
NATIONAL, HEIMAT AND ACTIVE MUSEUMS: AN OUTLINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF GERMAN MUSEUMS INTO THE 1990'S *

Frederick Baker,
Gottfried Korff

237

IZVLEČEK

V članku *Nacionalni, domoznanski in aktivni muzeji: oris razvoja nemških muzejev na poti v devetdeseta leta* avtorja razčlenjujeta te tipe muzejev in orisujeta njihov razvoj in sedanje stanje.

ABSTRACT

In the article National, heimat and active museums: an outline of the development of german museums into the 1990's, the authors analyse these types of museums and describe their development and present state.

Introduction

While German museology shares many features with other European countries, it has various particular aspects resulting from its federal structure and particularly the reassessment since 1945, which has thrown up interesting initiatives, such as the Active Museum of Berlin. This article will outline this particularly rich German museum landscape on three levels. The first will be local or 'Heimat' museums, secondly regional 'Länder' museums, and finally the large national museums.

The German Museums Boom

In 1990 Alan Balfour wrote of the Potsdamer Platz in Berlin which is the classic palimpsest of Germany's newly reunited history. (The busiest place in Europe in the 1920's, bisected by Ulbricht's Berlin Wall and skirted by Hitler's bunker): "The presence of the past persistently interferes with the promise of the future. There are no dreams in isolation: all are in reflection and reaction, in a swirling confusion of past existence...the presence of so many pasts denies the operation of any simple struggle of opposites, and all attempts at synthesis seem to increase the fragmentation." (1990:249).

Since 1945 museums have been one of the key institutions used to represent the reconstruction of the country, but like the Potsdamer Platz, the attempts at synthesis have only lead to increased fragmentation. This has lead to the situation in which the museums have been thrown into the centre of the heated debate on Germany's history and culture of the country. The last 20 years have

* First appeared in: *New Research in Museum Studies* (London 1992).

seen an amazing boom in museums in almost all European states. There are some official statistics which show a two-fold increase and even a threefold rise since 1970. Germany is not alone with its enormous growth rate, but the extreme expansion of museums between 1970 and 1990 is particularly clear. There is hardly a place over 5000 inhabitants that does not have its own museum and there are hardly any villages below the 1000 population limit which can not proudly point to its own museum. Those responsible for planning in the cultural affairs offices have already spoken of a saturated level of museums provision. In 1969 West Germany had 673 museums, by 1988 this had grown to 2400 (Korff 1990:59). To put this in a Pan-German perspective: in 1982 East Germany had 642 Museums, of which 76 were literary and 73 were art museums, all of which staged a total of 1500 special exhibitions (Zimmerman 1985:918).

238

Historical museums were particularly favoured by this museum boom, because the rapid modernization in the post-war period, not only changed the structure of the economy, the face of the cities, but also the everyday private sphere. It is definitely possible to speak of a loss of identity as a result of an increasing loss of familiarity and intimacy. There where the living environment has been radically altered by new buildings or other changes, there where even private habits have been changed by new consumer orientations and lifestyles, there a nostalgia for old things has blossomed. A nostalgia serviced by flea markets, the many historical exhibitions and museums. An utterly concreted and asphalted environment demands a secure familiarity, and this was provided by the museum.

The museum plays a dual role. It provides both an identity that is historically speaking ones own and supplies an alternative identity which is historically different to the present. The museum must be both foreign and indigenous. A paradoxical situation in which the exhibits must transmit a history that is close to today, but is also far away (and therefore provide an alternative) to the present, a form of internal exoticism as Hermann Bausinger has described it in his seminar work "Popular Culture in the Technical World" (1961).

The Zürich based German philosopher Hermann Lübbe (1981) has given one of the most complete accounts of the social processes underlying the museum boom. The increased pace of change of the familiar environment is compensated for by the museological approach to the old. It therefore follows that the museum is a logical epiphenomenon of modern industrial society. The museum responds like no other institution to the need for colour, familiarity and meaning in people's everyday world.

Heimat Museums

The victorious career of the Heimat museum, started under the monarchy, took a strong surge in the Weimar republic, was then centrally controlled by the Nazis and stagnated in the post war period, because there were other priorities. Finally, in the 70's and 80's its career has reached a highpoint. As was said: there is hardly a place in the federal republic without a museum.

With the dramatic increase in the number of Heimat museums in the 70's and 80's it should not be surprising that the institution was the subject of a large number of discussions and the subject of many experiments (Scharfe 1982). One of the most controversial areas of debate has been an all-round struggle to

control and define Germany round the key German concept of "Heimat". This word can be loosely translated as hometown or homeland, but neither of these English words conveys the emotive power, which heimat has for the Germans. For them it carries a strong association with roots. Roots that are particularly precious for a people in the centre of war-torn Europe.

The difficulty of "Heimat" for the modern Germans, is highlighted in Siegfried Lenz's novel "Heimatmuseum", published in Britain under the title "The Heritage" (1981). The hero is the curator of a Heimat museum, recording and saving the culture of his heimat of Masuria, which he fled before the approaching Red Army, and that is now in Poland. At the end of the novel, Lenz's hero burns down his own Heimatmuseum, rejecting it as a form of documented History.

During the Second World War the Nazis used the Heimat museums as part of their propaganda (Roth 1990). A fact that discredited them for the postwar generations. As Hermann Bausinger describes, the situation was such that: "You could not use the word Heimat anymore. It was seen as either narrow or ideologically discredited. The phrase was for a time taboo, it is only now that one is trying to put the thing back on its feet...Heimat is not a fenced off area with a few folk costumes...Heimat is not what appears in the tourist brochures, it is the totality" (1988)¹.

In Bavaria the right wing CSU party have instituted the position of the "Heimatpfleger", which can be loosely translated as guardian, custodian or nurse to the homeland. Their responsibilities stretch from local archaeology and the Heimat museum to elements of folklore such as costumes and dances. This approach is accused of conserving only the cosmetic outward manifestations of Heimat. It is seen as a cosmetic compensation for the pollution of the local environment, and for the radical destruction of local communities by the urban sprawl, turning formerly autonomous villages into dormitory towns.

An alternative radical concept of Heimat was provided by the philosopher Ernst Bloch: "At the root of history is the working, creating and circumstances changing human. If he has understood himself and founded his being without privation and alienation in real democracy, there is in the world something that shines in everyone's childhood, but where no one ever was: 'Heimat'". The goal of the 1968 generation was to remain true to Bloch's radical definition of Heimat and avoid the commodifying influence of the so-called "Culture Industry" defined by Theodore W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer in their classic work "The Dialectic of Enlightenment" (1979). As David Held explains, they believed that "Most areas of cultural life become co-opted and transformed into means of controlling individual consciousness" (1987:90) in which cultural objects become "a species of commodity...marketable and interchangeable like an industrial product" (Horkheimer & Adorno 1979:158). While it is clear today that this dominant ideology analysis is too simplistic for the way in which museums function (Merriman 1987) the impact on the 68 generation of the so-called Frankfurt school should not be underestimated, since it described very effectively what museums should not do. It was in an attempt to escape the 'Culture Industry' and create an alternative that many of the 68 generation not only redefined the Heimat museums, but also found new forms of museum. A

¹ All translations are by Frederick Baker, unless stated.

major part of the 68 agenda was extra-parliamentary opposition and one of the key issues for them was history. People working outside the existing museum structures addressed categories of data, not adequately covered by traditional museums, such as the Nazi period and popular culture. The strategies adopted were either the formation of alternative forms such as history workshops (Halter 1990) or artistic installations on historical themes. One of the best examples of this approach was the 1987 "Mythos Berlin" which sought to explore the history of Berlin, purely through artistic installations. One of the most interesting examples was Claudio Lange's "Museum of the Utopias of Survival" (1987), which was specifically intended as an alternative to the large historical exhibitions.

240 Another idea popular at the time was the 'March through the institutions'. Udo Gößwald, curator of the Neu-Köln Heimatmuseum in Berlin, took the museum as his institution to march through. "We were all 68ers who studied sociology and history, and followed one of the anthems of the 68 students revolution: 'dig where you stand'. What we meant by that was that we should identify large-scale historical processes in the local area" (pers. comm. 1988)²... The idea behind this movement was brought together by Svet Lindquist in his book of the same name "Dig where you stand" (1988).

He went on to become the author of one of the two publications crucial to the museum debate. "A Place of Learning versus Museum Temple" (1972) and "Experiment Heimatmuseum" (Bätz & Gößwald 1987) are 15 years apart but share the ambition to bring the didactic competence of historical museums to the fore, but in very different ways. The 1972 volume is very clearly influenced by the educational reforms and euphoria of the 60's and 70's (Craig 1982:170). Education and the acquisition of knowledge were seen as the means of creating a successful and egalitarian society. As the title shows, museums were to adopt the pedagogical methods of schools. The imperative was for a discursive approach to learning, which concentrated strongly on the way in which texts were used in museums. At the end of the 70's museums increasingly broke away from the school-orientated educational model and aided by Lübbe's identification of the trend towards a 'love of old things' moved to a more artefact based approach. In the case of ethnographic museums the debate raged between ideas of Third world solidarity or a non-European art approach (Harms 1988) and continue with Peter Kolowski's proposal for the world exhibition in Hannover in the year 2000, that the cultures of the world be exhibited as the "Experiments to find the right life" (1990).

The discussions that accompanied this transition are reflected in "experiment Heimatmuseum", which is the result of a conference held at the 1987 European Museum Prize winning Neu-Köln Heimat museum in West Berlin. "Our thesis runs: there are many approaches to the PRESENTATION of a historical relationship, and one uses the objects at hand in different ways. One imbues them with meaning...and makes objects into the carriers of meaning. Museum presentation relies on the meaning of the individual object that can then be placed in the context of an ensemble...the question is 'Can the artefact be used or not, for the relationship that I wish to show?...The method which we used in EXPERIMENT HEIMAT MUSEUM is based on the tenet that: what we

² Personal communication to Frederick Baker.

are showing here is a portion of history; we do not aim at completeness, and we do not suggest a totality. What is crucial for the presentation is that it succeeds in showing its incompleteness, not giving the viewer a false impression and giving him space for independent thought" (Cohn & Gößwald 1987:94-5 original emphasis).

With typical cold-war irony, East German party policy promoted the areas that the 68 students were particularly interested in i.e. postwar history, antifascist resistance and other so-called 'progressive' historical elements of large-scale history, that could be tied down to the Heimat, to the local area. However it was very clear which ends should be served by this work i.e. "The creation and maintenance of a feeling for the socialist Heimat" (Zimmermann 1985:598).

Regional Museums

The staggering career that museums have built for themselves in Germany have both current and historical causes (Preiß et al 1990). On the one hand there is the tradition of federalism, which allowed provincial metropoli to compete with each other for prestige as in the times of the small dukedoms and baronies. Museums have become the new form of representing local patriotism. If Stuttgart built itself a new Staatsgalerie, then Munich cannot stay behind and nor does the new provincial capital Düsseldorf. This of course awakes the ambitions of its Rhineland neighbour Cologne, which can display its former importance on the European stage with a handsome number of noteworthy museums. In addition to the federally organized cultural politics, there is the fact that German cities are legally and financially stronger than their English and French counterparts (Watson 1992).

This mechanism of cultural competition and ambition also advanced the career of the smaller museum. If the Ministerpräsident of Baden-Württemberg can gain status with his museum foundations, then so can the mayors of small towns in the Black forest and Lake Constance. Due to the diverse and decentred history of the patchwork of states which made up Germany through much of its history, small provincial towns like Ludwigsburg or Regensburg often have a rich cultural heritage, that can be shown to good effect in a museum. Once the institution of the museum had reached this level the competition and prestige race trickled down to even smaller towns, eventually reaching the level of the heimat museum.

A crucial component to the museums culture in Germany at this regional or "Länder" level were the so-called "Landesausstellung" which started in the late 1970's. This is the equivalent of an English county or French department organizing a publically funded blockbuster historical or art exhibition once a year. The take-off for this sort of museum event was the "Staufer Exhibition" in Stuttgart in 1977, which took place on the 25th anniversary of the foundation of Baden-Württemberg. Just as the German emperor moved his court from city to city, creating a mobile capital, so these exhibitions move the cultural caravan of blockbuster exhibitions around the country, allowing even a small town with a 70.000 population like Tübingen to become a cultural capital for a few months.

Although very different in scope, theme and approach these exhibitions had one thing in common: that is that they presented authentic artefacts. This had

long been a tradition in art museums, but had to be introduced bit by bit in historical museums. The experience of the large exhibitions enabled new presentational ideas to be tested out, to replace the previous text-orientated methods. The aim was to show the public a 'self evident ensemble' free of excessive reading material. The museum was to get away from its role of a schoolmaster, to a place of preservation and display that appealed to the senses. It was during this period that exhibition architecture became a popular phrase and made the exhibition an artefact of its own, worthy of posthumous publication (Korff & Rürup 1988).

National Museums

242

In Berlin these regional exhibitions took on a particular national character, starting with the controversial 1981 "Prussia: the search for a balance" exhibition, which tried to come to terms with the previously taboo subject of Germany's prussian heritage. So sensitive was the subject that the East Germans even criticised the West for not renaming the Prussian State Cultural foundation (which owns most of the collections held in West Berlin's postwar Dahlem museums) as being propaganda for a reunited German cultural nation. (Hexelschneider & John 1984:90). The radical Heimat museums shared the critique and saw "no place for national museums in a divided Nation like Germany" (Cohn & Gießwald 1987:99) and the Berlin History workshop saw "the category of the nation as inappropriate" for museum work (*Geschichtswerkstatt* 1987:9).

The clear political nature and importance of this debate is shown by Chancellor Kohl's ex adviser Michael Stürmer who said in the context of the debate about the two new national museums in Bonn and Berlin "Whoever controls history, they have the future" (in Lindqvist 1989:326). In Berlin there was, of course, the added dimension of East Berlin. The East-West competition was particularly strong during the 750.th anniversary of the founding of Berlin celebrations (Herbst 1987). In the East the national representation of history was centralized in the Museum of German History, opposite the parliament building. Its creation was called for at the 7.th Plenum of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) on the 20.th of October 1951. By the 18.th of January 1952 it was open for "the enlightenment of the people and particularly of the youth". Overseeing the director, all 3 of whom have been party members, was an academic commission with the job of seeing that the museum stuck to a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of German history (Zimmermann 1985:919).

Partially in reply to this version of national history the history graduate Chancellor Helmut Kohl commissioned a German Historical Museum in West Berlin, designed by Aldo Rossi (Williams 1988). He also commissioned the "House of History" in Bonn, which has the task of showing the development of the Federal Republic. Countering accusations of nationalism the Berlin museum's Director Christoph Stützl described the museum as "A matter for the nation, without any superficial nationalistic accent, a museum not of German History, but a German historical museum" (Williams 1988:25). Consistent with the political events of reunification, Kohl's museum has taken over the building of Honecker's 'Museum for German History', but not its name. Rossi's plan is seemingly redundant. The German historical museum has also started taking on its responsibilities by preserving a large section of the Berlin Wall in the Bernauer Strasse (Baker 1992, Möbius & Trotnow 1990).

The emphasis on national museums is not just a result of a reunited country, it is also a reaction to the heimat museums, which have reached the saturation point. Balance has clearly to be restruct. History can not be explained purely by the local and the detail, museums must also show the large-scale processes and deep structures. Brecht in his 1935 poem "Questions from a worker who reads" asks "Great Rome / Is full of triumphal arches. Who erected them?...Every page a victory/ Who cooked the feast for the victors?" Just preserving and studying the cook's kitchen or the mason's home is not going to help us understand us why they had to cook or why the masons had to build triumphal arches, not viaduct arches.

Less controversially the large art and archaeology collections have been reunited, since 1990 and are to take up their old place on Schinkel's classic Museums island, with the ethnographic collection remaining in Dahlem (Kipphoff 1991).

The Active Museum of Berlin

The other group, preserving a part of the Berlin Wall, are the Active Museum, which combines elements of the 68 'dig where you stand' heimat museum movement, but also tackle major sites and exhibits of national importance (Baker 1987, 1990). The 'Active Museum of Fascism and Resistance in Berlin' started in the early 1980's and came to public attention when they used excavation as an active tool in the fight against the suppression of Nazi past and neo-fascism today. 'At 11 o'clock on Sunday the fifth of May 1985 an excavation began in West Berlin. The Active Museum of Fascism and Resistance in Berlin (Schilling 1985), an association founded to set up a memorial at the former SS, SA and Gestapo headquarters in and around the 17th century Prinz-Albrecht Palace, "the most feared address in Berlin" (Rürup 1987:18).

Only after the Active Museum's protest excavation did the Senate of West Berlin fund a full excavation of the site in 1987. From the former complex of buildings, now adjacent to the Berlin Wall, Himmler organized the 'purge' of Jews, communists, Social Democrats, homosexuals, gypsies, clergymen, Quakers, the handicapped and the old. From here the bureaucrats, or "desk criminals", (Rürup 1987, 192) as well as interrogators, torturers and murderers of the Gestapo, SS and SA spread terror and suffering throughout Europe (Tuchel & Schattenfroh 1987).

In May 1985 people excavated not for money, academic interest, fun or to comply with planning regulations. They excavated as an act of remembrance. Remembrance is essential to come to terms with the Nazi past: "Whoever closes his/her eyes to the past, becomes blind to the present. Whoever does not want to remember inhumanity, will be vulnerable to reinfection" (von Weizsäcker 1985, 19). Remembrance is for the resistance fighters and countless victims interrogated and tortured in the Gestapo and SS cellars (Ev. Akademie 1989, Szepansky 1985), so that by uncovering the physical remains of the Prinz-Albrecht complex, "a place of remembrance should finally be created on the site of this centre of terror... A place of reflection to impart the lessons and insights from the site's history, and so contribute to war and fascism never setting forth from German soil again" (Aktives Museum 1985). The call to excavate ends with the appeal: "GRASS MUST NEVER BE ALLOWED TO GROW OVER IT" (Aktives Museum 1985. Original emphasis), and in similar

vein, a leaflet at the excavation site proclaims: "THE WOUND MUST STAY OPEN" (Aktives Museum 1987. Original emphasis).

The central theme of the Active Museum's didactic work is to turn visitors from consumers into producers of history (Baker 1990). In this they follow Walter Benjamin who said on the subject of writing "A writer's production...must have the character of a model: it must be able to instruct other writers in their production and, secondly, it must be able to place an improved apparatus at their disposal. This apparatus will be the better, the more consumers it brings into contact with the production process - in short, the more readers or spectators it turns into collaborators" (1973:98). To take a concrete example, guided tours "should wherever possible be dissolved by active participation, which makes producers out of consumers" (Schoenberner 1985:10). In order to achieve this the active Museum propose a methodology called 'Forschendes Lernen', which I translate as 'investigative learning'. This is described as "a collective process of learning and working, in which the planning implementation and the analysis of research are communal activities" (Fischer-Defoy 1985:24). The museum should act as an agent, a medium by which visitors can channel the shock, indignation and curiosity aroused by the physical confrontation with the site, into studying the history of their own local area, factory or profession in the Nazi period. "Taking their own interests and needs as a starting-point, democratic initiatives by social groups must be encouraged and enabled to undertake their own research, help for self-help must be offered...you can best appeal to people when you work with them" (Schoenberner 1985:10).

The Active Museum sees this methodology as working democratically since: "In accordance with a plurality of views in an open society, there should be room for different accounts, not just the views provided by one particular historical school... It is not the building of consensus by blurring different political positions, but the provocative stimulation of ideas through the presentation of contradictions and oppositions, which is the prerequisite for the formation of a political culture and a democratic consciousness" (Schoenberner 1985:9-10).

The essential element in the context of a plurality of views is for the museum to provide information about the origins and consequences of Nazi rule since "a poorly informed public, that is imprisoned by prejudice, was not only one of the foundations of fascism, but is also a precondition of antidemocratic tendencies today" (Fischer-Defoy 1985:23).

Here the Active museum are following the tradition of Erwin Piscator's experimental theatre in which, as his collaborator Bertold Brecht described, Erwin Piscator "saw the theatre as a parliament, the audience the legislative body. To this parliament were supplied all plastic forms, all the great public questions that needed an answer... It was the stage's ambition to supply images, statistics, slogans which would enable its parliament, the audience, to reach political decisions. Piscator's stage was not indifferent to applause, but it preferred a discussion" (1959:130-1).

The principle of dialogue is not only central to the Active Museum's methodology but also to its physical design. The temporary exhibition hall with its simple undecorated form and large windows, intrigues the visitor to enter, but does not intimidate him like the grand entrances of many museums. "The traditional division between the administration rooms and the workshops, to which the public are not admitted, and the exhibition and function rooms must

be dissolved" (Zwieska 1985:26). A permanent exhibition should be complemented by everchanging temporary exhibitions. Exhibitions work best when laid out in an asymmetrical manner. At the Active Museum's exhibition '1933', this design was found to stimulate visitors to spontaneously discuss the exhibited material in the nooks and corners provided by the design (Zwieska 1985:27). An exhibition should also include a means by which visitors can comment on the work, and propose new areas of research. The facilities and advice of the museum's workshop and technicians must be available to groups who wish to mount their own exhibitions.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall on the 9.th of November 1989 the Active Museum has also been working on a pan-Berlin level. The first campaign was to preserve the section of the Berlin Wall running adjacent to the Gestapo site, so as to provide a unique palimpsest of German history. "We have to keep the Wall here, because the Wall is a result of Hitler's war and the Nazi terror which was planned and administered from this site. It is crucial to preserve the physical relationship, so as to confront visitors with the physical relationships of German history" says Silvia Lange of the Active Museum (pers. comm 1990).

245

Since reunification they have been particularly active in protecting plaques commemorating the anti-fascist resistance in East Berlin, which are increasingly coming under pressure from neo-nazi skinhead groups. Because they were erected by the East German government, they have become vulnerable to the blind rage of those who seek to destroy every trace of the former workers' and farmers' state.

"We in Berlin are living with the difficult situation, that in one half of the city the destruction of Anti-fascist memorials is being encouraged, and in West Berlin we are pleased that the Nazi period and the sites of their crimes are finally penetrating the public's consciousness and memorials are being built" (Aktives Museum 1990:2).

In May 1991 they replaced 5 of the plaques erected by the East German party to commemorate victims of the nazis in East Berlin. The Active Museum estimate that 16 such plaques have been removed by unknown persons (presumably Neo-Nazis) in the spring of 1991 (*Tagesspiegel* 1991).

Similar replacement activities have been induced by the blacking out of a plaque in the Niederkirchner Strasse, which reminded passers by that, before being named after a communist victim of the Gestapo, the street was called 'Prinz-Albrecht Strasse' and was the home of the Gestapo (*Neue Zeit* 1991). With streets already being renamed in East Berlin, the museum's official policy is now that any streets named after Nazi victims (even if they were communists) should be kept (*Tageszeitung* 1991).

One of the most vehement advocates of this policy is Robert Zeiler, a social democrat who had the unenviable experience of being incarcerated in the Buchenwald concentration camp by both the Nazis and the Soviets (*Berliner Zeitung* 1991).

He has since drawn particularly heavy criticism from sections of his party, who argue that because people like Clara Zetkin and Ernst Thälmann were not only victims of the Nazis, but also founders of the "communist regime of violence" (*Kreutzer* 1991), who forced 100.000 social democrats to flee, and killed an additional 1.400 in prison (*Kreutzer* 1991). Herr Kreutzer is however in favour

of keeping the Rosa-Luxemburg Platz, named after the famous communist, since it was here that Erich Mielke (later head of the Stasi) shot two policemen in 1932. Which all goes to show that even the remembrance of Nazi victims is not neutral, and that even after 50 years the famous factional fights between the social democrats and the communists, which allowed Hitler to become the chancellor in 1933, still fester.

Another major class of monuments examined by the Active Museum are the monumental sculptures of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Thälmann and the Red Army. The Museum mounted an exhibition recording all these monuments, cataloguing both their construction and defacement, with the aim to provide information and stimuli for the debate on the future of these historical artefacts. As the exhibition title states, the options are clear: "Preservation, alteration or destruction" (*Elfert et al 1990*).

246

The museum's most recent project has been an exhibition in an exhibition. The exhibition is a commentary by a group of East and West-German historians on an old East-German 'Tradition Cabinet of the Anti-Fascist Resistance in Prenzlauer Berg', dating from 1986. So the texts of the Active Museum's exhibition stands alongside and among the original exhibition, mingling with and commenting upon them, allowing the visitor to compare 1986 museology with 1991. The Active Museum justify the need for this exhibition in their invitation to be: "In a time when the memory of the past forty years is increasingly being suppressed, when museums are being hastily closed, streets renamed, symbols taken down, this is the place for a confrontation ("Auseinandersetzung") with an important part of GDR history, i.e. its official picture of antifascism".

The exhibition's motto is "Living with History". The work of the Active Museum shows that museums are not only Lübke's compensatory refuges from the present, but also crucial critical and controversial forms of coming to terms and living with the past, even one as complex as Berlin's, which is National History on a heimat scale.

Conclusion

It is in its diversity of approaches and the theoretically based discussions of museums that Germany has much to offer to the European museum landscape post 1992. Which models will prevail and how they will mutate cannot be predicted yet, but some, such as the Active Museum, could be of considerable significance, particularly to the new democracies of Eastern and Central Europe, who like Berlin have a difficult recent history to live with.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. Susan Pearce and Frau Korff for their patience and to all those at 16, Normandy and Thames Television's "Down to Earth" team for their help and support during the writing process. Finally special thanks are due to the staff of the Merkister Hotel on Orkney for collecting the crucial German fax.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno*, T.W. & *Horkheimer*, M. 1979 "The Dialectic of Enlightenment", Cambridge, Verso.
- Aktives Museum* 1985 '1933-1945 Nachgraben'. West Berlin: Aktives Museum.
- Aktives Museum* 1987 'Zur Eröffnung der Ausstellung Topographie des Terrors am 4. 7. 1987. West Berlin: Aktives Museum.
- Aktives Museum* 1990 'Berliner Denkmäler seit 1945 - Gedenken oder Zerstören?'. West Berlin: Aktives Museum.
- Baker*, F. 1987 'History that hurts: excavating 1933-1945', Cambridge, Archaeological Review from Cambridge 7:1, 93-101.
- Baker*, F. 1998 'Archaeological and the heritage industry', Cambridge, Archaeological Review from Cambridge 7:2, 141-144.
- Baker*, F. 1990 'Archaeology, Habermas and the pathologies of Modernity' in Baker, F. & Thomas J. (Eds.) "Writing the Past in the Present". Lampeter, St. David's University College Lampeter. Pp 54-63.
- Baker*, F. 1992 'The Berlin Wall: the production, preservation and consumption of a 20.th century monument'. Cambridge, Antiquity, March.
- Balfour*, A. 1990 "Berlin. The politics of order 1737-1989". New York, Rizzoli International Publications.
- Bätz*, O. & *Gößwald*, U. (Eds.) 1988 "Experiment Heimatmuseum. Zur Theorie und Praxis regionaler Museumsarbeit", Marburg, Jonas Verlag.
- Bausinger*, H. 1988 "Bausinger: Heimat ist nicht, was im Tourismus-Prospekt steht". Tübingen, Schwäbisches Tagblatt. Süd West Presse. December 31st.
- Benjamin*, W. 1973 "Author as Producer" in "Understanding Brecht" Anna Bostock trans. London, New Left Books.
- Berliner Zeitung* 1991 "Zetkin soll bleiben". Berlin, Berliner Zeitung, July 1st.
- Brocu*, E.,
- Brecht*, B. 1935 "Questions from a Worker who Reads?" Michael Hamburger trans. from "Bertolt Brecht. Poems 1913-1956". London, Methuen.
- Brecht*, B. 1959 "On Experimental Theatre" in Willet, P. (ed.) "Brecht on Theatre". London, Eyre Methuen. Pp 130-135.
- Cohn*, R. & *Gößwald*, U. "Experiment Heimatmuseum-Zur Theorie und Praxis der Präsentation von Geschichte" in Bätz, O. & Güßwald, U. (Eds.) 'Experiment Heimatmuseum.' Marburg, Jonas Verlag. Pp 92-100.
- Craig*, G.A. 1984 "The Germans". Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Elfert*, E. et al. 1990 "Erhalten-Zerstören-Verändern? Denkmäler der GDR in Ost Berlin. Eine documentarische Ausstellung". Berlin, Neue Gesellschaft für Bildende Kunst - Schriftenreihe des Aktiven Museum Band 1.
- Ev. Akademie* 1989 "In der Gestapo-Zentrale Prinz-Albrecht-Strasse 8. Berichte ehemaliger Häftlinge". West Berlin, Evangelische Bildungswerk.
- Fischer-Defoy*, C. 1985 'Zur Praxis' in "Zum Umgang mit einem Erbe", West Berlin, Aktives Museum, 23-26.
- Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin* 1987 "Die Nation als Ausstellungsstück. Planungen, Kritik und Utopien zu den Museumsgründungen in Bonn und Berlin" Geschichtswerkstatt Nr. 11. Hamburg, VSA-Verlag.
- Halter*, M. 1990 "Die Barfuß-Historiker im Schuhgeschäft". Freiburg im Breisgau, Badische Zeitung.
- Harms*, V. 1988 "Marketing non-European art or Third World solidarity". Cambridge, Archaeological Review from Cambridge 7:2, 177-184.
- Held*, D. 1980 "Introduction to critical theory. Horkheimer to Habermas". London, Hutchinson University Library.
- Herbst*, W. "Berlin 1871-1945". East Berlin, Museum für Deutsche Geschichte Berlin.

- Hexelschneider*, E. & John, E. 1984 "Kultur als einigendes Band? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit der These von der 'einheitlichen deutschen Kultur'". East Berlin, Dietz Verlag.
- Kipphoff*, P. 1991 "Die Zukunft der Berliner Museen: Aus zwei mach drei". Hamburg, Die Zeit Nr. 8, February 15th.
- Koslowski*, P. 1990 "Die Kulturen der Welt als Experimente richtigen Lebens. Entwurf für eine Weltausstellung". Passagen Heft Nr. 3. Wien, Passagen Verlag.
- Korff*, G. 1990 "Apriorien der Musealisierung" in Zacharias, W. (Ed.) "Zeitphänomen Musealisierung". Essen, Klartext Verlag. Pp 57-72.
- Korff*, G. & Rürup, R. 1988 "Berlin, Berlin. Bilder einer Ausstellung". Berlin (West), Berliner Festspiele GmbH.
- Kreutzer*, H. 1991 "Letter of 11th August" in "Aktives Museum. Mitgliederrundbrief Nr. 11", Berlin, Aktives Museum.
- 248 *Lange*, C. 1987 "Museum der Utopien vom Überleben". West Berlin, Transit Buchverlag.
- Lenz*, S. 1987 "The heritage", London, Methuen.
- Lindquist*, S. 1989 "Grabe wo du stehst. Handbuch zur Erforschung der eigenen Geschichte", Bonn, Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf.
- Luebbe*, H. 1981 "Zwischen Trend und Tradition. Überfordert uns die Gegenwart?", Zürich, Edition Interfrom.
- Merriman*, N. 1988 "The Heritage Industry Reconsidered". Cambridge, Archaeological Review from Cambridge Vol. 7:2. pp 146- 157.
- Neue Zeit* 1991 "In memoriam Prinz-Albrecht-Strasse". Berlin, Neue Zeit. August 31st.
- Preiß*, A. et al 1990 "Das Museum. Die Entwicklung in den 80er Jahren", München, Klinkhardt & Biermann.
- Rossi*, A. 1989 "Deutsches Historisches Museum". West Berlin, Aedes.
- Roth*, M. 1990 "Heimatmuseum. Zur Geschichte einer deutschen Institution". Berlinerschriften zur Museumskunde Band 7. Berlin, Gebrüder Mann.
- Rürup*, R. 1987 'Topographie des Terrors. Gestapo, SS and Reichssicherheitsamt auf dem Prinz Albrecht Gelände: eine Dokumentation'. West Berlin: Willmüth Arenhövel Verlag.
- Scharfe*, M. (Ed.) 1982 "Museen in der Provinz. Strukturen, Probleme, Tendenzen, Chancen". Tübingen, Tübingen Vereinigung für Volkskunde.
- Schoenberger*, G. 1985 'Zur Sache' in 'Zum Umgang mit einem Erbe', 5-10. West Berlin: Aktives Museum.
- Szepansky*, W. 1985 "Dennoch ging ich diesen Weg". West Berlin, Karl G. Mund-Neue Welt.
- Tagesspiegel* 1991 "Erinnern notwendiger denn je". Berlin, Der Tagesspiegel, May 9th.
- Tageszeitung* 1991 "NS-Opfer-Namen bleiben". Berlin, die Tageszeitung, August 31st.
- Tuchel*, J. & *Schattenfroh*, R. 1987 "Zentrale des Terror. Prinz- Albrecht-Strasse 8. Das Hauptquartier der Gestapo". West Berlin, Seidler Verlag.
- Von Weizsäcker*, R. 1985 "Von Deutschland Aus". München, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag 10639.
- Williams*, S. 1988 "Rossi in Berlin". The Architects' Journal Vol. 187, Number 32, August 10th. London, The architectural Press. Pp 24-27.
- Zacharias*, W. (Ed.) 1990 "Zeitphänomen Musealisierung. Das Verschwinden der Gegenwart und die Konstruktion der Erinnerung". Essen, Klartext Verlag.
- Ziescke*, C. 1985 'Zur Organisation' in Zum Umgang Mit einem Erbe, 27-29. West Berlin: Aktives Museum.
- Zimmermann*, H. 1985 "DDR Handbuch. Band 1 A-L", Köln, Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik.

NACIONALNI, DOMOZNANSKI IN AKTIVNI MUZEJI: ORIS RAZVOJA NEMŠKIH MUZEJEV NA POTI V DEVETDESETA LETA

Frederick Baker,
Gottfried Korff

249

Uvod

Nemška muzeologija ima mnogo skupnih potez z muzeologijo drugih evropskih držav, vendar tudi posebnosti, ki izhajajo iz zveznega ustroja države in še posebej iz spremenjenih vrednot in pogledov po letu 1945, ki so navrgli zanimive pobude, kot je Aktivni muzej v Berlinu. V tem članku bova orisala zelo bogato podobo nemških muzejev na treh ravneh. Prva raven so lokalni ali domoznanski muzeji (Heimat muzeji), druga regionalni "deželni" muzeji in končno veliki narodni muzeji.

Konjunktura nemških muzejev

Potsdamski trg v Berlinu je bil v dvajsetih letih tega stoletja najbolj živahen kraj v Evropi. Pozneje so ob njegovem robu zgradili Hitlerjev bunker in po vojni ga je presekala Honeckerjev berlinski zid. Danes je trg klasičen palimpsest ponovno združene Nemčije. Leta 1990 je Alan Balfour o njem zapisal: "Navzočnost preteklosti se vztrajno meša z obeti prihodnosti. Sanje niso same po sebi, izolirane, vse so prežete z razmišljanjem in odzivanjem, v zmedu preteklega bivanja ... navzočnost tako številnih preteklosti onemogoča delovanje kakršnegakoli preprostega boja nasprotij, vsi poskusi sinteze pa le povečujejo drobljenje (1990:249).

Od leta 1945 dalje igrajo muzeji ključno vlogo pri predstavljanju prenovе, a podobno kot pri Potsdamskem trgu, so poskusi sinteze povzročili le še večja razhajanja. Tako smo se znašli v položaju, v katerem so muzeji kar naenkrat postali središče vročih debat o nemški zgodovini in kulturi. V zadnjih dvajsetih letih je napočila presenetljiva konjunktura muzejev v skoraj vseh evropskih državah. Uradne statistike pričajo o podvojitvi in celo potrojitvi števila muzejev od 1970 dalje, vendar je izredno naraščanje števila muzejev v Nemčiji v letih 1970-1990 prav poseben pojav. Komaj je še kakšen kraj z več kot 5000 prebivalcev, ki nima muzeja in komaj kakšna vas z manj kot 1000, ki ne bi ponosno kazala na lastni muzej. Tisti, ki so v raznih kulturnih uradih odgovorni za načrtovanje, že govorijo o zasičenosti z muzejsko ponudbo. Leta 1969 je Zahodna Nemčija štela 673 muzejev, do 1988 pa je njihovo število naraslo na 2400 (Korff 1990:59). Če na stvari pogledamo še z vsenemškega vidika: Vzhodna

Nemčija je leta 1982 imela 642 muzejev, od katerih je bilo 67 literarnih in 73 galerij. Skupaj so ti muzeji priredili 1500 posebnih razstav (Zimmerman 1985:918). Največ koristi od te konjunkturo so imeli zgodovinski muzeji, ker hitra modernizacija v povojnem obdobju ni spremenila samo strukture ekonomije in videza mest, ampak tudi vsakdanje zasebno življenje. Brez dvoma lahko govorimo o izgubljanju identitete kot posledici pospešenega izginjanja domačnosti in intimnosti. Tam, kjer so nove stavbe in druge spremembe temeljito preobrazile življenjsko okolje, kjer so novo potrošništvo in novi načini življenja spremenili celo osebne navade, tam je cvetela nostalgija po starem. To povpraševanje so zadovoljevali boljši trgi, številne zgodovinske razstave in muzeji. V povsem zabetoniranem in asfaltiranem okolju ljudje iščejo nekaj znanega, domačega in to najdejo v muzejih.

250

Muzej igra dvojno vlogo. Pomeni identiteto, ki je z zgodovinskega stališča naša lastna in hkrati alternativno identiteto, različno od današnje. Muzej mora biti tako tuj kot domač. To je paradoksalen položaj, v katerem morajo eksponati prenašati zgodovino, ki je sicer blizu sedanjosti, hkrati pa tudi daleč - in tako pomeni alternativo sedanjosti. Gre za nekakšno domačo eksotiko, kot je zapisal Hermann Bausinger v vplivnem delu *Ljudska kultura v tehničnem svetu* (1961).

Hermann Lubbe, nemški filozof iz Züricha, je 1981 naredil eno izmed najbolj celostnih analiz družbenih procesov, ki so omogočili konjunkturo muzejev. Vse hitrejšo spreminjanje znanega okolja se kompenzira z muzeološkim pristopom k staremu. To pomeni, da je muzej logična posledica sodobne industrijske družbe. Muzej se bolje kot katerakoli druga ustanova odziva na potrebe ljudi po barvitosti, domačnosti in smislu v vsakdanjem svetu.

Domoznanski muzeji (Heimat muzeji)

Zmagoviti pohod domoznanskih muzejev se je začel že pod monarhijo. V weimarski republiki so naredili velik korak naprej, nacisti so jih centralizirali, po zadnji vojni pa so najprej stagnirali, ker je država imela druge prioritete. V sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih pa je njihov razvoj dosegel vrhunec. Kot smo že rekli, komaj je še kakšen kraj v Zvezni republiki, ki nima svojega muzeja.

Ker se je število domoznanskih muzejev v sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih tako zelo povečalo, nas ne sme presenetiti, da je ta ustanova postala predmet številnih razprav in eksperimentov (Scharfe 1982). Ena izmed najbolj kontraverznih razprav je bila vsesplošna bitka za to, da bi "obvladali" in definirali Nemčijo na podlagi ključnega nemškega koncepta "Heimat". Besedo lahko površno prevajamo kot domači kraj ali domovina, vendar s tem ne izrazimo čustvenega naboja, ki ga ima "Heimat" za Nemce. Zanje je ta pojem močno povezan s koreninami. Korenine, ki so še posebno dragocene za narod sredi Evrope, raztrgane od vojn.

Težave, ki jih imajo današnji Nemci s pojmom "Heimat", je izvrstno upodobil Siegfried Lenz v romanu *Heimatmuseum*, objavljenem v Veliki Britaniji pod naslovom *The Heritage* (Dediščina) (1981). Junak knjige je kustos domoznanskega muzeja, ki zbira in ohranja kulturno dediščino svojega domačega kraja v Mazuriji (sedaj na Poljskem), od koder je pobegnil pred prodirajočo Rdečo armado. Na koncu romana Lenzov junak zažge svoj lastni *Heimatmuseum*, ker ga zavrača kot obliko dokumentirane zgodovine.

Med drugo svetovno vojno so nacisti domoznanske muzeje uporabljali v propagandne namene (Roth 1990). To jih je seveda pri povojnih generacijah spravilo na slab glas in kot poroča Hermann Bausinger je bil položaj takšen: "Besede Heimat sploh nisi več smel uporabljati. Imeli so jo za preozko ali ideološko nesprejemljivo. Nekaj časa je bil ta pojem tabu in šele zdaj se ponovno uveljavlja... Heimat ni nekakšno ograjeno območje z nekaj narodnimi nošami. Heimat ni to, kar vidimo v turističnih prosepkih, ampak je totaliteta" (1988).

Na Bavarskem je desničarski CSU uvedel naziv in službo "Heimatpfleger", kar bi lahko prevedli kot varuh Heimata. Njegove naloge segajo od lokalne arheologije in domoznanskega muzeja do folklorističnih prvin kot so noše in plesi. Temu pristopu očitajo, da z zunanjimi manifestacijami samo ohranja kozmetično podobo Heimata kot nekakšno kompenzacijo za onesnaženo okolje in razpad lokalnih skupnosti, ki jih urbanizacija iz nekoč avtonomnih vasi spreminja v spalna naselja.

Filozof Ernst Bloch je oblikoval alternativnen, radikalen koncept Heimata: "Korenine zgodovine so v človeku, v njegovem delu, ustvarjanju in spreminjanju življenjskih razmer. Ko sebe razume in si v pravi demokraciji ustvari svojo bit brez pomanjkanja ali odtujitve, potem je svet poln nečesa, kar sije v mladosti vseh nas, a kjer nihče izmed nas nikoli ni bil: Heimat."

Cilj generacije iz 1968 leta je bil ostati zvest Blochovi radikalni definiciji Heimata in se izogniti udobnemu popuščanju vplivom tako imenovane "industrijske kulture", ki sta jo definirala Theodore W. Adorno in Max Horkheim v njunem klasičnem delu *Dialektika razsvetljenstva* (1979). Po Davidu Heldu sta verjela, da "postaja večina področij kulturnega življenja kooptiranih in se spreminjajo v sredstva nadzora nad posameznikovim zavedanjem" (1987:90). Kulturne dobrine postanejo "tržno in zamenljivo blago, tako kot industrijski proizvodi" (H & A 1979:158). Čeprav je danes jasno, da je ta ideološka analiza preveč preprosta v zvezi z načinom, kako funkcionirajo muzeji (Merrian 1987), ne smemo podcenjevati vpliva tako imenovane frankfurtske šole na generacijo iz 1968. leta, ker je zelo nazorno opisala, česa naj muzeji ne bi počeli.

Prav poskusi, da bi se izognili "industrijski kulturi" in ustvarjali alternativno, so mnoge pripadnike te generacije pripeljali do tega, da niso samo na novo definirali domoznanskih muzejev, ampak so tudi vpeljali nove oblike muzejskega delovanja. V programu generacije je zunajparlamentarna opozicija igrala pomembno vlogo in ena izmed ključnih programskih točk je bila zgodovina. V praksi je bilo to tako, da so ljudje zunaj obstoječih muzejskih mrež zbirali sklope podatkov, ki jih tradicionalni muzeji niso ustrezno "zajemali": npr. nacistično obdobje in množično kulturo. Strategija, ki so jo uporabili pri tem, so bile nove oblike, kot npr. zgodovinske delavnice (Halter 1990) ali umetnostne razstave o zgodovinskih temah. Eden izmed najboljših zgledov za to je bila razstava *Mit Berlin*, ki je skušala odkrivati zgodovino Berlina izključno z umetnostjo. Med najbolj zanimivimi primeri pa je tudi Muzej utopij o preživetju Claudia Langa (1987), ki je bil specifično zamišljen kot alternativa velikim zgodovinskim razstavam. Druga popularna ideja je bil "pohod skozi ustanove". Udo Goßwald, kustos domoznanskega muzeja v Neu-Kölnu (Berlin), si je za pohod izbral kar lastni muzej. "Vsi smo leta 1968 študirali sociologijo in zgodovino in se odzvali pozivu iz neke himne takratne študentske revolucije: "koplji tam, kjer stojiš". S tem smo mislili na to, da bi morali velike zgodovinske procese identificirati v lokalnem obsegu (osebni razgovor, 1988). Ozadje tega

gibanja je opisal Sven Lindquist v knjigi z enakim naslovom: "Koplji tam, kjer stojiš" (1988).

Lindquist je sicer napisal še dve deli ključnega pomena za razprave o muzejih. Knjigi Mesto učenja, ne pa svetišče (1972) in Eksperiment Heimatmuseum (Bätz & Gößwald 1987) sta izšli v presledku 15 let, vendar jima je skupna ambicija postaviti v ospredje didaktično kompetenco zgodovinskih muzejev, vsaki na svoj način. Knjiga iz 1972 leta je pod očitnim vplivom izobraževalnih reform in evforije šestdesetih in sedemdesetih let (Craig 1982:70). Izobrazbo in pridobivanje znanja so takrat imeli za sredstvi za ustvarjanje uspešne in egalitarne družbe. Imperativ je bil logična metoda učenja, s posebnim poudarkom na načinu, kako v muzeju uporabiti tekste. Na koncu sedemdesetih let so se muzeji že zelo oddaljili od šolsko-izobraževalnega modela in se na podlagi Lübbejeve identifikacije težnje ljubezni za "stare reči" usmerili bolj v prikazovanje artefaktov. V zvezi z etnografskimi muzeji so potekale najbolj vroče razprave o zamisli o solidarnosti s tretjim svetom ali o neevropskem odnosu do umetnosti (Harms, 198). Nadaljevale so se v zvezi s predlogom Petra Kolowskega za svetovno razstavo v Hannoveru leta 2000, kjer naj bi bile kulture sveta razstavljene kot "poskusi kako najti pravi način življenja" (1990). Odsev razprav, ki so spremljale to prehodno obdobje, zasledimo v publikaciji Eksperiment Heimatmuseum, ki je plod konference v Neuköllnskem domoznanskem muzeju v Zahodnem Berlinu, na kateri je ta muzej l. 1987 prejel evropsko muzejsko nagrado. "Naša teza se glasi: mnogo je različnih metod PREDSTAVITVE zgodovinskih odnosov, in predmete, ki so nam na voljo, uporabljamo na različne načine. Vdahnemo jim pomen... in jih spremenimo v nosilce pomena. Muzejske predstavitve temeljijo na pomenu posameznega predmeta, ki ga potem lahko vključimo v kontekst celote..., a vprašanje je, "Ali je artefakt koristen ali ne za razmerje, ki ga želim prikazati?... Metoda, ki smo jo uporabili v EKSPERIMENTU HEIMATMUSEUM temelji na stališču, da je to kar prikazujemo, del zgodovine, ne težimo h kompletnosti in ne želimo dajati vtisa celovitosti. Ključnega pomena za predstavitev je to, ali se ji posreči pokazati svojo nekompletnost, tako da obiskovalec ne dobi napačnega vtisa in mu pustimo možnost za neodvisno razmišljanje" (Cohn & Goßwald 1987:94-5, poudarki so izvirni).

Z ironijo, tipično za hladno vojno, je vzhodnonemška partijska politika promovirala tista področja, ki so še posebej zanimala študente osemindesetdesetega leta, tj. povojno zgodovino, antifašistični odpor in druge tako imenovane "napredne" zgodovinske elemente velike zgodovine, ki bi jih lahko povezali s Heimatom, z domačim krajem. Vendar je bilo zelo očitno, katerim ciljem naj bi vse to služilo, namreč "ustvarjanju in gojenju občutka za socialistični Heimat" (Zimmermann 1985:598).

Regionalni muzeji

Za osupljivo konjunkturo nemških muzejev obstajajo tako sočasni kot zgodovinski razlogi (Preiß et al., 1990). Na eni strani imamo tradicijo federalizma, ki je deželnim metropolam omogočala tekmovali med seboj za prestiž, tako, kot so to nekoč počela majhna vojvodstva in baronije. Muzeji so postali nova oblika lokalpatriotizma. Če si Stuttgart lahko postavi novo Staatsgalerie, München ne sme zaostati, pa tudi novo deželno glavno mesto Düsseldorf ne. In potem je tu še renski sosed Köln s prebujenimi ambicijami, ki

lahko prikazuje svojo nekdanjo veljavo na evropskem odru z lepim številom pomembnih muzejev. Poleg tega, da je kulturna politika organizirana federalno, moramo upoštevati tudi to, da so nemška mesta bolj samostojna in finančno močnejša od angleških ali francoskih (Watson, 1992).

Mehanizem kulturnega rivalstva in ambicij je koristil tudi razvoju manjših muzejev. Če si deželni predsednik Baden-Württemberga lahko poveča ugled z muzejskimi fondi, potem je ta pot odprta tudi županom majhnih mest v Schwarzwaldu in ob Konstanškem jezeru. Zaradi različne in decentralizirane zgodovine minidržav, iz katerih je bila Nemčija sestavljena večji del svoje zgodovine, imajo majhna provincialna mesta kot Ludwigsburg ali Regensburg pogosto zelo bogato kulturno dediščino, ki jo lahko uspešno prikazujejo v muzejih. Potem ko je muzej kot ustanova dosegel to raven, sta rivalstvo in tekma za prestiž prenikala v še manjša mesta, prav do ravni domoznanskega muzeja.

253

Ključna sestavina muzejske kulture v Nemčiji na tej regionalni ali deželni ravni so bile tako imenovane "deželne razstave", ki so jih vpeljali v poznih sedemdesetih letih. Zamislite si, da bi kaka angleška grofija ali francoski departma vsako leto z javnimi sredstvi organiziral zgodovinsko ali umetniško velerazstavo. Začetek muzejskih dogodkov te vrste je bila Staufferjeva razstava v Stuttgartu leta 1977, v čast petindvajseti obletnici ustanovitve Baden-Württemberga. Tako kot je nemški cesar selil svoj dvor iz mesta v mesto in ustvaril potujočo prestolnico, se je kulturna karavana velerazstav selila po vsej državi. Celo Tübingen, mestece s 70.000 prebivalci, je za nekaj mesecev postal kulturna prestolnica.

Kljub razlikam v obsegu, temah in metodi so te razstave imele nekaj skupnega: razstavljale so avtentične artefakte. V umetnostnih muzejih je to že bilo dolgoletna tradicija, v zgodovinskih pa je bilo treba novost vpeljati postopoma. Izkušnje z velikimi razstavami so omogočile preizkušanje novih idej glede načina predstavljanja, da bi tako nadomestili prejšnje, na tekstih temelječe metode. Cilj je bil javnosti prikazati "samoumevno celoto", ne da bi ljudje pri tem morali prebrati dolge tekste. Muzej naj bi se oddaljil od vloge predmetnega učitelja in postal mesto, kjer se stvari ohranjajo in prikazujejo tako, da dražijo čutila. V tem obdobju je postal popularen pojem "razstaviščna arhitektura". Razstave so same postale artefakti, vredne celo "posmrtno" objave v knjižni obliki (Korrf & Rürup, 1988).

Nacionalni muzeji

Berlinske različice deželnih razstav so imele poseben nacionalni značaj. Začelo se je s kontraverzno razstavo Prusija: iskanje ravnotežja leta 1981, ki je skušala premagati tabu temo pruske dediščine Nemčije. Tema je bila tako občutljiva, da so Vzhodni Nemci kritizirali zahodne sosede celo zaradi tega, ker niso preimenovali Pruskega državnega kulturnega fonda (v lasti katerega je večina zbirk v povojnem muzeju Dahlem v Zahodnem Berlinu). Trdili so, da gre za propagando za ponovno združitev nemške kulturne nacije (Hexelschneider & John 1984:90). Radikalni domoznanski muzeji so se pridružili tej kritiki, ker "v razdeljeni naciji kot je Nemčija, ni mesta za nacionalne muzeje" (Cohn & Gößwald 1987:99). Delavnica Zgodovina Berlina pa je menila da "je kategorija nacija neprimerna" za delo v muzejih (Geschichtswerkstatt 1987:9)

Očitni politični značaj in pomen te razprave je potrdil bivši svetovalec kanclerja Kohla, Michael Stürmer, ki je v kontekstu razprav o obeh nacionalnih muzejih, v Bonnu in Berlinu, dejal: "Kdor nadzira zgodovino, temu pripada prihodnost" (v Lindquistu 1989:326). V Berlinu je sosednji Vzhod pomenil dodatno razsežnost razprave. Rivalstvo med Zahodno in Vzhodno Nemčijo se je še posebej pokazalo ob praznovanju 750. obletnice ustanovitve Berlina (Herbst 1987). Na Vzhodu je bila nacionalna predstavitev zgodovine centralizirana v Muzeju nemške zgodovine nasproti skupščinski stavbi. Ustanovitev muzeja je zahtevala sedma plenarna seja Enotne socialistične stranke (SED) 20. oktobra 1951. Že 18. januarja naslednjega leta so muzej odprli za "razsvetljevanje ljudi in še posebej mladine". Zaporedne ravnateljice muzeja - vsi so bili, seveda, člani partije - je nadzirala akademska komisija, ki je skrbela za pravoverno marksistično-leninistično interpretacijo nemške zgodovine (Zimmerman 1985:919).

Deloma v odgovor na to verzijo nacionalne zgodovine je kancler Helmut Kohl, sicer diplomirani zgodovinar, naročil postavitev Nemškega zgodovinskega muzeja v Zahodnem Berlinu po načrtih Alda Rossija (Williams, 1988). Prav tako je naročil, da Hiše zgodovine v Bonnu, katere naloga je prikazovati razvoj Zvezne republike. Ravnatelj berlinskega muzeja Christoph Stützel je - da bi odvrnil obtožbe o nacionalizmu - opisal muzej takole: "To je nekaj za nacijo, a brez vsakršnega nacionalističnega poudarka. To ni muzej nemške zgodovine, ampak nemški zgodovinski muzej" (Williams, 1988:25). V skladu s političnim razvojem, tj. s ponovno združitvijo obeh Nemčij, je Kohlov muzej prevzel stavbo Honeckerjevega Muzeja nemške zgodovine, vendar ne njegovega imena. Zdi se, da so Rossijevi načrti postali odveč. Nemški zgodovinski muzej je začel izvajati svoje naloge tako, da je konzerviral velik odsek berlinskega zidu v ulici Bernauer (Baker 1992, Mobius & Trotnow 1990).

Poudarek na nacionalnih muzejih ni zgolj posledica ponovne združitve, ampak tudi odziv na domoznanske muzeje, ki so dosegli raven zasičenosti. Očitno je treba ponovno vzpostaviti ravnotežje. Zgodovine ne moremo razlagati le z lokalnim in podrobnostmi, muzeji morajo prikazati tudi globalne procese in globlje strukture. V pesmi Vprašanja delavca, ki bere (1935) sprašuje Brecht: "Veliki Rim / je poln slavolokov zmage. Kdo jih je postavil? Na vsaki strani je kaka zmaga / Kdo pa je zmagovalcem pripravil pojedino?" Če samo ohranimo in proučujemo kuharjevo kuhinjo ali zidarjevo hišo, nam to ne bo pomagalo razumeti, zakaj so kuharji morali kuhati ali zakaj so morali zidarji postaviti slavoloke zmage namesto lokov viaduktov.

Na manj kontraverzen način so po letu 1990 ponovno združili velike umetnostne in arheološke zbirke. Te bodo tam, kjer so nekoč že bile: na Schinklovem otoku klasičnih muzejev, medtem ko bo etnološka zbirka ostala v Dahlemu (Kipphoff 1991).

Aktivni muzej v Berlinu

Druga skupina, ki ohranja del berlinskega zidu je Aktivni muzej, skupina, ki združuje elemente gesla "koplji tam, kjer stojiš" z gibanjem domoznanskih muzejev. Hkrati se loteva izkopavanj in razstav nacionalnega pomena (Baker 1987, 1990). Aktivni muzej protifašističnega odpora v Berlinu je začel delovati v zgodnjih osemdesetih letih in pritegnil pozornost javnosti, ko je z izkopavanji aktivno posegel v boj proti zamegljevanju nacistične preteklosti in sedanjemu

neofašizmu. "V nedeljo, petega maja 1985, ob 11. uri dopoldne se bomo lotili izkopavanja v Zahodnem Berlinu. Aktivni muzej fašizma in odpora v Berlinu (Schilling 1985) je združenje, ustanovljeno z namenom postaviti spomenik pred nekdanjim glavnim štabom SS, SA in gestapa v palači princa Albrechta (17. stoletje), pred naslovom, ki so se ga v Berlinu najbolj bali" (Rurup 1987, 18).

Šele po tem protestnem izkopavanju je senat Zahodnega Berlina 1987 odobril sredstva za popolno izkopavanje kraja. Iz tega kompleksa stavb je Himmler organiziral "čistke" Židov, komunistov, socialdemokratov, homoseksualcev, ciganov, duhovnikov, kvekerjev, prizadetih in ostarelih. Od tod so birokrati, "zločinci za pisalnimi mizami" (Rurup 1987, 192), zasliševalci, mučitelji in morilci gestapa, SS in SA širili teror in trpljenje po vsej Evropi (Tuchel & Schattenfroh 1987).

Maja 1985 so ljudje tam izkopavali ne zaradi denarja, akademskega interesa, zabave ali zato, da bi zadostili planskim zahtevam. Izkopavanje je bilo dejanje spominjanja. Spominjanje je bistvenega pomena, če hočemo premagati nacistično preteklost: "Kdor zapira oči pred preteklostjo, postane slep za sedanost. Kdor se noče spominjati nečlovečnosti, se bo lahko z njo okužil" (von Weizsäcker 1985, 19). Spominjanje je namenjeno borcem odpora in neštetim žrtvam, ki so jih zasliševali in mučili v kletah gestapa in SS (Ev. Akademie 1989, Szepansky 1985). Ko spravimo na dan ostanke kompleksa Princa Albrechta, bomo končno ustvarili kraj spominjanja prav tam, kjer je bilo središče terorja ... Kraj razmišljanja, ki bo dajal nauk in omogočal vpogled v zgodovino kraja ter tako prispeval k temu, da se vojna in fašizem nikoli več ne bosta začela na nemških tleh" (Aktivni muzej 1985). Vabilo k izkopavanju se konča s pozivom: "TRAVA TEGA NIKOLI NE SME PRERASTI" (Aktivni muzej 1985, poudarjeno v izvorniku). Podobna zahteva je na letaku, ki so delili tam: "RANE MORAJO OSTATI ODPARTE" (Aktivni muzej 1987, poudarjeno v izvorniku).

Osrednja tema didaktičnega dela Aktivnega muzeja je spremeniti obiskovalce iz porabnikov v "proizvajalce" zgodovine (Baker 1990). V tem oziru sledi Walterju Benjaminu, ki je o temi pisanja dejal: "Pisateljev proizvod... mora imeti značaj modela: iz njega naj bi se lahko učili drugi pisatelji pri svojem delu in, drugič, mora jim dati na razpolago izboljšan aparat. Ta aparat (orodje) bo tem boljši, čim več porabnikov mu uspe vključiti v proizvodni proces - skratka, čim več bralcev ali gledalcev bo spremenil v sodelavce" (1973:98). Konkreten primer so, recimo, vodeni ogledi, ki naj bi se "kjerkoli je mogoče razpustili z aktivnim sodelovanjem, ki iz porabnikov naredi izdelovalce" (Schönberner 1985:10). Da bi to dosegli, je Aktivni muzej predlagal metodologijo, imenovano "forschendes Lernen", kar lahko prevedemo kot "raziskovalno učenje". Opisal sem to metodo kot "kolektivni učni in delovni proces, s katerim sta tako načrtovanje kot analiza raziskave skupinski aktivnosti" (Fischer-Defoy 1985:24). Muzej naj bi deloval kot sredstvo ali medij, s katerim obiskovalci preusmerijo svojo šokiranost, ogorčenje in radovednost, ki jih je zbudilo fizično soočenje s tem krajem, v proučevanje zgodovine svojega kraja, tovarne ali poklica v nacističnem obdobju. "Če interese in potrebe družbenih skupin jemljemo kot izhodišče, moramo spodbuditi njihove demokratične pobude in jim omogočiti, da se lotijo raziskovanja po svoje. Pomagati jim moramo k samopomoči... Ljudje se najbolje odzivajo, kadar delaš skupaj z njimi" (Schönberner 1985:10).

Aktivni muzej meni, da je ta metodologija demokratična ker mora "v skladu s pluralnostjo mnenj v odprti družbi biti prostor za različne poglede, ne samo

za tistega, ki ga sporoča ena zgodovinska šola..." Ne gre nam za to, da bi ustvarili konsenz z brisanjem različnih političnih stališč, ampak za provokativno spodbujanje idej skozi protislovja in nasprotja, kar je prvi pogoj za oblikovanje politične kulture in demokratične zavesti" (Schönberner 1985:9-10).

V kontekstu pluralnosti stališč je bistveno, da muzej daje informacijo o izvoru in posledicah nacistične vladavine, ker "pomankljivo informirana javnost, ujeta v predsodke, ni bila samo eden izmed temeljev fašizma, ampak tudi pogojuje antidemokratične težnje naših dni" (Fischer-Defoy 1985:23).

256

Aktivni muzej tudi sledi tradiciji eksperimentalnega gledališča Erwina Piscatorja. O njem je njegov sodelavec Berthold Brecht dejal da "gleda na gledališče kot na parlament, gledalci pa so zakonodajno telo. Temu parlamentu sporočamo vse plastične oblike, vsa velika javna vprašanja, ki zahtevajo odgovor... Namen gledališča je bil prikazovati podobe podobe, statistične podatke, gesla, ki bi "poslancem" omogočili priti do političnih odločitev. Piscatorjev oder ni bil brezbrizen do aplavza, a je dal prednost razpravi" (1959:130-1).

Načelo dialoga ni samo osrednjega pomena za metodologijo Aktivnega muzeja, ampak tudi za fizično izvedbo. Začasna razstavna dvorana, ki s preprostimi, neokrašenimi oblikami in velikimi okni vabi mimoidočega, da bi vstopil, ne deluje tako odbijajoče kot veličastni vhodi mnogih muzejev. "Tradicionalno delitev na administrativne prostore in delavnice, v katere javnost nima vstopa, ter na razstavne in funkcionalne prostore je treba ukiniti" (Zwieska 1985:26). Stalne razstave je treba sprti dopolnjevati z začasnimi. Razstave so najbolj učinkovite, če so postavljene asimetrično. Ob razstavi 1933 v Aktivnem muzeju so ugotovili, da način postavitve z raznimi kotički in koti lahko spodbuja obiskovalce k spontani razpravi o eksponatih (Zwieska 1985:27). Na razstavi naj bi obiskovalcem omogočili, da bi jo komentirali in predlagali nova področja raziskovanja. Oprema muzejske delavnice in strokovna pomoč tehnikov naj bi bili na razpologo skupinam, ki želijo postaviti svojo lastno razstavo.

Od padca berlinskega zidu, 9. novembra 1989, deluje Aktivni muzej tudi za celotno območje Berlina. Namen prve akcije je bil ohraniti del berlinskega zidu, ki teče mimo gestapovskega kompleksa, da bi tako dobili edinstven palimpsest nemške zgodovine. "Zid mora ostati tu, ker je posledica Hitlerjeve vojne in nacističnega terorja, ki so ju načrtovali in vodili s tega mesta. Bistveno je, da ohranimo to bližino in tako soočimo obiskovalce s fizičnimi odnosi nemške zgodovine", pravi Silvia Lange iz Aktivnega muzeja (v pogovoru z avtorjem, 1990).

Od ponovne združitve dalje je muzej posebno aktiven pri varovanju spominskih plošč antifašističnemu odporu v Vzhodnem Berlinu, ki so vse bolj tarča neonacističnih skinheadov. Ker jih je postavila bivša vzhodnonemška oblast, so izpostavljene slepemu besu tistih, ki hočejo uničiti vse sledove nekdanje države delavcev in kmetov.

"V Berlinu živimo v težkem položaju, ker se v enem delu mesta spodbuja uničevanje antifašističnih spomenikov, medtem ko se v zahodnem Berlinu veselimo, da nacistična doba in kraji zločinov končno prodirajo v zavest javnosti. Tu spomenike šele postavljamo" (Aktives Museum 1990:2).

Maja 1991 so nadomestili pet spominskih plošč, ki jih je vzhodnonemška partija postavila v spomin žrtev nacizma v vzhodnem Berlinu. Po oceni

Aktivnega muzeja so neznanci (domnevno neonacisti) spomladi 1991 odstranili šestnajst takih plošč (Tagespiegel 1991).

Podobne aktivnosti muzeja je spodbuditi premazanje plošče v ulici Niederkirchner, ki je mimoidoče spomnil na to, da se je ulica, prej kot so ji dali ime po žrtvi gestapa, imenovala ulica Princa Albrehta, in da je tu bil sedež gestapa (Neue Zeit 1991). Medtem ko v vzhodnem Berlinu že preimenujejo ulice, je uradna politika Aktivnega muzeja, da morajo vse ulice, poimenovane po žrtvah fašizma (tudi če so bili komunisti), ohraniti svoje ime (Tageszeitung 1991).

Eden izmed najbolj vnetih zagovornikov te politike je socialdemokrat Robert Zeiler, ki mu je usoda namenila, da so ga v Buchenwald internirali najprej nacisti, potem pa še komunisti (Berliner Zeitung 1991).

Razne struje v Zeilerjevi stranki ga napadajo, češ da sta bila npr. Klara Zetkin in Ernst Thälmann ne samo žrtvi nacistov, ampak tudi ustanovitelja "komunističnega nasilnega režima" (Kreuzer 1991). Ta je pogal v izgnanstvo 100.000 socialdemokratov, 1.400 pa jih je pobil po zaporih (Kreutzer 1991). Isti Herr Kreuzer pa le zagovarja, naj trg Roze Luxemburg ohrani ime slovite komunistke, ker je Erich Mielke (pozneje vodja Stasija) tam 1932 ustrelil dva policaja. Vse to samo dokazuje, da niti spomin na žrtve nacizma ni nevtralen in da sektaštvo med socialdemokrati in komunisti, ki je 1933 Hitlerju omogočilo, da je postal kancler, še vedno živi.

Druga skupina spomenikov, ki jih proučuje Aktivni muzej so monumentalni kipi Marxa, Engelsa, Lenina, Thälmanna in rdeče armade. Muzej je priredil razstavo s pregledom vseh teh spomenikov z navedbo datumov postavitve in odstranitve. Namen tega je bil informirati in vzpodbuditi razprave o prihodnosti teh zgodovinskih artefaktov. Kot pravi že naslov razstave so možnosti jasno definirane: ohraniti, spremeniti ali uničiti (Elfert et al. 1990).

Najnovejši projekt muzeja je bila razstava v razstavi. Skupina vzhodno- in zahodnonemških zgodovinarjev je na ta način komentirala vzhodnonemško razstavo Tradicionalni kabinet antifašističnega odpora v Prenzlauer Bergu iz leta 1986. Besedila Aktivnega muzeja so postavljena med eksponate in besedila izvirne razstave in jo tako komentirajo. Obiskovalci lahko primerjajo muzeologijo iz 1986 in 1991 leta. Aktivni muzej to razstavo v vabilu na otvoritev zagovarja takole: "V času, ko se spomin na preteklih 40 let vse bolj zatira, ko na hitro zapirajo muzeje, preimenujejo ulice, odstranjujejo simbole, je to pravi kraj za soočenje s tako pomembnim delom zgodovine NDR, kot je bila njena uradna podoba antifašizma."

Moto razstave je "Živeti z zgodovino". Delo Aktivnega muzeja priča, da muzeji niso samo zavetišča pred sedanostjo (po kompenzacijski tezi Lübbeja), ampak tudi pomembne kritične in kontraverzne oblike za premagovanje preteklosti in za življenje z njo. To velja tudi za kompleksno preteklost Berlina, ki predstavlja nacionalno zgodovino na ravni Heimata.

Sklep

Nemčija lahko s svojimi raznovrstnimi metodami in teoretično utemeljenimi razpravami o muzejih mnogo ponudi evropski muzejski sceni po l. 1992. Kateri modeli bodo prevladali in kako se bodo spreminjali, ni mogoče napovedati. Nekatere oblike kot je Aktivni muzej, bi lahko bile pomembne, predvsem za

nove demokracije v Vzhodni in Srednji Evropi, ki morajo tako kot Berlin živeti s težko nedavno preteklostjo.

Zahvale

Zahvaljujema se dr. Susan Pearce in gospe Korff za njuno potrpežljivost, vsem sodelavcem v ulici Normandy 16 in ekipi programa Down to Earth (Thames Television) za njihovo pomoč med pisanjem. Končno se želiva še posebej zahvaliti osebju hotela Merkister na Orkneyu, ki nam je posredovalo ključni telefaks iz Nemčije.

Iz angleščine prevedel Franc Smrke

AVTOR

Frederick Baker, častni raziskovalec na Oddelku za arheološke vede, Univerza v Bradfordu, Anglija.

Gottfried Korff, profesor kulturoloških študij o sodobnosti na Inštitutu za etnologijo Ludwiga Uhlanda, Univerza Eberharda Karla v Tübingenu, Nemčija.

THE AUTHORS

Frederick Baker, Honorary Research Assistant, Department of Archaeological Sciences, University of Bradford, England.

Gottfried Korff, Professor of Contemporary Cultural Studies, Ludwig-Uhlands Institute for Volkskunde, Eberhard-Karls University Tübingen, Germany.