generally one of the few buildings designed by Speer which have been conserved. The attributes that turn this architecture into National Socialist architecture are their monumentality, generally considered as excessive and immoderate, as well as the aforementioned orientation of all the spectators towards one centre. Otl Aicher, famous German designer and dissident eye witness describes it as follows:

"I recognised the nazis as such in the core of their buildings. [...] the language of this architecture was a design vocabulary that had been borrowed from military deployment. This vocabulary is composed of the centre line, the mass alignment, the blocks and wings as well as the geometricised order as the front of power, grandeur and strength." [8]

>>

[3] On this see: Siegfried Zehnhöfer, 'Bauen als Vortriff auf den Sieg', *Centium Industriekultur* (ed.), *Kulissen der Gewalt. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg, München 1992*, p. 47

[4] Irit Rogoff, 'The Where of Now', Jessica Morgan (ed.), *Time Zones. Recent Film and Videos*, London 2004, p. 87

[5] Rogoff, 'The Where of Now', p. 88

[6] Benjamin Steininger, *Raum-Maschine Reichsautobahn. Zur Dynamik eines bekannt/unbekannten Bauwerks*, Berlin 2005, p. 169/170

[7] On this see: Alexander Schmidt, *Geländebegehung. Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, Nürnberg 2002, p. 243

[8] Otl Aicher, *Immensiten des Kriegs. Frankfurt am Main 1998*, p. 208

[9] Aicher, *Immensiten des Kriegs*, p. 210

[10]

[11] David Wagner, 'Auf dem Reichsparteitagsgelände, Nürnberg', *Stephan Prömbke, et al. (ed.), Böse Orte. Stätten nationalsozialistischer Selbstdarstellung – heute*, Berlin 2005, p. 116

[12] Wagner, 'Auf dem Reichsparteitagsgelände, Nürnberg', p. 117

[13] Kosfeld, 'Nürnberg', p. 85

[14] Ulrich Maly et al., 'Ein Diskussionsbeitrag über den Umgang mit dem ehemaligen Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg', Feb. 2003, <http://www.nuremberg.de/imperia/md/content/internet/internet_portal/stadt_buearger/verwaltung_rat/reder_ohr/rpg.pdf>, 14. 01. 2008

[15] Roger Boyes, 'We will all mention the war, Nuremberg tells English fans', <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article782550.ece>, 02.01.2008/26.12.2005

[16] Clive Freeman (dpa), 'History: Nuremberg faces up to its Nazi past / Fussball Weltmeisterschaft WM 2006 in Deutschland (inoffizielle Webseite)', 02.01.2008 <http://www.GermanGermany2006.com/index/index_en.php?cat_id=23&article_id=31&logger_name=History%20I> ; 02.01.2008

However they borrowed their concrete design language from preceding models of demonstration of power whilst applying an excessive classicism. "The nazis did not have any new ideas to add to this. Nevertheless, they exceeded the familiar demonstrations of the absolutist central state by singling out the factor grandeur. The moderate classicism Schinkel offered as a front to the Prussian military state suddenly appeared as a modest model for the projected buildings of the greatest constructor in history." [9]

These days, this monumentality seems to have lost its impressiveness. "I had imagined it to be bigger. I am not that impressed when I am standing on the Führer's balcony on top of the Zeppelin field, the nearly square field, 289 by 312 metres in size, surrounded by slightly decayed stone stands." [10]

The German writer David Wagner, seems to express disappointment when he writes that "I had imagined the grandstand to be massive. But it is not. Here and there, grass stalks are growing out of the gaps between the floor and wall slabs made out of creme limestone. There is broken glass scattered about everywhere". [11] He visited the rally grounds in order to see the place where his grandparents met during a party rally nearly 70 years previously.

The use of the back of the grandstand as a tennis wall is notorious. In recent years, the tennis players have had to concede some of their space to the skateboarders for whom a half-pipe was installed. This half-pipe is now competing as an object with the anti-war monument in front of the entrance to the golden hall inside the grandstand. Before the opening of the Documentation Centre in 2001 Anne Kosfeld voiced her criticism of this everyday use in the following way: "In view of the monumentality of locations and constructions such as the Zeppelin field, the ruin of the Congress Hall, the Luitpold arena or the Great Street these traces of German normality seem out of place [...]." [12]

However, it was exactly its monumentality that proved one of the stumbling blocks that hindered critical remembrance on the rally grounds. Over and over again, architects tried to retort to this gigantomania with designs of the same size. Given their financial expense, these projects were doomed to fail. However, they were not an adequate approach to handling National Socialist architecture, either. A town planning competition in 2001 did not deliver any convincing solutions. In his contribution to the debate on the future use of the grounds Lord Mayor Ulrich Maly declared in February 2003:

"Probably one of the basic misconceptions is to assume that there can be one single constructional solution for the whole grounds. Even without the current everyday uses for the funfair, sports, leisure activities and the exhibition centre it would be difficult to conceive one single overall concept to handle the variety of the buildings realised and planned on the premises of the former Nazi Party Rally Grounds.

One cannot entirely help thinking that one or two of the participants in the competition were too captivated by Speer's architecture. The outcome of the competition shows that, intellectually speaking, the attempt to break and counteract Speer's urbanistic and visual axes is understandable. However, on this site it simply cannot be put into practice." [13] Nevertheless, the failure of this competition also means that there still is no binding town planning concept to address the various interests and to contain projects driven by commercial goals that come up over again. [8]

The occasion of the football world cup in 2006 shows that the different uses of the grounds may still counteract one another. Five games, amongst which England vs Trinidad and Tobago, took place in the stadium in Nuremberg. Before the world cup, concerns were voiced that in particular the English hooligans may abuse the grounds, especially the freely accessible Zeppelin grandstand right next to the stadium. The Times Online wrote in December 2005: "It does not take a big leap of imagination to see England fans mimicking the goose-step march or heading for the Zeppelin tribune from where Hitler took the salute from the massed ranks of party faithful." [14] And although Lord Mayor Maly rejected the idea of a "no go" area for English supporters, he said he would call the police if some of them gave Hitler salutes, forbidden in Germany, in front of the ns-architecture. [15]

Therefore, foreign media focussed their attention on Nuremberg as a host city. Eventually, this attention made it possible to install an information system comprising 23 panels spread all over the grounds, for which the federal government had not allocated any money beforehand. However, in the end there was no such abuse and the Zeppelin grandstand was extensively used to display the respective countries' national flags.

[16] Martina Christmeier, quoted in: Landeshauptstadt München, Kulturreferat, *Der Umgang mit der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. Perspektiven des Erinnerns*, München 2007, p.181

[17]

Wagner, 'Auf dem Reichsparteitagsgelände, Nürnberg', p.118/119

[18] Artur Zmijewski quoted in: Joanna Mytkowska (ed.), *If it happened only once it's as if it never happened - Einmal ist keinmal, Ostfildern (Ruit) 2005*, p.125

[19]

Zmijewski quoted in: Mytkowska (ed.), *If it happened only once it's as if it never happened - Einmal ist keinmal*, p.125

[20]

Wagner, 'Auf dem Reichsparteitagsgelände, Nürnberg', p.117

[21]

Sadie Coles, 'Nürnberg', Juergen Teller, Nürnberg, Göttingen 2006 (no page numbers)

[22]

Steffen Radmaier, *Der Nürnberger Lernprozess. Von Kriegsverbrechen und Starreportern*, Frankfurt am Main 2001, p.250



[d]



[e]

Moreover, a considerable number of supporters took heed of the advice given in the tourist guidebooks and visited the exhibition in the Documentation Centre.

Nowadays, the conservation of the facilities on the rally grounds is widely deemed a sensible solution. One of the strongest arguments in favour of conservation is the increasing value of 1:1 models in view of the decreasing number of eye witnesses. They serve as a reminder and have an implicit authenticity which makes them worthwhile of conservation as 'witnesses made out of stone'.

"We work a lot with architecture. One of our offers is called "architecture of power". The point is to allow people to decode the architecture of the Congress Hall themselves, but also the architecture of the grounds as a whole. Therefore, the most important exhibits in our exhibition are the buildings themselves. In that sense, the Congress Hall is a walkable exhibit. The visit of the grounds, a tour around the whole site, which takes about 1 ½ hours, is the big hit amongst our offers. This fact shows that the visitors go to this location in order to decode the constructions, in order to find out which mechanisms the National Socialists applied to impress the masses." [16]

However, the location by itself is not easy to grasp. David Wagner explains this insecurity as follows: "The Zeppelin field and the Führer's stand seem to be much older than the short seventy years that have passed since its construction. No, not because they look so decayed. The grounds looks as if they date from an entirely different time because their purpose seems so remote and incomprehensible. A castle is a castle and a church is a church. But this construction? What is it actually meant to be? What kind of thing is it? [...] Is it six or seven hundred or two thousand seven hundred years old? Have human beings been sacrificed here as happened on the aztec pyramids which are similarly terraced? Or did they only shoot films here? Was it an open air theatre stage? Were the party rallies only massive operas after all?" [17]

Therefore, the rally grounds deny any simple reading as an authentic location not simply because of the time distance and altered conditions. Their absurd monumental design language thwarts any temporal assignment, whereas, on the other hand, our experience of contemporary constructions, such as mega airports and stadiums reduces the monumental impression of the buildings in Nuremberg. Nevertheless, one message that comes across clearly during a tour of the original location is the physical dimension of the grounds.[d]

NATIONAL MONUMENT.

The Polish artist Artur Zmijewski, born in 1966, makes the current state and the original use of the grounds his central theme by looking at the Zeppelin grandstand, which is also the title of the film he realised in 2002. He emphasises his point of view of the stand as a non-German - as a tourist. "This is a place of pilgrimage for tourists - it's in every guidebook." His assessment of the grounds is not very flattering for the German people: "It is at the same time the most neglected, dirty, and ruined place in all of Germany. They rarely clean, and reluctantly. You could say the whole nation works in solidarity to destroy these remnants of the past. Yes - dirt and litter are welcome here." [18]

In 2007 the state of the stand has not changed much, if anything, it has become worse. Some cynical voices in the city council even suggested newly building a more solid clone. The conservative CSU party, by contrast, is worried that the continuation of the car race was in danger and therefore calls for a refurbishment. Zmijewski's film shows a couple, both Turkish artists, who march and dance through Nuremberg with glittering spades. The spades were the RAD's (Reichsarbeitsdienst - nazi labour service) replacement for weapons, and therefore, the artists were mocking military drill, and eventually start sweeping the dirt off the stands. "If these places are still "alive," why not return to the historical forms. This is a film about impersonation, about memory. But about memory so perverse that leads many tourists standing on Hitler's old balcony to raise their hand in the gesture of the nazi salute." [19] The film also shows these mostly hesitant attempts that most visitors feel apparently tempted into when standing on the speaker's pulpit.

David Wagner, born in 1971, did not get the impression that it is badly maintained. "Although I have read about it many times, I don't see any graffiti, any Führer's hearts and no swastikas. Only once the word "love" scribbled on in capitals in a rather awkward way as if finger colours had been used. All other messages have been whitewashed carefully and the stone freshly painted. There must be a man with a bucket of paint and a paintbrush living round the corner." [20]

This wall-painted word "love", also features in the illustrated book "Nürnberg" by the German photographer Juergen Teller, born in 1964. In 2004/05 he took photographs of the rally grounds in all four seasons. The pictures are mainly close-ups of the grass stalks that have fought their way up in the gaps between the slabs of the Zeppelin grandstand. For him, the rally grounds are not only one of the main sites of National Socialism, but also the background for pleasant memories of holidays spent with his grandmother, during which he played on the grounds. With this work, Teller confronts the encounter of two very different, personal meanings of one location. „In recording the advanced state of decay of this powerful, loaded site, Teller had to confront the complicated residue of German history ever present amongst his generation as a melancholic malaise.“[21]

Of course, the rally grounds do not carry a negative connotation for all Germans. The grounds seem to be predestined for abuse by Nazis of Hitler's generation and neo-nazis, who identify positively with the nationalsocialist past. However, both the grounds and the Zeppelin stand do not seem to particularly arouse their interest despite their free accessibility, so that, apart from some isolated cases, there is neither graffiti nor meetings of sympathisers on record. If, with respect to the sense of responsibility of the German general public, the mistake was perhaps made to accuse only the major war criminals in Nuremberg and thus to clear the majority of Germans by stating that they merely carried out orders and followed suit, one particular mistake was not made: Göring and the ten executed war criminals were not buried in graves but cremated and their ashes were scattered to the four winds in accordance with the rulings of the commission of the four powers. The creation of a kind of pilgrimage site to conserve the memory of the nationalsocialist perpetrators was deliberately avoided and apparently with success: „Eventually, a decision was made in favour of cremation since the board was of the opinion that after a regular burial fanatics would turn up over again and turn the graves into a hallowed site or damage them.“ [22] the local newspaper Nürnberger Nachrichten wrote on 19th of October 1946.

This hypothesis seems to have been confirmed in the Franconian town Wunsiedel, some 130 kilometres from Nuremberg. The grave of Rudolf Hess, which is located there, attracts neo-nazi followers for their annual meetings.

These examples show how different the judgement and meaning of one memorial site can be, whose national import is emphasised over again. Zmijewski's formulations feature the Germans as a unified, homogeneous collective, that as a whole can be made responsible for the handling of the constructional relics of their nationalsocialist past. In actual fact, the real responsibility for the grounds lies with the City of Nuremberg as inheritor, as well as with its inhabitants as local residents and users and as people who are either committed to

the conservation of memory or who are uninterested. The municipality has to fight for the financial support of both the free state of Bavaria and the federal state in order to be able to finance big projects such as the Documentation Centre, the Information System for the grounds or, in future, the installation of a memorial site at the jury court room 600, where the Nuremberg trials took place. By contrast, viewed from the outside, the actions and omissions of the people of Nuremberg in their handling of the rally grounds are not simply of local importance but are perceived as national acts.

The personal involvement of Wagner and Teller, whether to do with their family or with personal memories, demonstrate very clearly the kind of contradictory feelings this location may evoke by making at least two different, in theory incompatible offers of identification. The multiform approaches youths of a migration background in Germany take towards handling the nationalsocialist past show further examples for the complex entanglement of acceptance and rejection.

DELOCALISED MEMORY. One striking aspect about the previous paragraph may be that I insisted on mentioning the respective protagonist's year of birth in a nearly obsessive manner. For Germany it seems to be a generally accepted fact that the memory of National Socialism is a matter of generation as Sebastian Haffner noted already in 1973. At that time, Haffner was still thinking two generations. The generation of the participants, comprising fathers and mothers as perpetrators, spectators or followers, and the following generation comprised of their children. Nowadays, at least a third and fourth generation comprised of grandchildren and great-grandchildren have been added. It seems that these later generations have for the large part a structurally new relationship to the ns past, characterised by the loss of an existential and emotional uncertainty, as well as by the lack of intellectual uncertainty, which deeply affected the preceding generations. The educationalist Wolfgang Meseth speaks of an "ethical universalisation, which is also primarily expressed by the demand to compare the ns crimes to current conflicts." [23] with this perception of an ethical universalisation, Meseth follows Levy and Sznajder, who analyse it as a part of a globalisation of the Holocaust memory, also happening in Germany. [24] Further he argues that this is a reaction to the delocalisation of the collective memory, which detaches itself from its national fixation and roots itself more and more in a global context.

Besides the party rallies and the Nuremberg Laws, the third element in the close tie of Nuremberg with National Socialism is the war crime trials of 1945/46 staged by the allies in the jury court room 600, world famous as the so-called Nuremberg trials. Nuremberg is trying to cope with this part of the tie to a negative past in a different way from the critical handling, which is closely linked to claim "never to forget". The Nuremberg trials, as the first international legal case and the basis for the later formulation of human rights, are the starting point for this new concept. In 1993 the public installation "Street of Human Rights" by the Israeli artist Dani Karavan was opened in the city of Nuremberg. Since 1995 the 'Nuremberg International Human Rights Award' has been conferred biennially. The fact that the interest shown by international tourists in the jury court room 600 as an authentic location is increasing, is probably still an independent development from the desired establishment of Nuremberg as the "City of Human Rights". To meet this increased demand a memorial site will be installed by 2010.

This initiative, the perspective of which is directed towards the future, presupposes a positive moral judgement from the outside. By doing this, Nuremberg as a community made up of the local authority and the commitment of certain citizens follows the ethical universalisation of Auschwitz that has been noted for the younger generations, which highlights the importance of human rights. By linking the past and the present in this way, Nuremberg wants to become a place where the universalisation, which has been termed as delocalised, is meant to localise. [e]

Back on the rally grounds there is a warning sign attached to the Zeppelin grandstand: "Steintribüne. Betreten auf eigene Gefahr. Skaten verboten. Enter at your own risk. Stadt Nürnberg" (Stone tribune. Enter at your peril. Skating prohibited. Enter at your own risk. City of Nuremberg)

And just as portrayed in Artur Zmijewski's video the visitors climb up onto the Führer's balcony and quite a few of them, even though hesitantly, lift their right hands to perform the Hitler salute, which is forbidden in Germany. However, their caution rather seems to result from their own presumptuousness, which unsettles their own position

in relation to National Socialism. By performing this gesture, for one moment, they risk becoming a nazi themselves.

The concrete physical accessibility of this construction stands for a part of the memory on the rally grounds which has been left open. Because of this openness there is no prescribed or even proposed reaction on the Zeppelin grandstand. The memorial act that establishes the link with the past is performed at one's own risk. Besides the examples discussed above this mini reenactment shows that it is impossible to position oneself clearly and consistently towards the location "Nazi Party Rally Grounds". One may almost get the feeling that the location permanently questions the possible links that can be established with it as a meaningful local, national and global memorial site. Therefore, it ever eludes permanent finality and reassuring fixation. Thus, it becomes a new type of location, a location of performativity and criticality, as Irit Rogoff suggested at the beginning of this article. ➔

04

05

[23] Wolfgang Meseth, *Aus der Geschichte lernen – Über die Rolle der Erziehung in der bundesdeutschen Erinnerungskultur*, Frankfurt am Main 2005, p.211

[24]

Daniel Levy, Natan Sznajder, *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: Der Holocaust*, Frankfurt am Main 2007