

OD ZAČASNEGA K STALNEMU: JAVNO ŽALOVANJE IN ARHITEKTURA PROSTOROV SPOMINA

FROM TEMPORARY TO PERMANENT: PUBLIC MOURNING AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF MEMORIAL SPACES

Ključne besede

prostor spomina; spomeniki; spontano žalovanje; navezanost; prisvojitvev prostora

Key words

memorials; trauma; spontaneous mourning; attachment; appropriation

Izvleček

Kako se soočamo z nedavnimi žalostnimi dogodki? Kako jih obeležimo v prostoru?

Abstract

How do we commemorate recent atrocities? In most cases, in the aftermath of tragic events, public mourning takes place - usually displayed through numerous objects left at the spot. If the event is considered to be of national interest, it is most likely that official plans for building a permanent memorial will take place. Since temporary memorials or so-called grassroots memorials are perceived as a form of democracy in action, they raise a range of critical questions for those commissioning and building permanent official markers for places of tragedy. One premise is that contemporary memorials, among other tasks, offer a space where individuals can make sense of loss and deal with conflicting emotions. In reality, however, most memorials fail to perform this function since the needs of the public collide with their architectural solutions. Through a brief investigation of several contemporary memorials, this paper aims to highlight approaches commissioners and designers adopt in regard to public sentiments and the process of transformation from spontaneous mourning to the built structure.

V mnogo primerih po tragičnih dogodkih se javno žalovanje izvaja na mestu tragičnega dogodka. V primeru, da je dogodek nacionalnega pomena, bo na tem mestu postavljeno obeležje.

Manifestacija žalovanja javnost izraža v izgradnji spominskega obeležja in prostora žalovanja. Ob teh, pa obstajajo še začasni, spontani prostori žalovanja, ki so predhodni označevalci spominskih parkov in obeležij spomina. Spontani prostori žalovanja so znak neposredne demokracije. Stalni prostori so formalizirani, podrejeni administrativnemu urejanju prostorskega oblikovanja in v mnogih primerih neustrezno nadomestijo prvotni sporočilni pomen prostora. Prispevek predstavlja kratek pregled izbranih sodobnih obeležij.

UKD 725.94
COBISS 1.02
Prejeto 25.08.2016

dr. ir. Sabina Tanović

Department of History, Architecture and Built Environment,
Delft University of Technology
tanovic.sabina@gmail.com

"Architecture's role is not to create strong foreground figures or feelings, but to establish frames of perception and horizons of understanding."

[Pallasmaa, 2000: 31]

1. Introduction

How to commemorate atrocities is an urgent question that resonates with the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium. The public feels the victims should be acknowledged, the perpetrators should be brought to justice, and the world should be united in the interpretation of what exactly happened and who is to blame. To set all this in stone, we call for a memorial of some sort: a place where survivors, victims, and their loved ones can gather together for support and commemoration, and where they might find solace; but also a place to remind society of what happened and how important it is to prevent it from ever happening again. In most cases, after a tragic event happens, public mourning takes place - usually displayed through numerous objects, such as flowers and images, left at the spot. These temporary memorials or so-called grassroots memorials are one of the most common impromptu expressions of grief on sites of trauma and tragedy. The importance of spontaneous memorials in contemporary culture has been widely recognized both in their political dimension and their non-institutionalized character. Their essentially material existence signifies the process of mourning and intimates the relationship with the deceased in the public space. By placing objects or any other kind of signification, people instinctively designate a place as the place for mourning and thereby appropriate the space. In this way, on a symbolic level, people establish a connection with the dead and the place becomes a "spontaneous shrine" [Santino, 2006]. Contrary to official monuments and memorials, spontaneous memorials are, according to art historian Harriet Senie, a form of "democracy in action" [Senie, 1999]. As such, they raise a range of critical questions for those commissioning and building permanent official markers for places of tragedy. It is not uncommon that spontaneous personal gestures collide with official commemorative

edifices, which results in removal of the spontaneous shrines within a very short period of time. In other cases, the public mourning is recognized by an official initiative to design a permanent memorial or monument, while public offerings are archived or stored. What to do with all the material that accumulated through public mourning is often a difficult question for the authorities. Regardless of the intricate process of creating a memorial structure, there is a pivotal figure in the translation process from sentiment to memorial that can be singled out - the architect or designer. They are usually commissioned by governments or other authorities to produce a structure that satisfies all parties involved. Given the highly specific nature of memorials, the difficulty of representing contested interpretations of traumatic events, and the rarity of such commissions, architects and designers as a rule do not receive much training in the peculiarities of memorial design and, hence, tend to rely more or less heavily on tacit knowledge. They typically have little experience with or knowledge of the psychology of mourning, and often operate under assumptions that deserve closer scrutiny, such as the idea that memorials can assist in the healing process of survivors. Through an analysis of several cases where spontaneous public mourning was transformed into permanent architectural forms, this paper aims to highlight the process of transformation from spontaneous mourning to the built structure by posing a question: to what extent and in what ways is public mourning invited in contemporary memorial designs?

2. Understanding public mourning

Places of tragic events that are transformed through material objects have been labelled as performative commemoratives, since they "display death in the heart of social life" [Santino, 1992]. They represent what cemeteries used to represent before the 19th century, when they were still part of the inner city and therefore of everyday public life. When cemeteries and mourning became more private and intimate, spontaneous memorials emerged as a cultural phenomenon. Some argue that the current practice

of spontaneous mourning originated in the 1980's, more precisely with the death of John Lennon. Today, we can witness outbursts of public mourning all over the world: it has become a common practice.

The concept of public mourning echoes a model of action-orientated mourning proposed by clinical psychologists. This model is based on several defined steps that the bereaved has to undertake in order to be able to cope with and adjust to the absence created by a specific physical or psycho-social loss. One of the stages includes 'readjustment to move adaptively into the new world without forgetting the old' [Rando, 2000]. It involves revising the assumptive world,¹ developing a new relationship with the deceased, adopting new ways of being in the world, and, finally, forming a new identity. Also, there is a question of reinvestment of the emotional energy that was once invested in the relationship with the deceased. The bereaved need to manage the transition by focusing on other people, objects, pursuits, and so forth. In this fundamental process of transformation, the survivor can be helped in several ways, but the underlying strategy is the recognition of the many challenges the bereaved person has encountered by.

"...looking beyond the actuality of the loss to another level of loss, one that transcends the literal impact of the missing person and the loss of their part in the life of survivor"

[Beder, 2005: 258]

In relation to this theory, the importance of materiality, for example the materiality of the body in burial ceremonies, has been underlined time and again. If there is a material point of reference the bereaved are able to visit, then the process of mourning can be performed in a more defined framework. In this way, mourners can receive support and a much needed platform where they can revise the assumptive world. Furthermore, a person dealing with trauma can experience emotions of anger and abandonment, which need to be acknowledged and overcome by the development of new relationships with objects and people. Spatial environments can help in the transition from anger to acceptance.

Hence, from a psychological point of view and concerning the immediacy of their occurrence, spontaneous memorials can be recognized as material objects with a communicative value that help the transition from grief to mourning. Corresponding with a theory on transitional experience widely adopted in children psychology, these objects can be perceived as a transitional medium that direct the bereaved from the abrupt painful feeling toward healing and acceptance [Winnicott, 1982]. In addition, Senie stressed that the flourishing of spontaneous memorials and grieving in public is related to the apparent need of having a private loss publicly acknowledged [Senie, 2003]. They are a relevant factor of social agency or even social change, since they inherently contain protest and indicate other feelings besides grief. Once the spontaneous expression of grief loses its immediacy, the mourning continues, expressed in more or less the same way but with diminished frequency. In a way, it transforms into a ritual similar to that of visiting a graveyard. Obviously, not all public expressions are welcomed, particularly if they result in vandalism or even the demolition of a monument or a memorial. Even though there are cases where designers do invite a more aggressive kind of public interaction, in most memorials these are not welcomed. For example, the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin, the official German Holocaust memorial, provoked contentious debates about the anti-graffiti solutions applied on its surface. Here interaction with the public is encouraged on a physical level, but even this has proven to be problematic as the site turns into a popular playground.

3. The memorial as a space in need of appropriation

The commonly accepted assumption, reinforced by two extensively commemorated world wars and to some extent confirmed by academic research, is that a memorial is capable of serving many purposes. Its mere existence is thought to be able to help victims and survivors cope. It re-establishes normality: even those who are under serious threat are in need of erecting a commemorative structure. It creates a material framework that is expected to positively influence the processes of mourning and healing. A memorial is thought to aid in constructing or reaffirming individual and collective identities. It serves to educate the general public and offers information and insight that might forestall future atrocities. Finally, its presence within a society offers a point of reference, a political platform from which to address relevant issues related to the traumatic event.

Once built, however, a memorial often does not live up to the expectations. The victims and survivors might not identify with the result, it attracts vandals, it causes social controversy and polarizes potentially disruptive debates, or it is hijacked by various parties to serve political objectives. Even though contemporary memorials aim to be objective and to avoid favouring one version of events over others, a number of problems arise as a result of the inherently political nature of the memorial. The significant proliferation of memorials and memorial museums after 1985 is also indicative of the importance assigned to the spaces of commemoration in contemporary society, in which memories are mediated through global networks of communication.

Slika 1: 11M obeležje, postaja Atocha, Madrid (2007), FAM Arquitectura y Urbanismo SLP. Podzemni prostor v katerem so sporočila nastala ob spontanem žalovanju. Sporočila so vtisnjena v notranjosti stolpa.
Figure 1: 11M memorial, Atocha station, Madrid (2007), FAM Arquitectura y Urbanismo SLP, Architects. Underground space with the messages from spontaneous mourning inscribed in the inner body of the cylinder (photograph by the Author).





Slika 2: 11M obeležje, postaja Atocha, Madrid (2007), FAM Arquitectura y Urbanismo SLP. Vidna sporočila in človeško merilo.

Figure 2: 11M memorial, Atocha station, Madrid (2007), FAM Arquitectura y Urbanismo SLP, Architects (photograph by the Author).

Having all this in mind, public mourning is yet another aspect the makers of contemporary memorials have to take into account. One premise is that contemporary design concepts dealing with loss and grief should aim to create a space for specific collective and private rituals of mourning. Hence a memorial becomes a transitional environment, a holding space that is expected to create a safe realm for individuals who need to make sense of loss and deal with conflicting emotions. In reality, however, most memorials fail to perform this function, as is the case with the 11M memorial at Atocha station in Madrid. The extensive outburst of public mourning that occurred after the 2004 terror attacks on Madrid overtook the space of Atocha station. As the collection of candles, dried flowers, messages and other objects started to become an obstacle, in June 2004 "cybershrines" known as *Espacios de Palabras* were installed at the entrances of Atocha and El Pozo stations, so that people could leave messages of condolence in an electronic form until a permanent memorial was built. These 'video walls' attracted a wide audience of people interested in leaving messages of condolence, and were therefore recognized as powerful instruments of living memory, whose meaning was shared

and instantly understood. Following the installation of these temporary shrines, many argued that the new permanent memorials might never achieve the same effect in engaging the public.² Within three years from the attacks a memorial was inaugurated, and all the public offerings were collected and archived.³ In a two-partite composition, an underground space and a street-level marker, the memorial aims to offer a secluded realm for contemplation and at the same time tries to prominently mark the place. Some of the text notes that were found among the objects of public mourning are inscribed on the ETF foil⁴ that constitutes part of the memorial.

Positing new objects, on the other hand, is not possible, since the underground space is guarded and kept free from any additional objects. Meanwhile the upper part remains difficult to reach due to the heavy traffic circling the memorial. Nevertheless, there are still flowers and other offerings to be seen at the base of the prominent cylindrical form in the middle of the roundabout. Hence, the public continues to leave objects even after this possibility was excluded from the design.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington D.C. deals with the subject in quite a different way. A common scene at the memorial is that of people tracing names with a piece of paper, caressing the surface of the reflective granite walls in order to touch the names, leaving flowers and other objects. This is also true for many First World War memorials, where one can often see a poppy attached to a particular name, at least the ones visitors are able to reach. The same can be observed at memorial sites of the Second World War, where small piles of stones, flowers and objects are always to be found. The matter of appropriation comes prominently to the fore in these places: clearly people need to feel invited to interact with the space. The sensory features of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, for example, provide the Vietnam Veterans with the necessary environment for facilitating the process of mourning through the presentation, confrontation and recognition of losses [Watkins, Cole and Weidemann, 2010: 364]. In situations where a memorial is not existent or it is in the process of making, it is not rare that people gather in a nearby space or a building, as was the case with the mourning over 9/11 in New York. At times, even existing monuments or memorials that are unrelated to the event are appropriated by the public, as happened with a 1987 monument on the Place de l'Alma in Paris that is used as an informal memorial to Princess Diana who died

in a traffic accident in 1997.⁵ In view of these facts, it is apparent that memorial spaces have a significant role in public mourning. How public mourning is accommodated in memorial spaces, on the other hand, is a topic that has not been addressed much, and particularly not in the discipline of architecture.

4. Inviting or censoring the public opinion?

The question of public freedom is inevitably, and ironically, a difficult one in regard to public architecture, since the level of publicity varies depending on the function. In the case of public memorials, communication with the public supposes a straightforward relationship: memorials are buildings for memories and commemorations. Of course, in reality the issue is highly problematized and particularly so in official monuments and memorials. With regard to the issue of a memorial space doubling as a public space, however, a question could be raised about how public a memorial space actually is, or, rather, what kind of public realm it is in the first place. This is particularly true regarding the tension that often rises between the program of demands defined by official bodies and the expectations of the public. The Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin is a good example of the turmoil a public memorial project can induce, leading to a cancelled competition, severe opposition and continuous adjustments of the chosen design.



Slika 3: Replika plamenice s spomenika Svobode (NY, ZDA). Pariz, Place de l'Alma. Obležje spominja na tragično smrt Princeze Diane (1997).

Figure 3: A replica of the torch held by the Statue of Liberty, Place de l'Alma, Paris (1987) appropriated as a memorial to Princess Diana who died in a traffic accident in 1997 (photograph by the Author).

Another well-known example is the commemoration of the terrorist attacks that happened on September 11th 2001 in New York. Here the ambition to effectively transmit the traumatic memory and the need to console the survivors of the event delivered an equally long and contested debate. The aftermath of the attacks saw the public display remarkable actions of spontaneous mourning. At the same time, a public discussion on the most appropriate ways to commemorate the victims was developing towards two distinct positions: rebuilding the site or leaving it empty. Unsurprisingly, many architects advocated for building new structures on the ashes of the old, while other voices urged for an immaterial – i.e. made of light – "phantom building" [Rosenblum, 2001]. A version of this idea became reality only six months after the attack. In an annual commemoration of the victims, an installation called "Tribute in Light", consisting of vertical columns of light, was installed at the base of the demolished Twin Towers. The practice continues to this day, even after the official memorial was inaugurated. In contrast to the fast resolution about the installation, the creation of a permanent memorial took a decade before it was opened to the public. The process involved several parties, was transparent and, to a certain extent, the public was invited to participate. This was demonstrated, for example, in the decisions made on how to inscribe the names of the victims into the memorial. The arrangement of the names was initially planned in alphabetical order, with insignia next to some names, for example the symbol of a fire department accompanying a member of a fire brigade. The public protested, arguing that it created a sense of hierarchy among the victims, and that it would disconnect the names of family members as well. Ultimately, the designers, Michael Arad and landscape architect Peter Walker, recognized the importance of public opinion. In the end, they also argued that finding a suitable solution was most rewarding since the memorial, as it is now, "brings individual human stories into an arrangement" [Arad, 2013]. The very choice of the final design, however, was in the hands

of a professional jury. Here, the greatest dilemmas concerned the character of the memorial itself. For example, in its final deliberations the competition jury dismissed proposals that focused on consoling memorialization by emphasizing the beauty and sacredness of the space. Instead, they looked for a design that would represent an equilibrium between encouraging redemption and demonstrating the destruction, such as the winning design entitled "Reflecting Absence".⁶

Arguing that the memorial needed to do two things, commemorate the event and act as an active public space, the designers of the chosen project stressed that the memorial should be used as a place for work and play. They also pointed out that there is no safe solution since public spaces are resilient, and that there is no certainty that a public memorial can be used only for "good purposes":

"We have to be optimists and hope that people will use public space in a way that is affirmative and not destructive, but you would be naive to think that it can't be co-opted and used in a way that will injure other people. It would show more than a little hubris on the part of any designer to say, I've designed a space that can only be used for good. But to deny public space altogether would be repressive" [Arad, 2013].

Slika 4: Konceptna prostorska rešitev za spomenik 22. julij. Utoya (2012), Jonas Dahlberg.
Figure 4: Concept design for 22. July memorial, Utoya (2012), Jonas Dahlberg (credits Jonas Dahlberg Studio).



After numerous adjustments of the original proposal, including elevating the plaques with victims' names from the underground to street level, the memorial eventually became a fountain inserted in the remaining footprints of the demolished Twin Towers. The memorial is surrounded with a carefully organized public park and a recently opened memorial museum next to it. Nearly 3000 names are inscribed into thick bronze parapets of the fountains. The names are arranged in groups, depending on the location where the victims were at the day of the attack. Next to this, the names are positioned according to the "meaningful adjacency requests" whereby relatives and colleagues could ask for particular individual names to be inscribed next to each other, depending with whom they were at the time of the attack. This kind of direct participation in crucial decisions about how the memorial space is going to perform some of its functions is in most cases not offered to the general public and, often, not even to the survivors. Norway's July 22 memorial sites, with their memorials in progress, testify to this. In the winning design proposal for the 2014 competition for Utoya island, Swedish artist Jonas Dahlberg envisioned a physical incision, a symbolical wound, into the Sorbraten peninsula which faces Utoya.

The literal cut into the landscape, with the names of the victims to be engraved on the flat vertical stone surface, was welcomed by the committee as radical, brave and relevant in the process of remembering. It only seems that the aspect of interaction with the public, such as in the Vietnam Veterans memorial that manifested in the possibility to touch the names, is taken away: a wide gap will be dividing the wall with names and the viewing gallery. The artist argued that accentuating rupture and interruption will bring visitors to a state of reflection in order to establish their own private ways of seeing and remembering [Dahlberg, 2012].

The realization of the memorial, however, has been postponed due to the opposition of Utoya locals who perceive the proposed design as intrusive. In the meantime, a subtler and nature-friendly approach that strongly involves aspects of 'healing'

has come to fore: the memorial newly installed at Utoya by architectural team 3RW entitled 'Lysningen – The Clearing'. Even though the name suggests similar notions of a void and absence as signifiers of traumatic memory, as employed in Dahlberg's concept, the memorial was designed to change as a structure subordinate to nature and the passing of time. The aspect of mutability through natural processes is reinforced by a careful selection of vegetation, but more importantly by the deliberate choice of a location without site-specific history. As the designers explained:

"We might talk about the memorial as a kind of void to be filled with the individual's needs to process grief, remember the lives that were lost and detach themselves from the drama that took place elsewhere on the island" [3RW architects, 2015].

5. Involving the public in the construction process

A 1978 competition for a commemoration of the Second World War destruction in Lüdenhausen, Germany, yielded a proposal that involved citizens as both designers and owners of the design. The project, entitled "Pro Memoria Garden" and designed by the Argentinian architect Emilio Ambasz, was devised as a labyrinthine garden with individually assigned gardening plots that needed to be nourished and cared for by the plot owners. In this way, the active participation would, the designer believed, symbolically keep the memory alive. Each plot would be assigned to a newborn and demarcated with a marble slab inscribed with that person's name.

The proposed concept was that a person would own the assigned garden from the age of five until death, when the plot would be given to a new owner with a new marble slab placed next to the previous one. The architect hoped that from divided plots the labyrinth would grow into a common community garden and that interacting in this way, the garden as a memorial in the making would teach people about the respect and value of life, as he argued: "Children are taught the rudiments of gardening to prepare for a lifetime of responsible cultivation" [Ambasz, 1978].

The tendency toward involving the public not only as viewers but also as active participants in creating a memorial seems to become more prominent in contemporary projects. For example, the so called “Field of Crosses” - Monument to Kornati Firefighters (2010) on the Island of Kornat in Croatia, was almost entirely realized by volunteers. The memorial, consisting of twelve dry-wall crosses of megalithic dimensions accompanied with a circular ‘chapel’, were put in place by nearly 3000 participants.⁷ The amount of participants in the construction of the memorial was recognized as both collective and individual witnessing. Throughout the process, described by the designer as “cathartic atonement” [Bašić, 2010], participants were learning about the event and, in some instances, ways to overcome the trauma.

This practice is widely used in projects by German artist Jochen Gerz, best known for his Monument Against Fascism in Harburg-Hamburg (1986-1996) and The Square of the Invisible Monument (also known as 2146 Stones-Memorial against Racism, 1993) in Saarbrücken. Gerz’s recent project.

The Square of the European Promise, continues this approach and takes participation as a key element in memorial design.⁸ Negatively surprised by the 1931 “Heroes Memorial Hall” in the Christ Church in Bochum, where a memorial mosaic accusingly depicts the names of enemy states opposite of the names of local First World War victims, the artist invited citizens to let their names be engraved on memorial plaques that will be added to this odd memorial. In the process, each individual that signed up to have their name included in the memorial, had to make a “promise” to Europe that remains private, hence invisible for the public - in line with Gerz’s earlier projects. In addition, the act of adding names to the existing memorial plaques indirectly refers to the post-war commemoration of the Second World War, when names of the dead were often added to existing memorials of the First World War. The fact that the new list consists of names that belong to living

individuals creates new meaning and creates a platform for current issues.

6. Discussion

In Atocha, the memorial was a response to the immediate post-traumatic period and can therefore be recognized as a spontaneous act of mourning since the designers felt personally affected by the attack. By extending the official program of demands that initially only called for a public memorial on the street-level, designers opted for a spiritual realm where people could contemplate the loss. Even though some of the messages of public mourning were used in the design of the memorial, the public and public mourning were excluded from the design process.

The result was an architecturally inspiring peace of work, but highly contentious in terms of its functioning and meaning. In fact, the project seems to become a victim of its own architectural supremacy since the unfulfilled demands for high maintenance caused the memorial’s deterioration. Perhaps more importantly, the memorial obstructed the appropriation of the space by the public which became difficult – if not impossible. In the case of the 9/11 memorial, on the other hand, public sentiment was included in the decision-making when some of the crucial elements of the memorial were resolved, namely the inscription of the victims’ names. The origin of the project was similar to that of the 11M memorial, since outbursts of spontaneous mourning after the attacks inspired many to think about permanent ways to commemorate the victims.

The designer Michael Arad was equally touched by the coming together of people in the public space after the attacks, which led him to think about the importance of public memorial space in society. Unlike the construction process of the 11M memorial, building the 9/11 memorial was much less straightforward and involved numerous alterations of the original proposal. Even though it is a highly controlled public space, the very process of its making confirms how relevant the role of the architect is, as the mediator between public opinion and official bodies.

Due to the transparent approach and highly public character of the process, the creation of The National 9/11 Memorial and Museum was an illustration of contemporary debates surrounding work of memorialization, in which the question of architecture in the service of memory faces multilayered issues. One of the most prominent issues during this process centered on the role of architecture as an embodiment of what society prefers in terms of a memorial's morphology. This was certainly not the case with the approach taken in the creation of memorials for July 22 memorials in Norway.

Public mourning is a delicate issue and, in most cases, difficult to manage for official institutions, particularly in cases of immediate spontaneous mourning manifesting itself in enormous quantities of material. In Madrid, these offerings were archived and documented in projects preceding the official memorial. Once the 11M was built, however, public mourning was in large part restricted. Conversely, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, visitors continue to leave objects that are collected on a daily basis and added to the growing collection.

In this way, the memorial stays true to its reputation of a "healing" structure, by reaffirming the importance of public mourning as an ongoing phenomenon. In contrast, the 11M did recognize the public sentiment, but chose to ossify it instead.

Keeping in mind that public mourning is a continuous process, as underlined by our knowledge of psychology, it is essential that architecture provides space for spontaneous expressions of grief. A memorial that fulfills its purpose as a public space is a memorial that is appropriated by its users. Even though it inevitably becomes an emotional realm, it needs to allow for this to happen on both an informal and an institutional level.

Regarding current issues in architectural practice that question the architect's role in society, examples of memorial projects that embrace a participatory approach and involve the public in the decision-making or the construction process, seem to carry seeds of actual change. This approach also resonates with the idea that architecture's role is related to

establishing "frames of perception and horizons of understanding", as quoted in the beginning of this paper. For example, if the accusatory First World War memorial in Bochum anticipated the destruction that swiped Europe in the Second World War, and as such has taught us a lesson (as commemorative edifices are expected to do), countering this approach is a demonstration of progress. What kind of prophetic message rests in Gerz's publicly made public memorial is yet to be seen, but for now it represents a valuable example of a design intervention that is both a reflection of public sentiment and a reaction to the architectural focus on form. In order to create meaningful spaces, designers of contemporary memorials need to look more closely to the process of mourning and towards the needs of the bereaved. In this view, memorial spaces should aim to reaffirm the power of design to elucidate collective emotion in a democracy.

Bibliography

- 3RW architects (2015): 3RW Wins the competition to design memorial on Utoya, Official website; <http://3rw.no/3rw-wins-the-competition-to-propose-memorial-on-utoya/>
- Abend, L. and P. Geoff (2004): Spain's path to 3/11 memorial, *The Christian Science Monitor*; [www.csmonitor.com/2004/0714/p07s01-woeu.html/\(page\)/2](http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0714/p07s01-woeu.html/(page)/2) <July 14, 2004>
- Ambasz, E. (1978): Pro-Memoria Garden, Official website Emilio Ambasz & Associates. Inc; <http://emilioambaszandassociates.com/portfolio/Pro-Memoria-Garden>.
- Arad, M. quoted in: H. Shapira, 'Reflecting Absence: An Interview with Michael Arad', *Public Books* www.publicbooks.org/interviews/reflecting-absence-an-interview-with-michael-arad <August 30, 2013>
- Bašić, N. (2010): A Monument to Kornati Firefighters in: *Pogledaj.to*; <http://pogledaj.to/drugestvari/nikola-basic-a-monument-to-kornati-firefighters/>, <November 27, 2010>
- Beder, J. (2004/2005): 'Loss of the Assumptive World – How we Deal with Death and Loss', *OMEGA*, Vol. 50(4), pp. 255-265.
- Dahlberg, J. (2012): July 22 Memorial Sites – winning entry, *Public Art Norway* – KORO http://publicartnorway.org/content/uploads/2016/03/Jonas-Dahlberg_ENG.pdf, <February, 2012>
- Gerz J. (2007): 49th City Talks: Square of the European Promise - A speech by Jochen Gerz in Bochum Museum of Art <http://europeanpromise.eu/chronology/49th-city-talks/> <January 17, 2007>
- Santino, J. (1992): Not an Unimportant Failure: Rituals of Death and Politics in Northern Ireland, in: M. McCaughan, ed., *Displayed in Mortal Light* Northern Ireland: Antrim Arts Council, n.p.
- Santino, J. ed. (2006): *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pallasmaa J. (2012): J. Pallasmaa and P. MacKeith, *Encounters 1: Architectural Essays*, Rakkenustieto.
- Rando, T. A. (2000): On the experience of traumatic stress in anticipatory and post-death mourning, in: T. A. Rando, ed., *Clinical Dimensions of Anticipatory Mourning: Theory and Practice in Working with the Dying, Their Loved Ones, and Their Caregivers*, Champaign, IL: Research Press, pp. 155-221.
- Rosenblum, R. (2001): quoted in D. Solomon, *Art/Architecture: From the Rubble, Ideas for Rebirth*, *The New York Times* www.nytimes.com/2001/09/30/arts/art-architecture-from-the-rubble-ideas-for-rebirth.html <(30th September, 2001)>
- Sánchez-Carretero, C., A. Cea, P. Díaz-Mas, Pilar Martínez and C. Ortiz (2011): *On Blurred Borders and Interdisciplinary Research Teams: The Case of the "Archive of Mourning"*, *Forum: Qualitative Research Sozialforschung*, Vol. 12, 3, www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1737/3237 <30th September, 2001>
- Senie, H. F. (1999): *Mourning in Protest: Spontaneous Memorials and the Sacralization of Public Space*, *Harvard Design Magazine: Constructions of Memory*, 9 (Fall 1999), pp. 23-27.
- Senie, H. F. (2003): *A Difference in Kind: Spontaneous memorials after 9/11*, *International Sculpture Center*, www.sculpture.org/documents/scmag03/jul_aug03/webspecial/senie.shtml.
- Young, J. E. (2006): *The Stages of Memory at Ground Zero*, in: O. B. Stier and J. Shawn Landres, eds., *Religion, Violence, Memory, and Place*, *Indiana University Press*, pp. 214-235.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1982): *Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena [1951]*, in: D. W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality*, *Routledge; New Edition*, pp. 1-34.
- Watkins, N., F. Cole and S. Weidemann (2010): *The War Memorial as Healing Environment: The Psychological Effect of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on Vietnam War Combat Veterans' Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Symptoms, Environment and Behavior*, Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 351-375.